North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP)

Policy Review Panel (PRP) & Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC)
Meeting Materials
January 15, 2015; 10 am – 3 pm
Ukiah Valley Conference Center, 200 South School Street, Ukiah

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following items correspond to the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) agenda for January 15, 2015 and are in agenda order and item number. The items below include background information for agenda items that require additional explanation and in some cases include recommendations for action. The meeting agenda and other meeting materials can be found on the NCRP website at http://www.northcoastresourcepartnership.org/app_folders/view/8541

IV NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Improvements Discussion

(Sandra Perez & Wayne Haydon, TPRC Co-chairs & Jen Jenkins Kuszmar, Humboldt County)

During the NCRP Meeting in October 2014, Chair Mackenzie directed staff to work with the TPRC and Executive Committee to develop improvements to the project review and selection process for consideration as an update to the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines. A list of NCRP project review and selection process improvement recommendations and feedback was compiled from the NCRP meeting in Fortuna, project proponents, a Tribal representatives meeting held on November 14 and from the TPRC Project Review de-brief meeting held on June 10, 2014 in Eureka. In November staff provided this list of process improvements to the TPRC for additional input. Based on the input, updated Guidelines were provided to the TPRC for review in December. Updated Guidelines for review are found as Attachment A; underlined and crossed-out text indicates new/changed language.

V NCRP Executive Committee Composition

In October of 2012, the NCRP PRP approved an election process for the Executive Committee as described in the NCRP Handbook (see below and at http://www.northcoastresourcepartnership.org/files/managed/Document/8343/NCRP_Handbook_201

4.pdf). During the NCRP Meeting in October 2014, Chair Mackenzie directed staff to set up an Executive Committee meeting to consider options to ensure Tribal representation on the Executive Committee and craft a recommendation or options for PRP consideration during the next NCRP meeting. Following is proposed language for the Executive Committee election process; underlined and crossed-out text indicates new/changed language.

Executive Committee

The NCRP Executive Committee is a Standing Committee, subject to the Brown Act. The Executive Committee is comprised of the Policy Review Panel Chair, Vice-Chair, ~~and~~ a third member, nominated and approved by the Policy Review Panel and a fourth nominated by the Tribal representatives and approved by the Policy Review Panel. The Policy Review Panel reconsiders the third and fourth ~~member's~~ members' appointment every two years. The Executive Committee provides day-to-day leadership for the NCRP, including signing letters of support, represents the NCRP with legislators and key agency partners and makes time-sensitive decisions on behalf of the NCRP. Any time sensitive decisions made by the Executive Committee reflect previous Policy Review Panel direction and are consistent with Policy Review Panel approved goals and objectives. Decisions are made by unanimous or majority vote. When majority vote cannot be reached, the decision is brought before the full Policy Review Panel for consideration. Executive Committee decisions are reported via email or provided as an update to the full Policy Review Panel at their next quarterly NCRP meeting.

VI Strategic Growth Council (SGC) Sustainable Communities Planning Grant

(Karen Gaffney, West Coast Watershed)

The North Coast Resource Partnership was awarded a Strategic Growth Council (SGC) Sustainable Communities Planning Grant, with the contract between the SGC and Humboldt County executed in August 2014. Humboldt County contracted with West Coast Watershed in October 2014 to execute the planning grant. The grant includes planning and analysis work focused in the following areas:

- greenhouse gas emissions reduction and energy independence
- economic valuation of working lands and natural areas
- climate adaptation
- model planning elements to support long term environmental and economic vitality (energy, transportation, water, waste, broadband)
- analysis of regional "grey and green" infrastructure
- economic analyses and financial plan

The final plan is expected to include stand alone reports in the above areas, yet also be well integrated across the above subject areas and with other NCRP planning documents. As is always the case with NCRP planning documents and implementation projects, local autonomy will be respected and counties and Tribes will have the option of "opting out" of particular themes that are not relevant to them, or may include statements in the document regarding their perspective on a particular topic. WCW

proposes to develop the document digitally, with the entire plan and distinct chapters available for download and printing via the NCRP website.

West Coast Watershed (WCW) will accomplish the work by hiring subject matter experts via a widely advertised, competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Technical writing, consultant coordination, PRP, TPRC and community input and meeting facilitation, as well as digital document development will be implemented by WCW. Per the grant award, a competitive sub-grants program will be conducted by WCW to enable local governments and tribes (or their designees) to provide local technical input and planning elements. Decisions regarding these sub-grant awards are proposed to be made by a sub-committee appointed by the PRP – with technical support provided by West Coast Watershed.

Following is a proposed timeline for the work and major milestones:

November - December 2014:

- gather background information related to SB 375/AB 32 implementation
- preliminary conversations with subject matter experts
- preliminary document outline and project management approach

January 2015:

- direction and input from NCRP Policy Review Panel

January-April 2015:

- meetings with state agencies on SGC and other agency priorities
- meetings with other regions on successful approaches
- develop detailed document outline
- hire subject matter experts
- perform research and analyses
- detailed interviews with PRP/TPRC members
- detailed interviews with local, state and federal agencies
- review preliminary findings and approach with PRP and TPRC at April meeting
- Appoint sub-committee for awarding sub-grants

May-July 2015:

- RFP for Tribal and local government technical contributions
- work with PRP appointed sub-committee to evaluate and award sub-grants
- July PRP/TPRC meeting: input from PRP and TPRC on interim work products (preliminary data and analyses, draft website pages and document outlines/draft sections)

August-October 2015:

- meetings with PRP, TPRC, local and state agencies on preliminary findings and recommendations
- continue research, analysis and technical report development
- digital document drafting
- coordinate with sub-grantees

- October PRP/TPRC meeting: input from PRP and TPRC on interim work products

November 2015-January 2016:

- review draft technical expert work products
- technical editing and report preparation
- continue research, analysis and technical report development
- digital document drafting
- coordinate with sub-grantees
- January PRP/TPRC meeting: input from PRP and TPRC on interim work products

February-July 2016:

- preliminary reports/work products from sub-grantees
- review draft technical expert work products
- technical editing and report preparation
- draft digital document to website
- finalize all sub-grants
- April & July PRP/TPRC meetings: input from PRP and TPRC on interim work products

August-October 2016:

- draft reports (individual and comprehensive)
- draft report to website for public review
- draft report to PRP and TPRC for review
- draft report to local, state and federal agencies for review
- April PRP/TPRC meeting: discuss input to date and next steps

November 2016 -January 2017:

- incorporate input and update draft
- final draft review by PRP/TPRC and select reviewers
- develop plan for rollout of document: media, funders, meetings

February-April 2017:

- finalize and publish plan on website
- deploy media and plan rollout strategy
- final report to SGC
- evaluate opportunities to leverage additional planning funds
- evaluate implementation opportunities

VII Proposition 1, California Water Bond

Background information about Proposition 1 can be found as Attachment B.

VIII North Coast Marijuana Issue: Policy Engagement & PRP Direction to Staff

(Supervisor Morris, NCRP Vice-chair)

During the NCRP Meeting in October 2014, Chair Mackenzie directed staff to work with Supervisor Morris and the Executive Committee to develop discussion topics and potential next steps during the next NCRP meeting. Supervisor Morris and NCRP staff met on December 1 and developed the following approach for the NCRP Meeting:

1. Review key presentation points and comments from the NCRP October meeting panel discussion
2. Provide pending legislation update
3. Roundtable discussion and solicit PRP direction

1. Key Presentation Points and Comments

During the NCRP meeting in October 2014, the panel looked at economic and environmental impacts - both positive and negative, as well as potential solutions and approaches. Following is a summary of the presentations and comments made during the meeting.

Presentation: Operation Yurok. The Yurok Tribe has a zero tolerance policy on Tribal lands. Many Tribal members do not have electricity and are dependent on surface water as their water source. Additionally, the Yurok have been working for decades on fisheries enhancement. This year, the drought has exacerbated a number of issues related to marijuana cultivation. It is perceived that Tribal land is lawless and the Tribe found that there was increased use of Tribal land for marijuana cultivation. The objective of Operation Yurok was not to arrest people or confiscate plants, but to stop illegal water diversions and storage before a major fish kill occurred. The Tribe has seen water tank levels falling from direct diversions.

Presentation: State Water Resources Control Board Regulatory Program. The Water Board is developing a pilot program to provide a permitting mechanism to with incentives for growers to properly apply for water permits and subsequently punishing those that are not complying with the regulations. The Water Board is not an enforcement agency and is unable to do anything about 'trespass grows' but will partner with authorities and other agencies to conduct enforcement and penalize. They want to provide education and outreach to support legal grows on private lands.

Presentation: North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Discharge Permitting Program: The North Coast RWQCB is currently developing a regulatory pilot program which includes: coordination with agencies, outreach/education, regulation, and enforcement. The program may include a waiver of waste discharge requirements which will be tiered and/or conditional based on threat to water quality. The guidelines for this order will be released for public review and consideration by the Board in mid 2015. The RWQCB anticipates a good deal of public input as this is a major change to the approach concerning marijuana cultivation.

Presentation: California Marijuana Legalization Initiative, 2016: Nearly two-thirds of Californians support legalizing, regulating and taxing recreational marijuana in the state

Discussion of the topic included the following points:

- There was a suggestion that California Department of Food and Agriculture/County Agricultural Commissioner's Office should be involved in crafting solutions. It was noted that working with state agencies is the first step.

- There was concern expressed about how to deal with those who do not support legalization especially if it would mean a reduction in price.

- A request was made for a field trip to look at farmers in the region who are using BMPs to cultivate marijuana with environmental sensitivity.

- Shasta County has had some success reviewing and changing county codes over time to create codes that are enforceable. Currently county codes are widely different, making it easy for illegal grows to fall through the cracks. Standardizing county codes throughout the state was suggested.

- The state needs to come up with solutions to mediate for clean up after trespass grows on private and public land. Currently many landowners are profiting from the grow operations, but are legally not responsible for the cleanup.

- It was discussed that 'boots on the ground enforcement' historically has not worked. Someone suggested that the Campaign Against Marijuana Planting (CAMP) program is a "starving failure". Enforcement is not how you start but how you end up. Enforcement alone will not work, but is important as part of the toolbox. A suggestion was made to focus on large cartels and major grows.

- There was concern expressed that we will never have enough funding to enforce proper management of all the grow operations. We should be looking at an integrated management approach such as creating zoned areas that would allow for tiered agricultural incentives including tax reductions for those using BMPs. The proposed SWRCB permit program is a big carrot that incentivizes BMPs. There was support for the agencies to regulate the practices not the product.

- There was discussion about the county's role in the permitting process and whether there should be a state lead agency that oversees all aspects of the permitting, regulation and enforcement of the practices and product. Some felt that the practices were land use issues and should be regulated at the county level.

- The Humboldt Bay Water District has partnered with California Fish and Wildlife to fund research in the Mad River watershed to quantify marijuana cultivation impacts. If there is interest to test the pilot SWRCB or RWQCB projects and related enforcement in the Mad River watershed, HBMD would be happy to partner.

2. Pending Legislation & Initiative Updates

The U.S. Justice Department issued a memorandum on October 28, 2014 titled Policy Statement Regarding Marijuana Issues in Indian Country announcing that federal marijuana laws will not be enforced on federally recognized Tribal land for Tribes that choose to allow its cultivation, use and sale. Tribes will need to follow eight federal guidelines, including restrictions on selling marijuana to minors and transporting it to areas that prohibit it.

- http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/tribal/pages/attachments/2014/12/11/policystatementregardingmarijuanaissuesinindiancountry2.pdf
- http://lostcoastoutpost.com/2014/dec/11/tribes-can-grow-and-sell-marijuana-feds-say/
- http://www.tworiverstribune.com/2014/12/feds-give-tribes-green-light-to-grow-and-sell-marijuana-on-tribal-lands/#sthash.WCaqhKTu.dpuf

California Cannabis Hemp Initiative 2016. This measure legalizes the production, sale, and use of marijuana for non-medicinal purposes, as well as legalizes the cultivation of industrial hemp. Despite these changes to state law, these activities would continue to be prohibited under federal law. Among other changes, the measure also requires the regulation of the commercial production and sale of marijuana, permits the application of an excise tax on the sale of non-medicinal marijuana, and requires the release of individuals currently in jail or prison or on probation or parole for marijuana offenses legalized by this measure.
Status: organizing a base of volunteers and supporters to get the signatures necessary to qualify for the November 2016 ballot before August 5, 2015.
Info from: http://www.cchi2016.org/

California A.B. 26 — Jones-Sawyer. Medical Cannabis Regulation and Control Act.
1) Would create the Division of Medical Cannabis Regulation and Enforcement within the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, and grant the department the power to register persons for the cultivation, manufacture, testing, transportation, storage, distribution, and sale of medical cannabis. The bill would establish the Medical Cannabis Regulation Fund for the purposes of administering the program and would require the deposit of penalty money into the General Fund. The bill would require the department, on or before January 1, 2017, to issue regulations for the implementation and enforcement of mandatory commercial medical cannabis registration including environmental, agricultural, consumer protection, and food and product safety requirements.
2) This bill would authorize the board of supervisors of a county to impose, by ordinance, a tax on the privilege of cultivating, dispensing, producing, processing, preparing, storing, providing, donating, selling, or distributing cannabis or cannabis products, including a transactions and use tax at any rate specified by the board for either general or specific governmental purposes. Subject to any applicable voter approval requirement.
3) This bill would provide that no State reimbursement to local agencies is required by this act.
Status: May be heard in committee January 1, 2015.
Info from: http://www.legislature.ca.gov/

California A.B. 34 — Bonta. Medical cannabis: state regulation.
This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would establish a comprehensive and uniform state regulatory structure to govern the cultivation, processing, testing, and distribution of medical cannabis.
Status: May be heard in committee January 1, 2015.
Info from: http://www.legislature.ca.gov/

California S.B. 1262 — Correa. Medical marijuana. This bill creates a licensing and regulatory framework for the cultivation, transportation, testing, and sale of medical marijuana, administered by the Bureau of Medical Marijuana Regulation (bureau) in the Department of Consumer Affairs.
Status: Second hearing, Aug. 14. Held under submission.
Info from: http://www.legislature.ca.gov/

US Congress H.R. 499 — Representative Polis. Ending Federal Marijuana Prohibition Act of 2013. Directs the Attorney General to issue a final order that removes marijuana in any form from all schedules of controlled substances under the Controlled Substances Act.
Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.
Info from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/499

US Congress H.R.2652 — Representative Perlmutter. Marijuana Businesses Access to Banking Act of 2013. Prohibits a federal banking regulator from: (1) terminating or limiting the deposit insurance of a depository institution solely because it either provides or has provided financial services to a marijuana-related legitimate business; or (2) prohibiting, penalizing, or otherwise discouraging a depository institution from providing financial services to a marijuana-related legitimate business.
Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.
Info from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/2652

US Congress H.R.1523 — Representative Rohrabacher. Respect State Marijuana Laws Act of 2013. Amends the Controlled Substances Act to provide that provisions of such Act related to marihuana shall not apply to any person acting in compliance with state laws relating to the production, possession, distribution, dispensation, administration, or delivery of marihuana.
Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.
Info from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/1523

US Congress H.R.1635 — Representative Cohen. National Commission on Federal Marijuana Policy Act of 2013. Establishes the National Commission on Federal Marijuana Policy to undertake a comprehensive review of current policies of the federal government toward marijuana in light of the growing number of states in which marijuana is legal for medicinal or personal use.
Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.
Info from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/1635

US Congress H.R.784 — Representative Lee. States' Medical Marijuana Property Rights Protection Act. Exempts real property from civil forfeiture under the Controlled Substances Act due to medical marijuana-related conduct that is authorized by state law.
Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, And Investigations.
Info from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/784

US Congress H.R.689 — Representative Blumenauer. States' Medical Marijuana Patient Protection Act. Requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), within six months of enactment of this Act, to submit to the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) a recommendation on the listing of marijuana within the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) and to recommend listing it as other than a Schedule I or Schedule II substance.
Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.
Info from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/689

US Congress H.R.501 — Representative Blumenauer. Marijuana Tax Equity Act of 2013. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to impose an excise tax on: (1) the sale of marijuana by producers or importers of such drug equal to 50% of the sales price, and (2) each person who is engaged in a marijuana enterprise.
Status: Referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means.
Info from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/501

3. Roundtable Discussion and Solicit PRP Direction:

- Staff direction for how to discuss the marijuana issue in future planning documents
- PRP direction for addressing potential Strategic Growth Council grant sub-grants related to this issue
- NCRP role in potential policy input and development

IX Updates

Executive Committee, PRP direction and staff action

Executive Committee Action documents and materials can be found at:
http://www.northcoastresourcepartnership.org/app_folders/view/6947

The NCRP Executive Committee met on December 8, 2014 to discuss PRP direction items per the NCRP Meeting in October, 2014:

- NCRP Executive Committee Composition & Recommendation for PRP consideration
- Marijuana cultivation topic & potential next steps for PRP consideration
- Suggestions from the TPRC regarding revisions to the NCRP Project Review process for PRP consideration

The NCRP Executive Committee met on January 5, 2015 to review the NCRP Quarterly Meeting Agenda and Materials for January 15, 2015.

Attachment A

North Coast Resource Partnership

Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines

2015~~4~~

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP

Table of Contents

Background 2

Schedule for development and approval of the Project Review and Selection Process 3

Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles 4

NCRP Project Application, Review & Selection Process 5

Guidelines for Public Input and Project Proponent Input during the Project Review Process 8

NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy 8

On-Going Project Inclusion Process into the NCIRWM Plan 9

Project Budget Under-runs and Funding Reallocation Process 10

PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection 11

Background

The North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) is committed to transparency, stakeholder inclusion and process improvement. At the July 21, 2011 NCRP meeting, the Policy Review Panel (PRP) directed the formation of an ad hoc committee comprised of PRP and Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) members and staff to evaluate the existing approach to project evaluation and ranking and to develop a draft approach for consideration at future NCRP PRP meetings. An on-line survey and interviews were conducted of ad-hoc committee members, TPRC members, and project proponents to gather information about the existing process and to make recommendations for improvement of the process. The interview summary and summary of recommendations can be found at (http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002175).

With this information as the basis, the ad-hoc committee developed the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines. The Guidelines were used during the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Proposition 84 Round 2 Implementation project solicitation. On March 1, 2012 the TPRC conducted a NCRP project review and selection process debriefing meeting and developed a listing suggested process improvements. These were presented to the PRP during the April 2013 NCRP quarterly meeting. The TPRC project review and selection process debriefing meeting summary and presentation can be found at http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002449.

In March 2014, the ad-hoc committee reviewed and refined sections of the Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines based on input from the TPRC project review de-brief meeting and the Draft 2014 IRWM Guidelines and Draft 2014 Drought Proposal Solicitation Package. The draft NCRP 2014 Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines and draft NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation Project Application were approved by the PRP during the April 17, 2014 meeting with the provision that they would be finalized based on input from the TPRC. The meeting materials and summary can be found at:
http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002542

Schedule for NCRP ~~2014 Drought~~ 2015 Project Solicitation, Project Proposal Review and Selection Process

This schedule is subject to change based on new information and the final ~~2014 IRWM Guidelines and final 2014 Drought Proposal Solicitation Package~~2015 IRWM Guidelines and final Proposition 84 2015 Proposal Solicitation Package expected to be released by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in ~~June~~[date TBD].

- ~~March – April 2014~~[date TBD]: The ~~Project Review Ad-hoc Committee~~TPRC and staff refine the Project Review and Selection Process based on TPRC input; develop portions of the application, developed review and selection process based on the draft ~~IRWM 2014 Guidelines~~ IRWM 2015 Guidelines and ~~draft Proposition 84 Expedited Drought Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package~~draft Proposition 84 Implementation Project Proposal Solicitation Package (announced by Department of Water Resources (DWR) on ~~April 3, 2014~~[date TBD].

- ~~April 17, 2014~~[date TBD] NCRP meeting: Report out of ad-hoc committee actions; PRP and TPRC review and provide direction and approve NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, ~~2014~~ 2015

- ~~April 2014~~[date TBD]: Ad-hoc committee and staff refine the final NCRP ~~2014~~ 2015 ~~Drought~~ Project Application materials and NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines

- ~~Late April – May 2014~~[date TBD]: NCRP project solicitation for IRWM Proposition 84 ~~Expedited Drought~~ Implementation Project grant funding

- ~~Early May~~[date TBD] - Informational & Assistance Workshops held throughout the North Coast Region. Project proponents are invited to bring project concepts and preliminary proposals to the meeting for review and discussion by TPRC members and NCRP staff.

- [date TBD]~~May – early June~~: TPRC project review period & project review meeting; selection of priority proposals; a TPRC project evaluation conference call or meeting will be held prior to the TPRC project review period. As a public meeting, project proponents are welcome to attend the TPRC Project Review Meeting and provide public comment where noted on the published agenda.

- [date TBD]~~Mid-June~~: PRP consider/approve TPRC suite of Priority North Coast Projects for IRWM Proposition 84 ~~Expedited Drought~~ Implementation Project funding at an in-person meeting held within the North Coast boundary

- [date TBD]~~July (subject to change)~~: regional application due to DWR for IRWM Proposition 84 ~~Expedited Drought~~ Implementation Project grant funding

- ~~Late 2015 (subject to change): Expected grant proposal for remaining Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation Grant funds~~

Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles

Policy Review Panel

The Policy Review Panel (PRP) is the governing and decision-making body for the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP). The composition of the PRP and decision-making process is defined in Section 5.4 of the NCIRWMP Memorandum of Mutual Understandings (MoMU). The role of the PRP in the NCRP project review and selection process is to set the policy, decision making criteria and framework for the process and to ensure that the process is fair, open and transparent. As the decision-making body, the PRP provides direction about how the project evaluation and selection process aligns with the NCRP priorities by defining project review and selection guidelines (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*). Taking into account review and recommendations from the Technical Peer Review Committee, the PRP approves all projects included in the NCRP and approves the region's highest priority

projects for grant submittals. As defined in the MoMU, the PRP is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act and is committed to transparency and inclusion, supporting input from stakeholders from throughout the region. All NCRP meetings are noticed in advance, open to the public, and all meeting summaries and information are posted on the NCRP website.

Technical Peer Review Committee

The Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) is advisory to the PRP and evaluates and makes recommendations based on technical expertise and scientific data. The composition of the TPRC is defined in the NCRP MoMU and is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. The role of the TPRC in the project review and selection process is to evaluate projects for technical merit based on their professional judgment and expertise, as well as on guidelines developed by the PRP and set by the funding solicitation. The TPRC prepares a draft suite of priority projects for review by the PRP. Scoring criteria and evaluation outcomes from the TPRC are available for public review.

NCRP Staff

The role of NCRP staff during the project application, review and selection process is to facilitate and ensure the integrity of the process. Staff develops and coordinates project application materials; performs outreach and makes information available to the PRP, TPRC and stakeholders; clarifies outstanding issues; makes sure decisions are understood; maintains records; consolidates and summarizes TPRC review of project grant applications, and performs fact checking of state guidelines and criteria as necessary. Per the direction of the PRP (NCRP meeting, July 2013) staff will support project proponents in coordinating and potentially integrating projects in the same watershed or project area (e.g., informing project proponents of opportunities to partner or gain economies of scope and scale by combining projects) where timing allows and in accordance with the source funding proposal process and eligibility requirements.

NCRP Project Application, Review & Selection Process

The NCRP project application, review and selection process is a multi-step process:

1. **NCRP Projects, Preliminary Project Information**
   Project proponents will upload Preliminary Project information to the NCRP website on an ongoing basis; project proponents will submit a signed MoMU; staff will publish eligible NCRP Projects (*see On-Going Project Inclusion Process below*).

2. **NCRP Project Solicitation, Supplemental Project Information**
   At the direction of the PRP and when there is a funding opportunity, a call for proposals will be announced to North Coast stakeholders. The PRP will review and refine the PRP directed guidelines and criteria for project scoring and selection based on NCRP goals and objectives, specific regional priorities and funding source requirements and preferences. Staff will develop and make available Project Solicitation application materials based on the NCRP priorities and the funding source solicitation and requirements. The project application materials will include an application, detailed instructions, a check list of elements that make up a competitive proposal and a clear description of scoring guidelines

and evaluation criteria, all of which will be reviewed by the TPRC and PRP and approved by the PRP. Project applicants will provide application materials to NCRP staff via email. A Microsoft Word version of the NCRP project application will be made available for reference, for application development and for submittal to NCRP staff. Staff will provide outreach, education and technical assistance via workshops and informal meetings by phone, internet and in person.

3. **Individual TPRC review of NCRP Project Applications**
   Staff will compile and provide application materials to the TPRC for review and scoring along with scoring/evaluation forms. When packaging the project application materials for each TPRC member, staff will randomize chronology of the project applications so that TPRC members are reviewing project applications in a different order. The TPRC members will strive to individually review and score the NCRP project applications for technical merit based on criteria as defined by the funding solicitation, NCRP PRP defined guidelines (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*) and their professional expertise and judgment. A TPRC project evaluation conference call meeting will be held prior to the TPRC project review period to discuss the general review process and go over scoring definitions to ensure calibration and clarity. TPRC members will review all projects referred to them unless they recuse themselves due to a potential conflict of interest. TPRC members will provide individual scores to staff for compilation. Time allowance for the individual TPRC review of project applications will be at least 2 weeks depending on the proposal solicitation timeframe. If two weeks is not available, the Executive Committee will determine the suitable duration to meet grant solicitation needs.

4. **Group TPRC review of NCRP Project Applications**
   Staff will compile all TPRC individual scores to determine an initial average project score. In adherence to a high standard of professional conduct, TPRC members and staff will meet to discuss each project and may make adjustments to their individual scores based on the group discussion. To ensure a comprehensive project proposal review process, TPRC member in-person attendance is strongly encouraged at this meeting. Any necessary background information or project-level clarification will be provided to the TPRC by NCRP staff. Staff will compile all updated TPRC individual scores to determine an updated average project score. TPRC review meetings are open to project proponents and the public. The agenda at a formally noticed public meeting will include a thorough review of the NCRP Conflict of Interest Guidelines as well as time for comment from the public (*see Conflict of Interest and Public Input Guidelines sections below*). All meeting deliberations, project scores, applicant and public input and recusals will be recorded.

5. **TPRC Selection of Draft Suite of NCRP Priority Projects**
   During the project review meeting, the TPRC will select a draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects and draft budget amounts for each project. 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 (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*) and the collective ability of the projects to meet NCRP goals and be competitive for the funding opportunity. A contingency list of projects will also be developed for consideration in the event that a

selected project could not move forward for inclusion into the regional application for any reason. All meeting deliberations, public input and Conflict of Interest recusals will be recorded in the meeting minutes.

6. **PRP Review, Consideration and Final Approval of the Suite of NCRP Priority Projects**
The NCRP PRP will convene a Brown Act compliant in-person meeting held within the North Coast boundary to present, review and approve the final list of NCRP Priority Projects. During a NCRP meeting, the TPRC will provide a summary of the project review process and present their recommended draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects and contingency project list. The PRP will review ~~and~~ , amend ~~the draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects recommended by the TPRC, along with the contingency list,~~ and ~~will~~ approve by majority vote a final suite of NCRP Priority Projects and contingency projects to forward to the funding entity. During the PRP's review of the draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects, the TPRC will answer questions and provide information as requested by the PRP. The PRP – comprised of elected public officials or their designees and elected Tribal representatives – will make their final decision based on TPRC recommendations, PRP guidelines and other factors that they believe represent the best interest of the North Coast region. For more information on the process by which PRP members are selected, refer to the ~~NCIRWMP~~ NCRP Memorandum of Mutual Understanding (MOMU). The NCRP Priority Projects list will be posted to the website and made available to the public. Project review scores and review meeting materials will be made available to the project proponents and to the general public, upon request.

7. **NCRP Priority Project Application Materials for Regional Proposal**
Depending on the source funding solicitation, NCRP Priority Project proponents will be asked to provide additional project information to include in a competitive regional application. Additional information may include, but not be limited to, a detailed work plan, budget, schedule, economic cost/benefits analysis, monitoring & performance measures and technical documentation that support the project. The timeframe to submit this additional information may be very short for expedited funding solicitations. In the event that additional information for a project cannot be provided within the requested timeframe, that project would not be able to be included in the regional application and another project would instead be selected from the contingency list. Where feasible, NCRP staff will provide technical assistance to project proponents who require it.

Once the regional application has been approved and selected for funding, individual project proponents will enter into an agreement, likely with the NCRP regional grant administrator, to implement each project. It is imperative that an agreement between a project proponent and the NCRP regional grant administrator be executed in a timely fashion, particularly with rounds of expedited funding. It will contain numerous conditions and default provisions. An example of a DWR grant agreement, from the latest Prop 84 Round 2 funding opportunity, is available online: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/docs/ResourcesLinks/ContractTemplates/GrantAgreement_Template_P84R2_FINAL_2014_02.pdf. The terms of the agreement that will be used for this funding opportunity will likely be similar. However, it is important to note that those specific terms have yet to be determined by DWR.

Preliminary Project information for all eligible projects will be published to the NCRP website on an ongoing basis as described in "*On-Going Project Inclusion Process*" below and included in the NCIRWM Plan.

Guidelines for Public Input and Project Proponent Input during the Project Review Process

All TPRC project review meetings will be noticed at least 72 hours in advance and will be open and welcoming to the public. A conference call-in number will be provided for project proponents so that they may listen to the meeting and provide input during the public comment period if desired. The meeting agenda and background materials to be used in the TPRC's decision-making will be available at the meeting location, posted to the NCRP website 72 hours in advance of the meeting and mailed to any interested member of the public upon request.

All TPRC meeting agendas include time for public comment, which will be typically limited to 3 minutes for each speaker. Project proponents, interested stakeholders and members of the public will be invited to provide ~~speak on any item on the TPRC's agenda during public~~ comment:

- on items not on the agenda;
- after the TPRC discusses the projects amongst themselves, but before the TPRC members submit their final scores
- after the TPRC develops their draft recommended list, but before the TPRC submits their final recommendation to the PRP

Public Comment portions of the meeting are not meant to be interactive and ~~The~~ TPRC members ~~may ask brief questions of the commenter for clarification, but~~ will not engage in discussion or debate an issue with any member of the public. ~~The TPRC Chair(s) may place time limits on public comment.~~ Public comment and materials delivered to staff from the public will be published on the NCRP website.

~~In the event that the TPRC requests specific or detailed clarifying information from a project proponent, a request will be made to NCRP staff and conveyed to the project proponent for response. All requests for clarifying information and responses thereto will be documented and made available to the public via the NCRP website.~~

NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy

The NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy will follow the California Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) guidelines and the intent of the guidelines to address obligations under the Political Reform Act's conflict of interest rules.

Under the FPPC rules, when a member has a conflict of interest with a specific project, that member must publicly disclose the specific nature of the conflict and recuse themselves (i.e. leave the room or remain silent) during discussion of that specific project. The FPPC guidelines seek to prevent conflicts of interest in two ways - disclosure and recusal.

> "No public official at any level of state or local government shall make, participate in making or in any way attempt to use his official position to influence a governmental decision in which he knows or has reason to know he has a financial interest." (Political Reform Act; Gov. Code Section 87100)
>
> "Assets and income of public officials which may be materially affected by their official actions should be disclosed and in appropriate circumstances the officials should be disqualified from acting in order that conflicts of interest may be avoided." (Gov. Code section 81002)

During the NCRP project review and selection process, TPRC and PRP members will disclose any potential financial interest in a project. If a TPRC or PRP member has a potential conflict of interest, they will be expected to recuse themselves (i.e. leave the room or remain silent) from making, participating in or in any way influencing a project scoring or selection decision.

In the interest of transparency, TPRC and PRP members will also disclose any history of contribution to the project including input in the grant development or project planning or other involvement that could potentially represent a real or perceived conflict of interest. Once disclosed, the TPRC and PRP member will determine whether these actions constitute a conflict of interest or will prevent an objective review of the NCRP implementation project(s) and will determine if recusal is necessary. The PRP or TPRC member may wish to request the advice of their colleagues on the PRP or TPRC to make their determination.

Opportunities for disclosure and reporting will occur during the individual TPRC review of NCRP projects, during the group TPRC project review and during the TPRC and PRP selection meetings. The project score sheets will include a checklist and comment box for TPRC members to disclose potential conflict of interest. Project review score sheets and meeting notes will document any conflict of interest disclosures and recusals. In addition, the TPRC Chair(s), or his/her designee, will be selected to provide oversight during the project review meetings and act as a facilitator of TPRC discussion should conflict of interest issues arise. The TPRC Chair(s), or his/her designee, will be supported by staff to ensure the process adheres to the Conflict of Interest Policy established by the PRP.

On-Going Project Inclusion Process into the NCIRWM Plan

Background

Increasingly, funding opportunities for project implementation require or give preference to projects that are included in an IRWM Plan. The following process will provide a mechanism for including projects on an on-going basis into the NCIRWM Plan.

1. Project proponents will complete preliminary on-line project information:

- Project Name
- Organization Name, Type & Contact information
- Project location address (for mapping purposes)
- Funding Program names
- Total project cost & Funding request
- Start/End dates (tentative)
- Alignment with NCIRWMP Objectives (selection boxes)
- Project Summary & Goals
- Project partners
- Description of benefits (including if/how the project will benefit DACs)
- Project management strategies/ project elements (selection boxes)

2. Project proponent will submit a signed MoMU
3. Staff will review the project and follow-up with project proponents regarding any eligibility concerns (Urban Water Management Plan, Agricultural Water Management, Surface Water Diverter, Groundwater Management Plan, CASGEM compliance, proponent type)
4. The TPRC will review and accept eligible projects
5. Staff will 'Publish' eligible NCRP Projects; project summaries will be included on the website; project locations will be included on the interactive map; and staff will report to the PRP at a NCRP meeting
6. Additional project information will be required when funding solicitations and calls for proposals occur; NCRP project proponents will be allowed to edit preliminary project upload information.
7. NCRP Projects will be reviewed and scored by the TPRC if required by a respective funding solicitation; NCRP Priority Projects will be selected by the PRP. NCRP Priority Project proponents ~~may~~ will need to adopt the NCIRWM Plan when completed as per the IRWM Guidelines.

Project Budget Under-runs and Funding Reallocation Process

Background: In some cases, a NCRP implementation project may complete under budget or otherwise not expend their entire grant allotment. Typically the funding agencies have allowed reallocation of funds to another project *within the suite* of projects included in the grant agreement for additional work toward the project. In previous instances where there has been funding to reallocate, the PRP has reallocated the funding to the projects within the county where the under-budget project occurred. The PRP members from that county have in turn determined how to reallocate the money to project(s) within that county.

It is expected that with current and future funding there will be projects that are completed under-budget and/or will have remaining funds to reallocate.

NCRP Project Funding Reallocation Process

1. The project funding reallocation will occur within the County where the original project is located, ~~and~~ is within the existing suite of projects in the grant agreement and should meet similar objectives (i.e. water conservation).

2. PRP members from the County and Tribal region where the original project is located will determine which projects receive reallocation and the amount of funding

3. If the County of origin option is not available (i.e., no projects from the County of origin within the project suite need additional funding):
    a. Staff will announce the availability of funds to project proponents within the grant agreement suite of projects; staff will solicit project requests and description of need from eligible project proponents
    b. Staff will determine eligible projects
    c. TPRC ad-hoc committee will be formed (at NCRP meeting if timing allows)
    d. Ad-hoc committee will develop criteria for project reallocation selection
    e. Ad-hoc committee will develop project reallocation option recommendations
    f. TPRC will review ad-hoc committee option recommendations
    g. PRP will review and approve recommendations at the next PRP meeting
    h. TPRC ad-hoc committee will be disbanded

4. In the event that a grant term is extended beyond the original contract timeline as a result of project scheduling extensions and if the regional management office has used their original administrative budget allocated for this project, grant funds may be reallocated to the regional manager to cover grant administration costs during the extended contract term.

5. Future grant applications: During the TPRC and PRP review process, projects will be identified to receive priority should additional funding become available; priority will be given to projects within the County where the original projects are located.

PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection

Background

The intent of the following PRP-directed project scoring and selection guidelines is to promote the implementation of NCRP goals while allowing the flexibility to address specific regional priorities and funding source requirements. These guidelines are in addition to those defined by the NCRP goals & objectives and IRWM Program or other funding source guidelines and scoring criteria. The PRP includes the following preferences and priority considerations in its decision-making process:

Regional Representation

The PRP will make every effort to ensure geographic representation by including projects from each of the seven counties and from the north, central and southern tribal areas of the North Coast Region. This guideline will apply only to those projects which are eligible for funding under the NCRP and other state

and federal requirements, and which have met the technical criteria established by the PRP and evaluated by the Technical Peer Review Committee.

Economically Disadvantaged Community (DAC) [1]

In an effort to build capacity and extend services to communities that are under-served and/or limited by economic barriers, the TPRC will include screening criteria that will confer additional weight to projects that, in addition to meeting other NCRP criteria, will benefit North Coast DACs. The PRP reserves the right to prioritize DAC projects, based on a project's ability to mitigate threats to public health, watershed health, and the economic and public health benefits that project implementation would bring to these communities.

Jurisdictional Notification & Coordination

Project applicants are required to demonstrate that they have notified counties and Tribes re: proposed projects in the proposed project impact area of a particular watershed or relevant area of County or Tribal interest. Project applicants are required to demonstrate coordination and outreach to potentially interested stakeholders in the relevant watershed, sub-watershed or project impact area.

Programmatic Integration and Balance of Project Type to effectively implement NCRP goals

NCRP goals: To support local autonomy and encourage cooperation; enhance public health & economic vitality in disadvantaged communities; restore salmon populations; enhance beneficial uses of water; and promote energy independence, emissions reductions and climate change adaptation.

a) All project types should address grant requirements and NCRP goals and priorities
b) Programmatic integration and project type diversity will be achieved at the portfolio level - (e.g. small /individual projects not required to demonstrate integration of all priorities, yet they must contribute to a comprehensive suite of projects that achieve a multi-benefit, integrated program)
c) Programmatic integration and project type diversity will be achieved over time and through multiple rounds of funding
d) Projects that provide multi-benefits will be prioritized (where all else is equal)
e) Projects that address specific targets as identified by the PRP, including specific North Coast objectives, challenges and opportunities (e.g., promote biomass-related projects, effective in-stream flow approaches, energy retrofits, drought or flood preparedness, effective instream flow approaches or specific funding opportunities) may be prioritized by the PRP.

---

[1] *Definition for Economically Disadvantaged Community (DAC)*: Department of Water Resources defines "disadvantaged community" as a community with an annual household income that is less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income*

Attachment B

Excerpt from 2015-16 Governor's Budget Summary

Link to budget summary: http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/FullBudgetSummary.pdf

2014 Water Bond — Proposition 1

In November 2014, the voters approved the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1), which provides $7.5 billion in general obligation bonds for water storage, water quality, flood protection, and watershed protection and restoration projects. Proposition 1 includes funding specifically intended to achieve the three over-arching goals described in the Plan: restoration, resilience, and reliability. The Budget proposes $532.5 million to begin the first year of a multiyear Proposition 1 expenditure plan (see Figure RES-01).

Figure RES-01

2015-16 Proposition 1 (Water Bond) Expenditure Plan

(Dollars in Millions)

Bond Investment Category	*Department*	*Program*	*Amount*
Safe Drinking Water	State Water Resources Control Board	Wastewater Treatment Projects	$66.3
	State Water Resources Control Board	Safe Drinking Water in Small Disadvantaged Communities	$69.2
Watershed Protection and Restoration	State Conservancies	Watershed Projects	$83.5
	Wildlife Conservation Board	Enhanced Stream Flow Projects	$38.9
	Santa Monica and San Gabriel Conservancies	Urban Rivers and Creeks	$19.1
	Department of Fish and Wildlife	Watershed Restoration Projects (Non-Delta and In-Delta)	$36.5
Regional Water Reliability	Department of Water Resources	Integrated Regional Water Management Program	$32.8
	Department of Water Resources	Water Conservation	$23.2
	State Water Resources Control Board	Stormwater Management	$0.6
Water Storage	Department of Water Resources	Statewide Water System Operational Improvement	$3.3
Water Recycling	Department of Water Resources	Water Recycling and Desalination	$5.5
	State Water Resources Control Board	Water Recycling and Treatment Technology Projects	$131.7
Groundwater Sustainability	Department of Water Resources	Groundwater Management Planning	$21.3
	State Water Resources Control Board	Groundwater Contamination	$0.6
Total			**$532.5**

WATER QUALITY, SUPPLY, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Funding Summary

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
September 2014

The Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, is a $7.545 billion general obligation bond proposal that would provide funding to address water quality, supply, and infrastructure improvement issues in California. The bond is comprised of seven categories of funding:

$520 million — **Clean and Safe Drinking Water**

- $260 million — Wastewater treatment in small communities
- $260 million — Drinking water projects for disadvantaged communities

$1,495 million — **Watershed Restoration and Protection**

- $515 million — Watershed restoration in designated areas around the state
- $475 million — State commitments for environmental restoration
- $305 million — Statewide watershed restoration
- $200 million — Projects to increase water flowing in rivers and streams

$810 million — **Regional Water Security**

- $510 million — Integrated regional water management projects
- $100 million — Water conservation and water use efficiency plans, projects, and programs
- $200 million — Multi-benefit stormwater management projects

$2,700 million — **Statewide System Operation**

- $2,700 million — Public benefits associated with water storage projects

$725 million — **Water Recycling**

- $725 million — Water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects

$900 million — **Groundwater Sustainability**

- $800 million — Prevention and cleanup of groundwater pollution
- $100 million — Local plans and projects to manage groundwater

$395 million — **Flood Management**

- $295 million — Reduce the risk of levee failure and flooding in the Delta
- $100 million — Statewide flood management

Of the $7.545 billion identified above, the state's ten hydrologic regions, as identified in the California Water Plan (see map on page 2), are eligible for specific funding dedicated in the bond to the regions, as well as other funds dedicated in the bond to conservancies or activities within a particular region. The following describes the distribution of bond funding to each hydrologic region of the state, as well as the funding eligible for expenditure within the specific regions to help finance water management projects and programs with local, regional and statewide benefits.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

HYDROLOGIC REGIONS OF CALIFORNIA

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

NORTH COAST HYDROLOGIC REGION

Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, and parts of Glenn, Lake, Marin, Modoc, Siskiyou and Sonoma counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The North Coast region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The North Coast region may be eligible for a share of each of the following: $30 million related to actions in support of the Ocean Protection Council; $100.5 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects for coastal watersheds; and a share of $475 million for projects that fulfill State obligations for Klamath Settlement. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, and $285 million for watershed restoration projects.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the North Coast is $26.5 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The North Coast region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The North Coast region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The North Coast region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The North Coast region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

SAN FRANCISCO BAY HYDROLOGIC REGION

San Francisco, most of Marin and San Mateo, and parts of Alameda, Contra Costa, Napa, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano and Sonoma counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The San Francisco Bay Area region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The San Francisco Bay Area region may be eligible for a share of each of the following: $30 million related to actions in support of the Ocean Protection Council, $100.5 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects for coastal watersheds, and $50 million for projects in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy area. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, $285 million for watershed restoration projects, and $87.5 million for ecosystem projects that benefit the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the San Francisco Bay Area is $65 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The San Francisco Bay Area region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The San Francisco Bay Area region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The San Francisco Bay Area region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The San Francisco Bay Area region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management and a portion of $295 million for projects that reduce the risk of levee failure in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

CENTRAL COAST HYDROLOGIC REGION

Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, most of Santa Cruz, and parts of Kern, San Benito, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The Central Coast region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The Central Coast region may be eligible for a share of $30 million related to actions in support of the Ocean Protection Council and $100.5 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects for coastal watersheds. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, and $285 million for watershed restoration projects.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the Central Coast is $43 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The Central Coast region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The Central Coast region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The Central Coast region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The Central Coast region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

SOUTH COAST HYDROLOGIC REGION

Orange and parts of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego and Ventura counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The South Coast region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The South Coast region would receive $87 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects in areas of the Baldwin Hills Conservancy, the San Diego River Conservancy, the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. The region would also receive $100 million for urban creek projects in the San Gabriel and Los Angeles river watersheds. The region may also be eligible for a share of $30 million related to actions in support of the Ocean Protection Council and $100.5 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects in coastal watersheds and Catalina Island. In addition, the South Coast region may be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, and $285 million for watershed restoration projects.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the South Coast is $213.5 million subdivided between three sub-regions. The Los Angeles sub region, which includes Ventura County, is allocated $98 million, the Santa Ana watershed is allocated $63 million, and the San Diego sub-region, which includes the southern portion of Orange County, is allocated $52.5 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The South Coast region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The South Coast region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The South Coast region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The South Coast region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

SACRAMENTO RIVER HYDROLOGIC REGION

Butte, Colusa, Plumas, Shasta, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo, Yuba and parts of Alpine, Amador, El Dorado, Glenn, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sierra, Siskiyou and Solano counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The Sacramento River region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The Sacramento River region may be eligible for a share of $50 million in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy area and $25 million in the Sierra Nevada Conservancy area to support multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects. The region may be eligible for a share of $475 million for projects that fulfill State obligations for the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, $285 million for watershed restoration projects, and $87.5 million for ecosystem projects that benefit the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the Sacramento River region is $37 million and a share of $13 million for the Mountain Counties Overlay area. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The Sacramento River region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The Sacramento River region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The Sacramento River region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The Sacramento River region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management and $295 million for projects that reduce the risk of levee failure in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

SAN JOAQUIN RIVER HYDROLOGIC REGION

Calaveras, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne and parts of Alameda, Alpine, Amador, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Fresno, Sacramento and San Benito counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The San Joaquin River region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The San Joaquin River region would receive $10 million for multi-benefit projects located in the San Joaquin River Conservancy area and may also be eligible for a share of $50 million in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy area and $25 million in the Sierra Nevada Conservancy area. The region may be eligible for a share of $475 million for projects that fulfill State obligations for the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, $285 million for watershed restoration projects, and $87.5 million for ecosystem projects that benefit the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the San Joaquin River region is $31 million and a share of $13 million for the Mountain Counties Overlay area. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The San Joaquin River region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The San Joaquin River region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The San Joaquin River region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The San Joaquin River region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management and $295 million for projects that reduce the risk of levee failure in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

TULARE LAKE HYDROLOGIC REGION

Kings, Tulare and parts of Kern, Fresno, and San Benito counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The Tulare Lake Region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The Tulare Lake region may be eligible for a share of $25 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects in the Sierra Nevada Conservancy area. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, and $285 million for watershed restoration projects.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the Tulare Lake region is $34 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The Tulare Lake region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The Tulare Lake region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The Tulare Lake region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The Tulare Lake region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

NORTH LAHONTAN HYDROLOGIC REGION

Parts of Alpine, El Dorado, Lassen, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Placer and Sierra counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The North Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The North Lahontan region would receive $15 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects in the Tahoe Conservancy area and may be eligible for a share of $25 million for projects in the Sierra Nevada Conservancy area. The region may be eligible for a share of $475 million for projects that fulfill State obligations for the Tahoe Regional Planning Act. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, and $285 million for watershed restoration projects.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the North and South Lahontan regions is combined; the North Lahontan region may be eligible for a portion of $24.5 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The North Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The North Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The North Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The North Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

SOUTH LAHONTAN HYDROLOGIC REGION

Inyo and parts of Kern, Los Angeles, Mono and San Bernardino counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The South Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The South Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $25 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection projects in the Sierra Nevada Conservancy area. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, and $285 million for watershed restoration projects.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the North and South Lahontan regions is combined; the South Lahontan region may be eligible for a portion of $24.5 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The South Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The South Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The South Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The South Lahontan region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

Summary for

COLORADO RIVER HYDROLOGIC REGION

Imperial and parts of Riverside, San Bernardino and San Diego counties

Clean and Safe Drinking Water

The Colorado River region may be eligible for a share of $260 million to support wastewater treatment programs and projects and a share of $260 million for safe, reliable, drinking water programs and projects.

Watershed Protection and Restoration

The Colorado River region would receive $10 million for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects in the Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy area and may be eligible for a share of $475 million for projects that fulfill State obligations for the Salton Sea. The region may also be eligible to receive a share of $200 million for projects that enhance stream flow, $20 million for water and urban river enhancement projects, and $285 million for watershed restoration projects.

Regional Water Security

The regional allocation for the Colorado River is $22.5 million. The region may also be eligible for a share of $300 million in water conservation and stormwater management funding.

Statewide System Operation

The Colorado River region may be eligible for a share of $2.7 billion for public benefits associated with water storage projects.

Water Recycling

The Colorado River region may be eligible for a share of $725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Groundwater Sustainability

The Colorado River region may be eligible for a share of $900 million to support groundwater sustainability programs and projects.

Flood Management

The Colorado River region may be eligible for a share of $100 million to support improved flood management.

This is a preliminary estimate by the California Department of Water Resources and may not represent exact availability of bond funding.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA