Proposition 50 Chapter 8
Integrated Regional Water Management
Grant Program Guidelines
Proposal Solicitation Packages
Round 2
April 2007

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

California Environmental Protection Agency
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Financial Assistance

The Resources Agency
Department of Water Resources
Division of Planning and Local Assistance

FOREWORD

This document contains the Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSPs) for Round 2 of the Proposition 50 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program. In Round 2, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the California State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) are soliciting proposals for IRWM Implementation Grants. The application process for Proposition 50 IRWM Implementation Grants is a two step process. DWR and the State Water Board encourage qualified interested parties to submit an Implementation Grant, Step 1 proposal. After review of the Step 1 proposals DWR and State Water Board will invite selected Implementation Grant, Step 1 applicants to submit an Implementation Grant, Step 2 proposal. Submittal of Proposals in this second step is by invitation only. This document contains the procedures for submitting Step 1 and Step 2 applications for grant funding and the detailed scoring criteria for each step.

IRWM GRANT PROGRAM WEBSITES

DWR and State Water Board will use the internet as a communication tool to notify interested parties of the status of Round 2 and to convey pertinent information. Information will be posted at the following websites:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html

http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/grants/integregio.cfm

MAILING LIST

In addition to use of the above-referenced websites, DWR and the State Water Board will distribute information via email. If you are not already on the IRWM mailing list and wish to be placed on it, please e-mail your contact information to:

IRWM_GRANTS@water.ca.gov

POINTS OF CONTACT

For questions about the Guidelines or PSPs, please contact Mr. Norman Shopay, DWR, at (916) 651-9218 (nshopay@water.ca.gov) or Mr. Scott Couch, State Water Board, at (916) 341-5658 (scouch@waterboards.ca.gov).

For questions about the State Water Board's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST), please contact FAAST staff by phone at (866) 434-1083, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. – 5 p.m., or by email at faast_admin@waterboards.ca.gov. Information regarding the FAAST is available at the following secure link:

https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov

FILL-ABLE TABLES

Applicants are encouraged to use the fill-able excel spreadsheet versions of the various tables provided in the PSPs which can be found at the following link:

http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/grants/integregio.cfm

DRAFT

ACRONYMS AND ABREVATIONS USED IN THESE GUIDELINES AND APPENDICES

Basin Plan	Regional Water Quality Control Plan
BF	Benefit Factor
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CWC	California Water Code
DCR	Disadvantaged Community Ratio
DWR	Department of Water Resources
FAAST	Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool
GWMP	Groundwater Management Plan
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
MB	Megabyte
MHI	Median Household Income
MP	Monitoring Plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NPS	Non-Point Source
PAEP	Performance Assessment and Evaluation Plan
PIN	Proposal Identification Number
PSP	Proposal Solicitation Package
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
Regional Water Board	Regional Water Quality Control Board
RFMF	Reduced Funding Match Factor
ROD	Record of Decision
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USCB	United States Census Bureau
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan

DRAFT

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT ROUND 2 GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS ONLY

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish the process and criteria that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the California State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) will use to jointly solicit applications, evaluate proposals, and award grants for the second round of funding from the Proposition 50 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program (Round 2). In Round 2, DWR and the State Water Board will only solicit implementation grant proposals.

Also included in these guidelines are the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP), which contain specific submittal instructions and required content of proposals.

II. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Proposition 50, the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002, was passed by California voters in November 2002. It amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add, among other articles, Section 79560 *et seq*., authorizing the Legislature to appropriate $500 million for IRWM projects. The IRWM grant funding is being disbursed via two rounds of grant proposal solicitations. Detailed information on Round 1 of the IRWM Grant Program (completed in March 2007) is available at the following links:

http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/grants/integregio.cfm

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html

The intent of the IRWM Grant Program is to encourage integrated regional strategies for management of water resources and to provide funding for projects that protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water.

A. Usage of Terms

To foster understanding and clarity DWR and the State Water Board will use the following terms consistently in these guidelines:

- "Plan" refers to an IRWM Plan or the collection of individual planning documents that function as an IRWM Plan.
- "Application" refers to the electronic or hard copy submission to DWR and the State Water Board that requests grant funding for a proposal that the applicant intends to implement.
- "Eligible Grant Recipient" refers to public agencies or non-profit organizations as defined in Section III.A.
- "Proposal" refers to a project or suite of projects and actions that are proposed for funding.
- "Project" refers to an individual effort included in the proposal that may be construction of physical facilities or implementation of non-structural actions.
- "Round 1" and "Round 2" refer to the two separate cycles to solicit, review, and approve grant funding for IRWM grants. Round 1 occurred between November 2004 (approval of the IRWM Guidelines) and March 2007 (award for the final Round 1 grants).
- "Step 1 and "Step 2" refer to the individual phases of the Implementation Grant solicitation. The Step 1 phase is an open invitation to eligible grant recipient. Step 2 is by invitation only to selected Step 1 applicants.

DRAFT

B. Funding

In Round 2 Implementation Grants will be provided to eligible grant recipients to implement projects that meet the requirements of the CWC § 79560 *et seq*. Eligibility requirements are contained in Section III. Approximately $64 million is available in Round 2. Funding will be awarded on a competitive basis with the following limitations:

- In order to meet the funding distribution requirements, See Section II.F, a maximum of approximately $21 million **may be** made available to Northern California.
- Up to $64.5 million will be awarded to proposals located in Southern California.

FIGURE 1

C. Maximum Grant Amount

In Round 2 DWR and the State Water Board are capping the implementation grant amount at $25 million. Round 1 IRWM Implementation grant awards will be considered as part of the maximum grant amount. Therefore, regions that have previously received a $25 million grant award will not be eligible for additional funding from Round 2. Figure 1 shows the locations of previous Implementation Grant awards. The dark shaded areas have received $25 million in grant funding and will not be considered for funding in Round 2, apart from the exceptions listed below. The light shaded areas have received grants for less than $25 million and will be considered for funding up to a combined Round 1 and Round 2 total of $25 million. To clarify the boundaries of the shaded areas, please contact the DWR Point of Contact listed in the Foreword.

IRWM efforts located wholly or partially within the dark shaded areas on Figure 1 may be eligible to apply under certain circumstances, as follow:

- Efforts organized to develop an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan containing project that eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significant, as identified in Section II.E, Program Preferences. To be eligible, an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan must meet the IRWM Plan Standards, including the Minimum Plan Standards, and will be scored using the same Scoring Criteria.
- Regions that only partially overlap the dark shaded areas in Figure 1 may be eligible to apply for funding if they can make a compelling demonstration that the region has fundamentally different objectives and needs, a separate and distinctly different process and stakeholder groups, and is coordinating with the neighboring region(s) where appropriate. Potential applicants are strongly urged to contact, prior to submitting a Step 1 application, the DWR and State Water Board Points of Contact listed in the Foreword to discuss their eligibility.

D. Minimum Funding Match Requirements

The applicant is required to provide a funding match. "Funding match" means funds made available by the grant recipient from non-state sources. Funding match may include, but is not limited to, federal funds, local funding, or donated services from non-state sources. For a State agency, funding match may include state funds and services. The required minimum funding match for an Implementation Grant will be 10 percent of the total proposal costs. (CWC § 79505.5(b-c))

E. Program Preferences

The CWC and implementing legislation specifies that preference will be given to specific project types. These program preferences are reflected in the scoring criteria and will be taken into consideration during the review process (Section V.F). As applicable, preference will be given to proposals that:

- Include integrated projects with multiple benefits;
- Support and improve local and regional water supply reliability;
- Contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards;
- Eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significance; or
- Include safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities.

Appendix E includes a listing of web links for accessing information on the Program Preferences.

DWR and the State Water Board will also give preference to proposals that address environmental justice concerns.

F. Geographic Scope

Proposals from throughout California will be considered for funding. CWC § 79564.(a) requires that not less than 40% of the funds will be available for eligible projects in Northern California and not less than 40% will be available for eligible projects in Southern California.

DRAFT

G. Proposal Solicitation

Approximately $64 million will be released in Round 2. Proposed projects must meet one or more of the objectives of protecting communities from drought, protecting and improving water quality, and improving local water security by reducing dependence on imported water and include at least one of the water management elements listed in Section III.C. The Implementation Grant Program is designed for projects that are ready for or nearly ready to proceed to implementation.

A two-step process will be used to evaluate the Implementation Grant proposals. Implementation Grant applications must be submitted by regional agencies or groups. The applicant must provide documentation of the following:

- Complete copy of the IRWM Plan, with proof of formal adoption;
- Demonstrated consistency with IRWM Plan Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b));
- Description of specific implementation project(s) for which funding is being requested;
- Prioritization of proposed projects listed in the IRWM Plan and within the proposal; and
- Funding match.

The IRWM Step 1 Implementation Grant proposals will be evaluated based on the scoring criteria identified in Appendix C, Table C.2. Selected applicants will be invited to submit a Step 2 application, Section V.G. The Step 2 proposals will be evaluated based on the scoring criteria in Appendix C, Table C.5.

III. Eligibility Requirements

A. Eligible Grant Recipients

Eligible grant recipients are public agencies and non-profit organizations, as defined below:

- "Public agency" means a city, county, city and county, district, joint powers authority, a state agency or department, or other political subdivision of the State.
- "Non-profit organization" means any California corporation organized under Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the federal Internal Revenue Code.

Other entities, including, but not limited to privately owned water utilities regulated by the Public Utilities Commission and tribal governments, may be part of the regional water management group responsible for applying for a grant and may perform work funded by the grant.

B. Eligibility Criteria

Applications for IRWM grants must meet all relevant Eligibility Criteria in order to be considered for funding. The Eligibility Criteria are as follows:

- Urban Water Management Planning Act Compliance – Water suppliers who were required by the Urban Water Management Planning Act (CWC § 10610 *et seq.*) to submit an Urban Water Management Plan to DWR by December 2005 must have submitted a plan to be eligible for IRWM grant funding. Applicants and participating agencies that are urban water suppliers and have projects that would receive funding through the IRWM grant program must have a complete Urban Water Management Plan by the time a grant is awarded to be eligible to receive funding.
- Groundwater Management Plan Compliance – For groundwater management and recharge projects and for projects with potential groundwater impacts, the applicant or the participating agency responsible for such projects must demonstrate that either:
  - They have prepared and implemented a Groundwater Management Plan in compliance with CWC § 10753.7,
  - They participate or consent to be subject to a Groundwater Management Plan, basin-wide management plan, or other IRWM program or plan that meets the requirements of CWC §10753.7(a);

DRAFT

- The proposal includes development of a Groundwater Management Plan that meets the requirements of CWC § 10753.7 which will be completed within 1-year of the grant application submittal date (for the purposes of these Guidelines, the Step 2 application submittal date), or
- They conform to the requirements of an adjudication of water rights in the subject groundwater basin.

- Consistency with an adopted IRWM Plan – An applicant's IRWM implementation proposal must be consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan that meets the minimum IRWM Plan standards as shown in Appendix A. For Round 2, DWR and the State Water Board will require that the applicant demonstrate that the IRWM Plan is adopted prior to submittal of a Step 2 application. To be eligible to submit a Step 1 application using a Draft IRWM Plan, the applicant must demonstrate that the Draft IRWM Plan undergone a formal, publicly noticed review and comment period. A minimum 30 calendar day public review and comment period is required and that public review and comment period must have been completed prior to submission of the Step 1 application.

C. Eligible Proposals/Project Types

Eligible proposal must meet one or more of the objectives of protecting communities from drought, protecting and improving water quality, and improving local water security by reducing dependence on imported water which must include one or more of the following water management elements (CWC § 79561):

- Programs for water supply reliability, water conservation, and water use efficiency;
- Storm water capture, storage, treatment, and management;
- Removal of invasive non-native plants, the creation and enhancement of wetlands, and the acquisition, protection, and restoration of open space and watershed lands;
- NPS pollution reduction, management, and monitoring;
- Groundwater recharge and management projects;
- Contaminant and salt removal through reclamation, desalting, and other treatment technologies;
- Water banking, water exchange, water reclamation, and improvement of water quality;
- Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood control programs that protect property; and improve water quality, storm water capture and percolation; and protect or improve wildlife habitat;
- Watershed management planning and implementation; and
- Demonstration projects to develop new drinking water treatment and distribution methods.

On-stream or off-stream surface water storage facilities **are not** eligible for funding (CWC § 79560). For Implementation Grant funding, flood control and watershed management projects must include an implementation component.

IV General Program Requirements

A. Conflict of Interest

All participants are subject to State and federal conflict of interest laws. Failure to comply with these laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the application being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal action may also be taken. Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding conflict of interest requirements. Applicable statues include, but are not limited to, California Government Code § 1090 and California Public Contract Code §§ 10410 and 10411.

B. Confidentiality

Once the proposal has been submitted to DWR and the State Water Board, any privacy rights, as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived.

C. Labor Code Compliance

California Labor Code § 1771.8 requires the body awarding a contract for a public works project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 50 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program pursuant to California Labor Code § 1771.5(b). Compliance with applicable laws, including California Labor Code provisions, will become an

DRAFT

obligation of the grant recipient under the terms of the grant agreement between the grant recipient and the granting agency. California Labor Code § 1771.8 appears to provide, where applicable, that the grant recipient's Labor Compliance Program must be in place at the time of awarding of a contract for a public works project by the grant recipient.

Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding California Labor Code compliance. See Appendix E for web links to the California Department of Industrial Relations.

D. Modification of a River or Stream Channel

Projects that include modification of a river or stream channel must fully mitigate environmental impacts resulting from the modification (See California Fish and Game Code § 1602). The applicant must provide documentation that the environmental impacts resulting from such modification will be fully mitigated considering all of the impacts of the modification and any mitigation, environmental enhancement, and environmental benefit resulting from the project, and whether, on balance, any environmental enhancement or benefit equals or exceeds any negative environmental impacts of the project. (CWC § 79560 and § 79560.1(b))

E. CEQA Compliance

Activities funded under Proposition 50 must be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq*.). See Appendix E for web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook. (CWC § 79506)

F. CALFED Program Consistency

Any project that assists in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals must be consistent with the CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision and must be implemented, to the maximum extent possible, through local and regional programs. See Appendix E for web links to the CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision. (CWC § 79509)

G. Monitoring Requirements

Any groundwater projects and projects that affect groundwater shall include groundwater monitoring requirements consistent with the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (Part 2.76 [commencing with § 10780] of Division 26 of the CWC). Projects that affect water quality shall include a monitoring component that allows the integration of data into statewide monitoring efforts, including, but not limited to the surface water ambient monitoring program carried out by the State Water Board. See Appendix E for web links to the State Water Board's monitoring and reporting requirements.

H. Watershed Management Plan Consistency

Any watershed protection activities must be consistent with the applicable, adopted, local watershed management plans and the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board). See Appendix E for web links to the Basin Plans. (CWC § 79507)

I. Waiver of Litigation Rights

Grant agreements funded by the State Water Board will specify that under no circumstance may a Grantee use funds from any disbursement under the grant agreement to pay costs associated with any litigation the Grantee pursues against the State Water Board or any Regional Water Board, regardless of the outcome of any such litigation, and notwithstanding any conflicting language in the grant agreement, the Grantee agrees to complete the Project funded by the grant agreement or to repay the grant funds plus interest.

DRAFT

V. Proposal Selection

A. Solicitation Notice

DWR and the State Water Board will solicit grant proposals with the Step 1 and Step 2 PSPs for Implementation Grants that are contained in Appendix C. The PSPs provide detailed instructions on the mechanics of submitting proposals and specific information on submittal requirements. The PSPs are also available on DWR and the State Water Board websites listed in the Foreword. A solicitation notice will be e-mailed to all interested parties on the IRWM Grant Program mailing list. Paper copies of the PSPs will be made available upon request.

B. Applicant Assistance Workshops

Informational workshops will be conducted to address applicant questions and to provide general assistance to applicants in preparing Step 1 and Step 2 grant applications. The date and location of the Step 1 workshop is provided in Section IV, Schedule. The dates and locations of the Step 2 workshops will be included in the Step 2 "Call Back" announcement and posted at the DWR and the State Water Board websites listed in the Foreword. In addition to these informational workshops, applicants are encouraged to seek assistance from DWR and State Water Board staff in understanding IRWM Grant Program requirements and completing grant applications.

C. Proposal Submittal

The Implementation Grant application process will be a combination of an electronic on-line submittal and a hard copy submittal. Applicants must submit a complete application on-line using the State Water Board's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The on-line FAAST applications will be made available at the following secure link:

https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov

The specific instructions, including the attachment naming convention referenced in Appendix B, Attachment Instruction, and details for submitting the Step 1 and Step 2 applications will be provided in the solicitation notice and posted at the DWR and State Water Board websites listed in the Foreword. Applications must contain all required items listed in the PSPs.

D. Completeness Review

All information requested in the PSP must be provided. Each application will first be evaluated in accordance with the PSP for completeness. If certain sections are not relevant to a particular applicant or proposal, the applicant must clearly state the rationale for such determination. **Applications not containing all required information will not be reviewed or considered for funding.**

E. Eligibility Review

Complete applications will be evaluated for compliance with eligibility criteria, Section III. **Applications that are determined to be ineligible will not be reviewed or considered for funding.**

F. Review Process

The Step 1 and Step 2 applications will both use the review process detailed here. All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers. The group of technical reviewers for each proposal will include one representative each from DWR headquarters, the State Water Board, and the applicable Regional Water Board or DWR District. At least three technical reviewers will be assigned to each eligible proposal. Furthermore, DWR and the State Water Board may request technical reviewers from other agencies, and will assign reviews based on technical elements of the proposals.

The technical reviewers will individually score proposals in accordance with scoring criteria in Appendix C, Tables C-2 and C-5, as applicable. The review and score will be based on the merit of the entire proposal as a whole versus the merit of an individual component. Following completion of the individual technical reviews, the reviewers will discuss the proposals and develop a consensus review and score.

DRAFT

Applications that are complete and eligible will be scored based on the scoring criteria presented in each PSP. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with a 1 being "low" and a 5 being "high." The score for each criterion will then be multiplied by the weighting factor shown in the Scoring Criteria Table of each PSP.

Where standard scoring criteria are applied, points will be assigned for a criterion as follows:

- A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.
- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and/or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed or no documentation or rationale is presented.

Following completion of the consensus scoring of all eligible proposals, DWR and the State Water Board will convene a Selection Panel to review the technical scores and comments. The Selection Panel will generate a preliminary ranking list of the proposals and make the "Call Back" list recommendations for Step 1, Section V.G below, or the initial funding recommendations for Step 2. When developing the ranking list, the Selection Panel will consider the following items:

- Amount of funds available,
- Consensus review and score,
- Program Preferences (Section II.E), and
- Geographic Scope (Section II.F).

The Selection Panel may recommend reducing individual grant amounts from that requested in order to meet geographic scope funding targets (Section II.F) and available funding limitations for DWR and the State Water Board.

G. Step 2 Call Back Process

The Implementation Grant Program is a two-step process. Based on the review process discussed above, DWR and the State Water Board will invite selected Step 1 applicants to submit a Step 2 application. Submittal of Step 2 applications is by invitation only. DWR and the State Water Board will notify the Step 1 applicants of the Call Back list by email and will post the list of applicants invited to submit Step 2 applications (Call Back list) at the DWR and State Water Board websites listed in the Foreword.

A public meeting will be held to present the Call Back list and to accept public comments on the Step 1 process. When developing the Call Back list, DWR and the State Water Board will consider available funding and geographic scope. In general the Call Back list will be limited to 1.5 to 2 times the amount of funding requests to available funding for each geographic area, i.e. Northern California and Southern California.

H. Applicant Notification and Public Meeting

The list of Step 2 proposals recommended for funding will be posted on DWR and the State Water Board websites and the applicants will be notified of the availability of the recommended funding list.

The recommended funding list will be presented at a public meeting held by DWR and the State Water Board to solicit public comments on the proposed funding recommendations. Interested parties will be notified of the public meeting by a news release informing the public of the date, time, and location of the meeting and by a notice placed on DWR and the State Water Board websites listed in the Foreword.

I. Funding Awards

Based on the individual proposal evaluations, the preliminary ranking list and initial funding recommendations developed by the Selection Panel, and the comments received during a public comment period, DWR and the State Water Board will approve a final funding list and the associated funding commitments. DWR's Director will approve the final funding list through DWR's existing administrative procedures. State Water Board approval will take place at a State Water Board

DRAFT

meeting. Following approval by DWR and the State Water Board, the selected grant recipients will receive a commitment letter officially notifying them of their selection for a grant, the grant amount, and the granting agency.

J. Grant Agreement

Although the grant solicitation and selection process is being implemented jointly by DWR and the State Water Board, the grant funding will be managed separately. Grant agreement oversight will be coordinated between DWR and the State Water Board depending on the scope of the proposal.

Following funding commitment, the granting agency will execute a grant agreement with the grant recipient. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by authorized representative of the grant recipient and the granting agency. An example grant agreement template can be found at the DWR and State Water Board websites listed in the Foreword.

In the event that an applicant is selected for grant funding, the following conditions will need to be met prior to execution of a grant agreement:

- Fiscal Statements: The Grantee must submit copies of the most recent three years of audited financial statements, for each agency or organization proposed to receive grant funding for a selected Proposal. The submittal must also include: 1) balance sheets, statements of sources of income and uses of funds, a summary description of existing debts including bonds, and the most recent annual budget; 2) separate details for the water enterprise fund, if applicable to an agency or organization; 3) a list of all cash reserves, restricted and unrestricted, and any planned uses of those reserves; and 4) any loans required for project funding and a description of the repayment method of any such loans.
- CEQA/NEPA: Grantee must demonstrate that it has complied with all applicable requirements of the CEQA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by submitting copies of the appropriate environmental documents.

DWR and the State Water Board encourage collaboration to enhance the integration of water management throughout regions of California. Parties that wish to collaborate on a proposal may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship, a joint venture, a joint powers authority, or other appropriate mechanism.

K. Funding Match Waiver or Reduction

The requirement for funding match may be waived or reduced to the extent that applicants demonstrate that the proposal will: 1) encompass a region that includes at least one disadvantaged community, 2) include representatives of the disadvantaged communities in the planning process, and 3) be designed to provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged community(ies). Such reductions in the required funding match percentage would be in proportion to the percentage of disadvantaged population served relative to the entire population in the region. Exhibit 6 provides more detail on the procedures for waiving or reducing the funding match.

L. Reimbursement of Costs

Reimbursable costs are as defined in Appendix D. Only work performed **after** the effective date of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Costs incurred after March 20, 2007, and prior to the effective date of a grant agreement are not eligible for reimbursement. However, these costs may be considered, at the Granting Agency's discretion, as a part of the applicant's funding match. **Advance funds cannot be provided.**

DRAFT

IV. SCHEDULE

The schedule below shows the program timeline from release of the Final Implementation Grant, Step 1 PSP through final approval Implementation Grants, Step 2 grant awards. Updates for the events listed in this schedule may be required. The Step 2 Call Back announcement will include the Step 2 application due date. When finalized, an updated schedule will be posted on both the DWR and the State Water Board web sites. Updates may also be advertised through fliers, e-mail announcements, and news releases.

TABLE 3 - ROUND 2 SCHEDULE

DATES SHOWN IN *ITALICS* ARE TENTATIVE DATES

MILESTONE OR ACTIVITY	SCHEDULE
Release Final IRWM Guidelines and PSPs	*June 2007*
Step 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Applicant Workshops *California Environmental Protection Agency* *1000 I Street* *Sacramento, CA, 95814* *This workshop will be broadcast via the internet at the following website:* *http://www.calepa.ca.gov/Broadcast/* *California Towers Building* *3737 Main Street* *Riverside, CA 92501*	*July 2007*
Implementation Grant, Step 1 applications must be submitted via FAAST to the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. Applications submitted after 5 p.m. on the due date will not be reviewed or considered for funding.	**August 1, 2007**
Invite selected applicants to submit Implementation Grant, Step 2 applications and hold Call Back meeting.	*November 2007*
Step 2 IRWM Implementation Grant Applicant Workshop *Number and location of workshops will be provided in the Step 2 Solicitation Notice*	*December 2007*
Implementation Grant, Step 2 applications must be submitted via FAAST to the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. Applications submitted after 5 p.m. on the due date will not be reviewed or considered for funding.	*January 2008*
Public meeting to discuss initial funding recommendations	*May 2008*
DWR and the State Water Board approval of final grant awards	*June 2008*

DRAFT

APPENDIX A
IRWM PLAN STANDARDS

In order to receive funding from the Proposition 50 IRWM Grant Program, an IRWM Plan must meet the standards outlined in this Appendix. The Plan must address all of the following topics.

A. **Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group** – Describe the regional water management group **or** regional agency responsible for development and implementation of the Plan. Include the member agencies and organizations and their management responsibilities related to water. Demonstrate that all agencies and organizations, including but not limited to, public agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and privately owned water utilities regulated by the Public Utilities Commission, that were necessary to address the objectives and water management strategies of the Plan were involved in the planning process.

B. **Region Description** – Explain why the region is an appropriate area for integrated regional water management. Describe internal boundaries within the region (boundaries of municipalities; service areas of individual water, wastewater, and land use agencies, including those not involved in the Plan; groundwater basin boundaries, watershed boundaries, county boundaries, etc.), major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions. Describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region, including surface waters, groundwater, reclaimed water, imported water, and desalted water. Describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon. Describe important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries and the associated water demands to support environmental needs. Describe the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values. Describe economic conditions and important economic trends within the region.

   In certain cases, individual agencies or organizations may participate in different regional efforts depending on geography, Plan objectives, or other relevant factors. For such cases, the application should include an explanation of why participation in various regional efforts is appropriate.

C. **Objectives** – Identify IRWM Plan objectives and the manner in which they were determined. The Plan must address major water related objectives and conflicts within the region, including, at a minimum, water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality.

D. **Water Management Strategies** – Document the range of water management strategies considered to meet the objectives. Strategies to be considered include but are not limited to:

Table A-1 – Water Management Strategies**	
✦ Ecosystem Restoration*	✦ Conjunctive use
✦ Environmental and habitat protection and improvement*	✦ Desalination
✦ Water Supply Reliability*	✦ Imported water
✦ Flood management*	✦ Land use planning
✦ Groundwater management*	✦ NPS pollution control
✦ Recreation and public access*	✦ Surface storage
✦ Storm water capture and management*	✦ Watershed planning
✦ Water conservation*	✦ Water and wastewater treatment
✦ Water quality protection and improvement*	✦ Water transfers
✦ Water recycling*	
✦ Wetlands enhancement and creation*	

* *Pursuant to CWC §§ 79562.5 and 79564, these water management strategies must be considered to meet the minimum IRWM Plan Standards.*

** *To be eligible for future funding pursuant to California Public Resources Code § 75026(a), IRWM Plans will need to consider all of the resources management strategies identified in the California Water Plan (http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/).*

DRAFT

E. **Integration** – Present the mix of water management strategies selected for inclusion in the Plan and discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives. Include a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies, as compared to stand alone alternatives.

F. **Regional Priorities** – Include short-term and long-term priorities for implementation of the Plan. Discuss the process used to determine the regional priorities and the process for modifying priorities in response to regional changes.

G. **Implementation** – Identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented. Identify the agency(ies) responsible for project implementation and clearly identify linkages or interdependence between projects. Demonstrate economic and technical feasibility on a programmatic level. Identify the current status of each element of the Plan, such as existing infrastructure, feasibility, pilot or demonstration project, design completed, etc. Include timelines for all active or planned projects and identify the institutional structure that will ensure Plan implementation.

H. **Impacts and Benefits** – Discuss at a screening level the impact and benefits from Plan implementation. Include an evaluation of potential impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from Plan implementation. Identify the advantages of the regional plan; including a discussion of the added benefits of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts. Identify which objectives necessitate a regional solution. Identify interregional benefits and impacts. Describe the impacts and benefits to environmental justice or disadvantaged communities. Include an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources, such as air quality or energy.

I. **Technical Analysis and Plan Performance** – Include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in development of the Plan. Include a discussion of measures that will be used to evaluate Project/Plan performance, monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operations and Plan implementation based on performance data collected.

J. **Data Management** – Include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public, and include discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs. Assess the state of existing monitoring efforts for water quantity and water quality, and identify data gaps for which additional monitoring is needed.

   If the Plan includes a water quality component, include a discussion of the integration of data into the State Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment Program. Appendix E provides a listing of web links for accessing information on the State Water Board's statewide data management strategies.

K. **Financing** – Identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for Plan implementation. Discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects.

L. **Statewide Priorities** – Identify issues of statewide significance or State agency priorities that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the Plan, proposal, or specific projects. Describe how the Plan, proposal, or specific projects were developed to meet issues of statewide significance or State agency priorities.

M. **Relation to Local Planning** – Discuss how the IRWM Plan relates to planning documents and programs established by local agencies. Demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers. Discuss how local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM strategies and the dynamics between the two planning documents. Discuss the linkages between the Plan and local planning documents.

N. **Stakeholder Involvement** – Identify stakeholders included in developing the Plan. Identify how stakeholders were identified, how they participate in planning and implementation efforts, and how they can influence decisions made regarding water management. Include documentation of stakeholder involvement such as inclusion of signatory status or letters of support from non-agency stakeholders, i.e. those who have not "adopted" the Plan. Include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the Plan. Discuss watershed or other partnerships developed during the planning process. Discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process. Discuss efforts to identify and address environmental justice needs and issues within the region. Identify possible obstacles to Plan implementation.

O. **Coordination** – Identify State or federal agencies involved with strategies, actions, and projects. Identify areas where a State agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication, cooperation, or implementation of Plan components or processes, or where State or federal regulatory decisions are required for implementation.

DRAFT

For Implementation Grant applications to be considered for funding, the proposed or adopted Plans must meet all of the following minimum standards:

- Must be adopted by all appropriate agencies and organizations prior to submittal of the Step 2 application;
- Participation of at least three agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water management, which may include water supply, water quality, flood control, or storm water management;
- Provides a map of the region showing the local agencies in the area covered by the Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects;
- Contains one or more regional objectives;
- Documents that the following water management strategies were considered (CWC §§ 79562.5 and 79564) when formulating the IRWM Plan:
  - Water supply reliability,
  - Groundwater management,
  - Water quality protection and improvement,
  - Water recycling,
  - Water conservation,
  - Storm water capture and management,
  - Flood management,
  - Recreation and public access,
  - Ecosystem restoration,
  - Wetlands enhancement and creation, and
  - Environmental and habitat protection and improvement;
- Integrates two or more water management strategies listed in Table A-1; **and**
- Presents project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs.

DRAFT

APPENDIX B
ATTACHMENT INSTRUCTIONS

Applicants must submit a complete application on-line using the State Water Board Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The on-line FAAST applications for Round 2 will be made available at the following secure link:

https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov

Applicants are encouraged to review the FAAST User Manual and Frequently Asked Questions, also available at the above link for questions about completing the online application. In necessary, DWR and the State Water Board may make minor technical and administrative changes to these Attachment Instructions. Applicants will be notified of any changes via email and the changes will be posted on the web sites listed in the Foreword.

A complete application consists of all the following items:

1. Electronic submittal of an application through the State Water Board's FAAST system (any attachment exceeding 10 megabytes (MB) in size cannot be uploaded to FAAST, see instructions below).
2. Four (4) hard copies (preferably double-sided) of attachments (as applicable) submitted to the State Water Board.
3. A CD containing copies of the referenced material (such as documents listed in the Step 2 PSP, Attachment 6, Scientific and Technical Merit).

Applications may include attachments with supplemental materials such as design plans and specifications, detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot projects, additional maps, diagrams, letters of support, copies of agreements, or other applicable items. Applicants are encouraged to submit attachments and supporting documentation in an electronic format. All applications materials, including attachments and supporting documentation, must be provided by the submittal deadline. Any material submitted after the deadline will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

All CDs and the cover page of any hard copy documents must be clearly labeled with the applicant name, proposal title, grant program name, and Proposal Identification Number (PIN) (assigned in FAAST). All portions of the application, FAAST submittal, CD, and hard copies must be received by the due date and hour. Late submittals will not be reviewed.

File size for each attachment submitted via FAAST is limited to 10 MB. Acceptable file formats are: MS Word, MS Excel, MS Project, or PDF. PDF files should be generated, if possible, from the original application file rather than scanned hard copy. Any application attachments larger than 10 MB must be delivered to the State Water Board on a CD and received before the deadline. The address for mailing or hand delivery of hard copy and CD application components will be provided in the Solicitation Notice and posted on the website listed in the Foreword.

When uploading an attachment in FAAST, the following attachment title naming convention must be used:

Att#_RND2Step#_PIN_AttachmentName_#ofTotal#

Where:

- "Att#" is the attachment number;
- "RND2Step#
  - Use RND2Step1 for Step 1 applications and
  - Use RND2Step2 for Step 2 applications;
- "PIN" is the applicant's 4-digit Step 2 PIN assigned by FAAST;
- "AttachmentName" is the name of the attachment as specified in Section IV – Requirements for Attachments; and
- "#ofTotal#" identifies the number of files that make up an attachment, where "#" is the number of a file and "Total#" is the total number of files submitted in the attachment.

For example, if the Step 2 Attachment 3 – Work Plan for applicant with PIN "1234" is made up of 3 files, the second file in the set would be named "Att3_RND2Step2_1234_WorkPlan_2of3".

DRAFT

APPENDIX C
IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

C.1 PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE FOR STEP I

This section describes the required elements of an Implementation Grant, Step 1 application and presents the Step 1 PSP. **Prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program guidelines with specific emphasis on the IRWM Plan standards (Appendix A) and the scoring criteria (Table C-2) prior to submitting their application to ensure that their submittals meet the IRWM Program requirements.** Applicants must submit a complete application by the deadline specified in Table 3, Schedule. The grant application consists of seven sections outlined in Table C-1, Step 1 Checklist, which is provided as a guide for the applicants to ensure that they have submitted the required information for a complete Step 1 application.

DRAFT

TABLE C-1 – STEP 1 CHECKLIST		
1.	**GENERAL INFORMATION** *The following fields must be completed:*	
☐	Project Title – Provide title of the proposal. **If this item is not completed FAAST will not accept the application**.	
☐	Project Description – Provide a brief description of the proposal, approximately 1-2 paragraphs. The length of the Project Description is limited to 1,000 characters including spaces and returns. **If this item is not completed FAAST will not accept the application.**	
☐	Project Director – Provide the name and details of person responsible for executing grant agreement for applicant. Persons that are subcontractors to be paid by the grant cannot be listed as the Project Director.	
☐	Grant Funds Requested – Provide amount of grant funds requested for the proposal in dollars.	The amounts provided in these three fields can be estimated amounts. Detailed information must be provided in Step 2. This information will be used by DWR and the State Water Board in the Step 2 Call Back Process, Section V.G.
☐	Local Cost Match – "Local Cost Match" is the same as "Funding Match" in the Guidelines. Provide Funding Match for the proposal in dollars.	
☐	Total Budget – Provide total cost for the proposal in dollars.	
☐	Latitude/Longitude – Enter Latitude/Longitude coordinates of the approximate mid-point of the region in degrees using decimal format. Additionally, applicants must also submit a digital geographic file (NAD 27 UTM 10 shapefile) with Attachment 1.	
☐	Watershed – Provide name(s) of watershed(s) the region covers. If the region covers multiple watersheds, list only the primary watershed. **Do not** enter "multiple"; see Item 7, Q3 below.	
☐	County – Provide county where the region is located. If the region covers multiple counties, select "Multiple Counties" from the drop down list; see Item 7, Q4 below.	
☐	Responsible Regional Water Board – Provide the name of the Regional Water Board where the region is located. If the region extends beyond more than one Regional Water Board boundary, select "Statewide" from the drop down list; see Item 7, Q5 below. **If this item is not completed FAAST will not accept the application.**	
2. ☐	**FUNDING PROGRAMS** Select the IRWM Implementation Grant, Round 2, Step 1 Program. **If this item is not completed FAAST will not accept the application.**	
3. ☐	**PROJECT MANAGEMENT** Enter the applicant's Federal Tax ID. Provide the name and contact information of the Project Manager from the applicant agency or organization that will be the day-to-day contact on this application. Provide the name and the contact information of the Project Director from the applicant agency or organization that will be the Authorized Representative from the applicant organization to submit the application and execute a grant agreement.	
4. ☐	**LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION** Enter the State assembly, State senate, and U.S. congressional districts where the region is located. For regions that include more than one district, please enter each district. Look at tables provided in FAAST to assist with determining the appropriate districts.	
5. ☐	**AGENCY CONTACTS** If the applicant has been collaborating with State and Federal agencies (DWR, Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, etc.) in proposal development, please provide agency name, agency contact first and last name, phone, and e-mail address. This information is used to identify individuals that may have an understanding of a proposal and in no way indicates an advantage or disadvantage in the ranking process.	

TABLE C-1 – STEP 1 CHECKLIST	
6. ☐	**COOPERATING ENTITIES** Include entities that have/will assist applicant in proposal development or implementation. Provide name(s) of cooperating entity(ies), role/contribution to proposal, first and last name of entity contact, phone number, and e-mail address.
7.	**APPLICATION QUESTIONNAIRE** *When entered into FAAST the answers to these questions will be used in processing the application and determining eligibility and completeness.*
☐	Q1. Additional Information: Based on the region's location, what is the applicable DWR district (Northern, Central, San Joaquin, or Southern)? The following link can be used to view each district's boundaries: http://www.water.ca.gov/nav.cfm?topic=Local_Assistance&subtopic=Groundwater.
☐	Q2. Additional Information: What are the names and numbers of the groundwater basins underlying the region? The following link can be used for further information on groundwater basin names and numbers: http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov/bulletin118/.
☐	Q3. Additional Information: For a region that encompasses multiple watersheds, list the names of the watersheds other than the primary watershed.
☐	Q4. Additional Information: For a region that encompass multiple counties, list the name of each county.
☐	Q5. Additional Information: For a region that encompasses more than one Regional Water Board boundary, list the name of each Regional Water Board.
☐	Q6. Additional Information: Does the agency or organization have an adopted IRWM Plan? Yes or No. If the answer is yes, please enter the adoption date. If the answer is no, please enter the anticipated adoption date. **The IRWM Plan must be adopted before submittal of a Step 2 application to be eligible for IRWM grant funding.**
☐	Q7. Major Water Issues: Briefly describe the major water related issues within the region.
☐	Q8. Objectives: Briefly describe the objectives for the IRWM plan.
☐	Q9. Stakeholders: List any major stakeholders that are/will participate in the IRWM Plan that were not identified in Item 5, above.
☐	Q10. Completeness: Have all of the fields in the application been completed? If no, please explain.

APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Provide the attachments listed below by attaching files to the FAAST application or providing a CD as required. For instructions on attaching files, please refer to the FAAST User Manual. The naming convention for these attachments, and the requirements for information to be included in these attachments, is found in Guidelines, Appendix B, Attachment Instructions.

ATTACHMENT #		ATTACHMENT TITLE
☐	Attachment 1	Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption
☐	Attachment 2	Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards
☐	Attachment 3	Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards
☐	Attachment 4	Disadvantaged Communities – Environmental Justice

C.2. REQUIREMENTS FOR ATTACHMENTS – STEP 1

Attachments 1 through 4 are required attachments for all IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 1 Proposals. Failure to submit any of Attachments 1 through 4 will make the application incomplete, and it will not be reviewed or considered for funding (Guidelines, Section V.E). A discussion of each of these attachments is provided below.

ATTACHMENT 1. ADOPTED IRWM PLAN AND PROOF OF FORMAL ADOPTION

For the "AttachmentName" in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "IRWMPlan" for this attachment.

For applicants with an adopted IRWM Plan – submit an electronic copy of the adopted Plan with proof of formal adoption (i.e. a signature page, with dates of signature) for all agencies and organizations approving the Plan or other documentation that the Plan has been adopted.

DRAFT

For applicants without an adopted IRWM Plan – submit an electronic copy of the most recent draft Plan in its most current state. The applicant most also provide documentation that the draft Plan has undergone a formal, publicly noticed review and comment period, consistent with the requirements of Section III.B. If a Plan has not been adopted, then the applicant must also provide a detailed schedule showing the major steps and milestones needed to ensure that a Plan will be adopted before submittal of the Step 2 application.

Applicants must submit a geographic file depicting the region (NAD 27 UTM10 shapefile) as part of this attachment.

Attachment 2. Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards

For the "AttachmentName" in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "MinStd" for this attachment. Attachment 2 must be no more than 3 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

Document how the Plan meets the Minimum IRWM Plan Standards as described in Appendix A of the Guidelines. In Attachment 2 of the application, discuss the manner in which the Plan meets each of the Minimum IRWM Plan Standards presented in the Guidelines. **To be eligible for funding, the applicant must document that its Plan meets the Minimum IRWM Plan Standards, Appendix A.**

Attachment 3. Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards

For the "AttachmentName" in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "ConsisStand" for this attachment. Attachment 3 must be no more than 6 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

Using the requirements shown in Appendix A of the Guidelines, document how the Plan addresses each standard listed. Applicants should structure Attachment 3 such that it has sub-sections that address each standard shown in the Appendix A of the Guidelines, i.e. "A. Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group", "B. Region Description", etc. Within each sub-section address how the Plan meets the requirements stated in the Guidelines for that standard and cross-reference sections (page number) of the Plan that address the relevant IRWM Plan Standard.

Attachment 4. Disadvantaged Communities – Environmental Justice

For the "AttachmentName" in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "DACEJ" for this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 4; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

As defined in Appendix D, a disadvantaged community is a community with an annual Median Household Income (MHI) that is less than 80% of the statewide annual MHI. Using Census 2000 data, 80% of the statewide annual MHI is $37,994 and, using U. S. Census Bureau data for 2003, 80% of the statewide annual MHI is $38,752. Attachment 4 must include information on the presence of any disadvantaged communities in the region. Document how the Plan identifies any disadvantaged communities in the Region and the specific critical water-related needs of such communities. Discuss what mechanisms were used in development of the Plan to ensure participation of disadvantaged communities.

Document how the Plan identifies any water-related Environmental Justice concerns for the Region. Discuss what mechanisms were used in development of the Plan to ensure that implementation of the Plan addresses Environmental Justice concerns.

C.3 Scoring Criteria – Step 1

The entire review process is discussed in detail in Guidelines, Section V. Applications will first be screened for eligibility and completeness. Applications that are complete and eligible will be scored based on the scoring criteria presented in Table C-2, Step 1 Scoring Criteria. Each criterion will be scored based on the general scoring standard contained in Guidelines, Section V.F or as presented below.

The evaluation criterion labeled "Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards" is a Pass/Fail ranking. If the application fails this criterion, then the application will not be scored or considered for funding.

The evaluation criterion "Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Adoption" will be scored as follows:

- A score of 5 will be awarded if the applicant has a Plan that has been formally adopted by submittal of the Step 1 application, August 1, 2007.
- A score of 1 will be awarded for applicants that have not formally adopted a Plan by submittal of the Step 1 application, August 1, 2007.

DRAFT

Table C-2 – Step 1 Scoring Criteria		
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Adequacy of IRWM Plan		
Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards *Shown in Attachments 1 and 2.* *This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards:* Will the IRWM Plan be adopted by all participating agencies or organizations by June 1, 2008? Does the Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group include at least three local public agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water management? Was a map of the region showing the member agencies involved in the IRWM Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects included? Does the IRWM Plan include one or more regional objectives? Does the IRWM Plan document that the following minimum water management strategies were considered: water supply reliability, groundwater management, water quality protection and improvement, water recycling, water conservation, storm water capture and management, flood management, recreation and public access, wetlands enhancement and creation, ecosystem restoration, and environmental and habitat protection and improvement? Does the IRWM Plan include the integration of at least two or more water management strategies or elements? Does the IRWM Plan include a project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs?	Pass/Fail	
Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards *Shown in Attachment 3.* *In addition to the pass/fail evaluation above, the IRWM Plan will be evaluated against the entire set of IRWM standards.*		
Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan has been/will be adopted.* Did the applicant submit documentation of formal adoption of the IRWM Plan by August 1, 2007?	1	5
Regional Description *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described the IRWM Plan region, and whether the defined region is appropriate to the planning and implementation.* Was a map or maps, with accompanying descriptive narrative, showing the region encompassed by the IRWM Plan provided? Did the map/maps include appropriate internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region? Did the IRWM Plan describe the current and future water resources of the region? Did the applicant explain why the region is an appropriate area for regional water management? Did the applicant describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region? Did the applicant describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon? Were important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries discussed? Did the IRWM Plan discuss the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values; and describe economic conditions and important trends within the region?	1	5
Objectives *In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described appropriate IRWM Plan objectives.* Did the IRWM Plan identify regional planning objectives and the manner in which they were determined? Does the IRWM Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region covered by the Plan?	1	5
Water Management Strategies & Integration *In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on how well the IRWM Plan integrates a wide range of water management strategies.* Did the IRWM Plan describe the range of water management strategies that were considered to meet the objectives of the plan? Was a brief discussion of why a water management strategy was not applicable provided? Did the applicant discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives? Was a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies provided, as compared to stand alone alternatives?	1	5

DRAFT

Table C-2 – Step 1 Scoring Criteria		
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Regional Priorities *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan has adequately described the priorities of the region.* Was a presentation of regional priorities for implementation provided? Did the applicant identify short-term and long-term implementation priorities? Does the IRWM Plan discuss how: 1) decision-making will be responsive to regional changes; 2) responses to implementation of projects will be assessed; and 3) project sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses?	1	5
Implementation *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is implementable and implementation steps are well documented.* Does the IRWM Plan identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented? Did the IRWM Plan include timelines for active or planned projects? Did the applicant identify the entities responsible for project implementation? Were the linkages or interdependence between projects clearly identified? Was the economic and technical feasibility of projects demonstrated on a programmatic level? Was the current status of each element of the IRWM Plan presented? Was the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation discussed?	1	5
Impacts & Benefits *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan clearly and fully describes the impacts and regional benefits of the Plan.* Does the IRWM Plan include an evaluation of potential negative impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from its implementation? Does the IRWM Plan include the advantages of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts? If applicable, does the IRWM Plan identify interregional benefits and impacts? If applicable, did the applicant describe the benefits to disadvantaged communities? Was an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources provided?	1	5
Technical Analysis and Plan Performance *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is based on sound scientific and technical analysis and includes measures to assess performance.* Did the IRWM Plan include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in selection of water management strategies? Were data gaps identified? Did the IRWM Plan discuss measures that will be used to evaluate project/plan performance, monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operation and plan implementation based on performance data collected?	1	5
Data Management *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan provides for management of data generated during plan development and implementation* Does the IRWM Plan include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public? Was a discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs provided? Did the IRWM Plan assess the state of existing monitoring efforts, both for water supply and water quality? If applicable, did the IRWM Plan discuss the integration of data into the State Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment Programs?	1	5
Financing *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of projects.* Did the IRWM Plan identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for plan implementation? Does the IRWM Plan discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects?	1	5

DRAFT

Table C-2 – Step 1 Scoring Criteria		
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Relation to Local Planning *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is well coordinated with local planning and management efforts.* Did the IRWM Plan discuss how the identified actions, projects, or studies relate to planning documents established by local agencies? Does the IRWM Plan demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? Did the IRWM Plan discuss how local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents?	1	5
Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination *Scoring will be based on whether development and implementation of the IRWM Plan includes stakeholder involvement through a collaborative regional process* Does the IRWM Plan identify stakeholders and the process used for inclusion of stakeholders in development of the plan? Does the process include a discussion of how: • Stakeholders are identified, • They participate in planning and implementation efforts, and • They can influence decisions made regarding water management? Did the IRWM Plan document public outreach activities specific to individual stakeholder groups? Does the IRWM Plan include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during plan implementation? Are partnerships developed during the planning process discussed? Did the application discuss environmental justice concerns? Did the application discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process? Were any possible obstacles to IRWM Plan implementation identified? Was coordination with State or federal agencies discussed? Did the IRWM Plan identify areas where a State agency or agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of plan components or processes, or identify any state or federal regulatory actions required for implementation?	1	5
Disadvantaged Communities – Environmental Justice *Shown in Attachment 4.* *Scoring will be based on the degree that disadvantaged communities will benefit from the proposed project(s).* Did the Plan identify the disadvantaged communities in the Region? Did the Plan discuss the specific critical water-related needs of disadvantaged communities? Did the Plan discuss the mechanisms used in development of the Plan to ensure participation of disadvantaged communities? Did the Plan identify the water-related Environmental Justice concerns for the Region? Did the Plan discuss the mechanisms used in development of the Plan to ensure that implementation of the Plan addresses Environmental Justice concerns?	2	10
Range of Total Possible Points		**14 – 70**

DRAFT

C.4 PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE – STEP 2

This section describes the required elements of an Implementation Grant, Step 2 application and presents the Step 2 PSP. **Prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program guidelines with specific emphasis on the IRWM Plan standards (Appendix A) and the scoring criteria (Table C-5) prior to submitting their application to ensure that their submittals meet the IRWM Program requirements.** Applicants must submit a complete application by the deadline contained in the Step 2 Solicitation Notice and posted on the websites listed in the Foreword. The grant application consists of seven sections outlined in Table C-3, Step 2 Checklist, which is provided as a guide for the applicants to ensure that they have submitted the required information for a complete Step 2 application.

Table C-3 – Step 2 Checklist	
1.	**GENERAL INFORMATION** *The following fields must be completed*:
☐	Project Title – Provide the title of the Proposal. **If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.**
☐	Project Description – Provide the PIN(s) for the Step 1 Proposal. Provide a brief abstract of the Proposal, such as a listing of individual project titles or types. The length of the Project Description is limited to 1,000 characters including spaces and returns. **If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.**
☐	Grant Funds Requested – Provide the amount of grant funds requested, in dollars, for the Proposal.
☐	Local Cost Match – "Local Cost Match" is the same as "Funding Match" in the Guidelines. Provide the Funding Match for the Proposal in dollars. **A minimum Funding Match of 10% of the total cost of the Proposal is required for IRWM Implementation Grant unless a waiver or reduction of the funding match is requested.**
☐	Total Budget –Provide the total cost, in dollars, for the Proposal. This amount must agree with the total Proposal cost shown in Attachment 4.
☐	Latitude/Longitude – Enter the latitude/longitude coordinates of the approximate midpoint of the region in degrees using decimal format.
☐	Watershed – Provide the name of watershed the region covers. If the region covers multiple watersheds, list only the primary watershed. **Do not** enter "multiple"; see Item 7, Q2 below.
☐	County – Provide the county in which the region is located. If the region covers multiple counties, select "Multiple Counties" from the drop down list. See Item 7, Q1 below.
☐	Responsible Regional Water Board – Provide the name of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) in which the region is located. If the region extends beyond one Regional Water Board boundary, select "Statewide" from the drop down list; see Item 7, Q3 below. **If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.**
2. ☐	**FUNDING PROGRAMS** Select the IRWM Implementation Grants, Round 2, Step 2 Program. **If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application**.
3. ☐	**PROJECT MANAGEMENT** Enter the applicant's Federal Tax ID. Provide the name and contact information of the Project Manager from the applicant agency or organization that will be the day-to-day contact on this application. Provide the name and the contact information of the Project Director from the applicant agency or organization that will be the Authorized Representative from the applicant organization to submit the application and execute a grant agreement.
4. ☐	**LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION** Enter the State assembly, State senate, and U.S. congressional districts in which the region is located (use district numbers only, not the name of the Legislator). For regions that include more than one district, please enter each district. Look at tables provided in FAAST to assist with determining the appropriate districts.
5. ☐	**AGENCY CONTACTS** If the applicant has been collaborating with State and federal agencies (DWR, Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, etc.) in Proposal development, enter the agency name, agency contact first and last name, phone, and email address. This information is used to identify individuals who may have an understanding of a Proposal and in no way indicates an advantage or disadvantage in the ranking process.
6. ☐	**COOPERATING ENTITIES** Include the entities that have/will assist the applicant in Proposal development or implementation. Provide name(s) of cooperating entity(ies), role/contribution to Proposal, first and last name of entity contact, phone number, and email address.

DRAFT

Table C-3 – Step 2 Checklist	
7.	**APPLICATION QUESTIONNAIRE** *The answers to these questions will be used in processing the application and determining eligibility and completeness.*
☐	Q1. Additional Information: For a region that encompasses multiple counties, list the name of each county.
☐	Q2. Additional Information: For a region that encompasses multiple watersheds, list the names of the watersheds other than the primary watershed.
☐	Q3. Additional Information: For a region that extends beyond more than one Regional Water Board boundary, list the name of each Regional Water Board.
☐	Q4. Step 1 Information: Enter the IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 1 FAAST PIN associated with this Proposal. Has the title of the Proposal changed from Step 1? Yes or No. If the answer is yes, please enter the Step 1 Proposal Title.
☐	Q5. IRWM Plan Adoption Date: Does the agency or organization have an adopted IRWM Plan? Yes or No. If the answer is yes, please enter the IRWM Plan adoption date. **If the answer is no, the proposal will not be evaluated or considered for funding.**
☐	Q6. Eligibility: Is the applicant a regional agency or regional water management group, of which at least one member is an eligible grant recipient (i.e., a public agency or non-profit organization as defined in Section III of the Guidelines)? If no, please explain. **At least one member of the regional agency or regional water management group must be an eligible grant recipient in order to be eligible for IRWM grant funding.**
☐	Q7. Eligibility: List the regional agency or regional water management group members that qualify as urban water suppliers and which will receive funding from the proposed grant (See Section III of the Guidelines). If there are none, so indicate.
☐	Q8. Eligibility: Have all of the urban water suppliers, listed in Q7 above, submitted complete urban water management plans to DWR? Have those plans been verified as complete by DWR? If not, explain.
☐	Q9. Eligibility: Does the proposal include any groundwater management or groundwater recharge projects or projects with potential groundwater impacts? If so, provide the name(s) of the project(s) and list the agency(ies) that will implement the project(s).
☐	Q10. Eligibility: For the agency(ies) listed in Q9, how has the agency complied with CWC § 10753 regarding groundwater management plans as described in Section III.B of the Guidelines?
☐	Q11. Objectives: Briefly describe how the proposal helps achieve the objectives of the IRWM Plan.
☐	Q12. Modification of River or Stream Channel: Does the Proposal include a project that will modify a river or stream channel? Yes or No. If yes, the applicant must complete Attachment 11 – Modification of River or Stream Channel.
☐	Q13. CALFED Record of Decision (ROD) Consistency: Does the Proposal assist in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals? Yes or No. If yes, the applicant must complete Attachment 12 – CALFED ROD Consistency.
☐	Q14. Letters of Support or Opposition: Are there any letters of support or opposition for the Proposal or individual projects contained within the Proposal? Yes or No. If yes, the applicant must complete Attachment 13 – Letters of Support or Opposition.
☐	Q15. Additional Information: Is the applicant or cooperating entity in default for any water rights permit requirements, including fee payment. Yes or No. If yes, please explain.
☐	Q16. Additional Information: Does the Proposal contain projects that have potential implications with respect to conflict between water users, water rights disputes, and/or interregional water rights issues? Yes or No. If yes, please explain.

APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Provide the attachments listed below by attaching files to the FAAST application or providing a CD as required. For instructions on attaching files, please refer to the FAAST User Manual. The naming convention for these attachments, and the requirements for information to be included in these attachments, is found in Guidelines, Appendix B, Attachment Instructions

Attachment #		Attachment Title
☐	Attachment 1	Authorization and Eligibility Requirements
☐	Attachment 2	Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption
☐	Attachment 3	Work Plan
☐	Attachment 4	Budget
☐	Attachment 5	Schedule
☐	Attachment 6	Scientific and Technical Merit

DRAFT

Table C-3 – Step 2 Checklist		
☐	Attachment 7	Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures
☐	Attachment 8	Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits
☐	Attachment 9	Other Expected Benefits
☐	Attachment 10	Program Preferences
☐	Attachment 11	Modification of River or Stream Channel (If Applicable)
☐	Attachment 12	CALFED ROD Consistency (If Applicable)
☐	Attachment 13	Letters of Support or Opposition (If Applicable)
☐	Attachment 14	Funding Match Waiver (If Applicable)

C.5 Requirements for Attachments – Step 2

Attachments 1 through 10 are required attachments for all IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 2 Proposals. Failure to submit any of Attachments 1 through 10 will make the application incomplete, and it will not be reviewed or considered for funding (Guidelines, Section V.E). In addition, applicants may need to submit one or more of Attachments 11 through 14. If the applicable additional attachment(s) is/are not provided, the application will be deemed incomplete and will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

A discussion of each of these attachments is provided below and the Attachments and associated Exhibits are summarized in Table C-4 – Summary of Attachments and Corresponding Exhibits.

Table C-4 – Summary of Attachments and Corresponding Exhibits		
Attachment[1]	Exhibit[2]	Comment
Attachment 1 – Authorization and Eligibility Requirements		Eligibility
Attachment 2 – Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption		Eligibility
Attachment 3 – Work Plan	1	Scored
Attachment 4 – Budget	2	Scored
Attachment 5 – Schedule		Scored
Attachment 6 – Scientific and Technical Merit		Scored
Attachment 7 – Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures		Scored
Attachment 8 – Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits	3	Scored
Attachment 9 – Other Expected Benefits	4	Scored
Attachment 10 – Program Preferences		Scored
Attachment 11 – Modification of River or Stream Channel		If Applicable
Attachment 12 – CALFED ROD Consistency	5	If Applicable
Attachment 13 – Letters of Support or Opposition		If Applicable
Attachment 14 – Waiver of Funding Match	6	If Applicable

1) The attachment discussion below provides the applicant with general directions regarding the content of each attachment.
2) The exhibit discussion provides specific direction regarding what information is to be submitted in the associated attachment.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT 1 AUTHORIZATION AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "Eligible" for this attachment. Attachment 1 is mandatory and consists of authorization and eligibility documentation including the Urban Water Management Planning Act Compliance and Groundwater Management Plan Compliance.

In Attachment 1 please provide:

- Authorizing Documentation: The grantee must provide a resolution adopted by the grantee's governing body designating an authorized representative to submit the application and execute an agreement with the State of California for an IRWM Implementation Grant. The following text box provides and example resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. _____

Resolved by the <Insert name of governing body, city council, organization, or other> of the <Insert name of agency, city council, organization, or other>, that application be made to the California Department of Water Resources and State Water Resources Control Board to obtain an Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Grant pursuant to the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Water Code Section 79560 et seq.), and to enter into an agreement to receive a grant for the <Insert name of proposal>. The <Insert title – Presiding Officer, President, Agency Manager, or other officer> of the <Insert name of agency , city, county, organization, or other > is hereby authorized and directed to prepare the necessary data, conduct investigations, file such application, and execute a grant agreement with California Department of Water Resources or State Water Resources Control Board.

Passed and adopted at a meeting of the <Insert name of agency, city, county, organization, or other> on <Insert date>.

Authorized Original Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____

Clerk/Secretary: _____

- Eligible Applicant Documentation: Eligible applicants are public agencies, including cities, counties, districts, joint powers authorities, a state agency or department, or other political subdivisions of the State or non-profit organizations that are a California Corporation organized under Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the federal internal revenue code.

  If DWR and the State Water Board determine that the applicant does not have the authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State, the applicant will not be eligible for funding and application will not be reviewed.

  The Grantee must provide a written statement containing the appropriate information outlined below:

  - Public Agencies
    1. Is the applicant a public agency as defined in the Guidelines, Section III? Please explain.
    2. What is the statutory or other legal authority under which the applicant was formed and is authorized to operate?
    3. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State of California?
    4. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.
  - Non-Profit Organizations
    1. Is the applicant a non-profit agency as defined in the Guidelines, Section III? Please explain.
    2. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State of California?
    3. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.
    4. Include a copy of the certificate of incorporation for the organization.

DRAFT

Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) – Guidelines, Section III.B identified compliance with the Urban Water Management Act as an Eligibility Criterion. Urban water suppliers are required to file an UWMP at least once every five years, on or before December 31, in years ending in five and zero. The 2005 UWMPs were due by December 31, 2005. Applicants and participating agencies that are urban water suppliers and have projects that would receive funding through an IRWM Implementation grant must have their 2005 UWMP deemed complete by DWR, before DWR and the State Water Board approve the Step 2 Implementation grant awards (See Guidelines, Section V.I, Funding Awards).

Groundwater Management Plan Compliance – Guidelines, Section III.B identified Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) compliance as an Eligibility Criterion. For groundwater management and recharge projects and for projects with potential groundwater impacts, either positive or negative, the applicant or the participating agency responsible for such projects must provide in Attachment 1 the following, as applicable:

- If the Proposal does not contain a groundwater management or recharge project or none of the projects in the Proposal have a potential to impact groundwater, either positively or negative, so indicate, and include in Attachment 1 the justification for such a conclusion.
- Identification of projects in the Proposal that involve any groundwater management or groundwater recharge or may have either positive or negative groundwater impacts.
- The agency(ies) that will implement such project(s).
- The status of the applicable GWMP compliance option as described below:
  - The applicant or participating agency has prepared and implemented a GWMP that is in compliance with CWC § 10753.7.
  - The applicant or participating agency participates or consents to be subject to a GWMP, basin-wide management plan, or other IRWM program or plan that meets the requirements of CWC § 10753.7.
  - The applicant or participating agency conforms to the requirements of an adjudication of water rights in the subject groundwater basin.
  - The applicant or participating agency is in the process of revising the GWMP to be compliant with CWC § 10753. In which case, Attachment 1 must state the estimated date for adoption, which must be within 1 year of submittal of the Step 2 Implementation Grant application.
- Copies of applicable GWMP.

Attachment 2 Proof of Formal Adoption

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "IRWMPlan" for this attachment.

For applicants that submitted an adopted IRWM Plan at Step 1 – submit an attachment stating that an adopted plan was submitted with the Step 1 application.

For applicants that submitted a draft IRWM Plan at Step 1– submit an electronic copy of the adopted Plan with proof of formal adoption (i.e. a signature page, with dates of signature) for all agencies and organizations approving the Plan or other documentation that the Plan has been adopted.

The Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule, Attachments 3, 4, and 5, deal specifically with the Proposal and are used to evaluate whether the projects are implementable and the applicant's readiness to proceed. Attachment 3, 4, and 5 relate to one another and each should support the other. For example, if the work plan is detailed, the budget estimate should be equally detailed. Lump sum costs in the budget may indicate a work item that is less implementable. The detail and accuracy of the work plan and budget should support the readiness presented in the schedule. Work items that are not detailed or are unclear indicate to a reviewer that the items are not ready to proceed.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT 3 WORK PLAN

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "WorkPlan" for this attachment. See Exhibit 1 for detailed guidance on preparing this attachment**.** There is no page limitation for Attachment 3; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

The work plan contains summary descriptions of all the projects constituting the Proposal and tasks (work items) necessary to complete each project in the Proposal. The work plan must be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that the Proposal is ready for implementation. Work item submittals (e.g. deliverables) should be identified in the Work Plan. The Work Plan should identify linkages between and among projects that are critical to the success of the regional effort.

ATTACHMENT 4 BUDGET

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "Budget" for this attachment. See Exhibit 2 for detailed guidance on preparation of this attachment.

For each project contained in the Proposal, provide detailed budget documentation supporting the costs shown in Table 2-1, Budget. Table 2-1 must be completed for each project in the Proposal and another form must be completed as a summary or roll-up budget for the entire Proposal. In addition, a detailed estimate of costs that supports the budget must be completed. For each budget category shown in Table 2-1, there may be several work items and sub work items (e.g. tasks and sub-tasks). The work items and sub work items shown in the Work Plan, Attachment 2, and Schedule, Attachment 4 should agree with the information shown in Attachment 3.

Applicants must identify minimum funding match of at least 10 percent for the total proposal costs. The requirement for funding match may be waived or reduced for those applicants that demonstrate that the proposal will provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities. Table 2-1 will be used to present the funding match.

Applicants must consider the relevant labor code compliance requirements and the applicability of prevailing wage laws in developing the budget (Guidelines, Section IV).

ATTACHMENT 5 SCHEDULE

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "Schedule" for this attachment.

Provide a schedule for implementation of the proposal showing the sequence and timing of the proposed project or suite of projects. The schedule should show the start and end dates and milestones. The schedule should illustrate any dependencies or predecessors by showing links between work items. At a minimum, the following work items should be included on the schedule:

- Development of financing;
- Development of environmental documentation and CEQA/NEPA compliance;
- Project design and bid solicitation process;
- Acquisition of rights of way, if required;
- Identification and acquisition of all necessary permits;
- Construction start and end dates with significant milestones included;
- Implementation of any environmental mitigation or enhancement efforts; and
- Post construction performance monitoring periods.

The work items shown on the schedule must agree with the work items shown on the work plan and budget discussed in Attachments 3 and 4.

Applicants must submit a schedule showing the sequence and timing of work items presented in the Proposal. The schedule must be consistent with the Work Plan and must use the assumed effective date of the grant agreement which will be provided in the Step 2 Solicitation Notice and at the websites listed in the Foreword. The schedule must show the start and end dates as well as milestones for each work item contained in the Work Plan and should be in a horizontal bar or Gantt chart format. An assumed end date of the grant agreement will not be established by DWR and the State Water Board, instead applicants must include a reasonable estimate of the end date, based on their Proposal including time for any final reports and invoicing.

DRAFT

Work items may overlap. Applicants should show any dependence on predecessors by showing links between work items. The schedule does not need to include the post implementation monitoring period.

ATTACHMENT 6 SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL MERIT

Attachment 6, Scientific and Technical Merit is used to verify that appropriate background data gathering and studies have been performed in the development of the Proposal and to assess the Proposal's ability to produce the benefits claimed. Applicants should note that the technical information provided in this Attachment will also be used in evaluating the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule (Attachments 3 – 5). Furthermore, applicants must provide detailed technical information enabling a reviewer to understand and verify benefits that are claimed in Attachment 8, Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits and Attachment 9, Other Expected Benefits. If the benefits claimed in Attachments 8 and 9 are not based on sound technical analysis, it may result in lower scores in Attachments 8 and 9. If the relevant supporting information requested for Attachment 8 is provided in other Attachments, then reference the exact location, including page numbers, where the information can be found.

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "SciTech" for this attachment. Attachment 6 must be no more than 20 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

This attachment describes the scientific and technical merit of the Proposal and includes an assessment of the: 1) technical adequacy of the data and analysis used in developing each project contained in the Proposal and 2) feasibility of each project.

The applicant will be required to demonstrate the scientific and technical merit of the proposal. Such demonstration **may** include:

- Submittal of a copy(ies) of all reports and studies prepared for the proposal that form the basis for or include information pertaining to this application;
- A brief summary of the types of information in each reference;
- If feasibility and pilot studies have not been completed for the proposed implementation project(s), an explanation regarding what has been done to determine the project's feasibility; and
- Provide copies of the most complete design plans and specifications for the proposed project(s).

In Attachment 6, applicants must submit the following items:

- A discussion for each project in the proposal that lists and briefly describes the data that have been collected and studies that have been performed that support the projects' site location, feasibility, and technical methods. Include references to the page locations of the studies or reports that support the claims made in this discussion. See the Guidelines, Section II for instructions on submitting such studies, reports, or other reference materials.
- Discussion of any project data gaps and references to work items in the Work Plan that would fill the data gaps.

ATTACHMENT 7 MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "Measures" for this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 7; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

Describe the performance measures that will be used to quantify and verify project performance. Provide a discussion of the monitoring system to be used to verify project performance with respect to the project benefits or objectives identified in the proposal. Indicate where the data will be collected and the types of analyses to be used. Include a discussion of how monitoring data will be used to measure the performance in meeting the overall goals and objectives of the IRWM Plan.

This attachment presents the planned project monitoring, assessment, and performance measures that will demonstrate that the Proposal will meet its intended goals, achieve measurable outcomes, and provide value to the State of California. All grant recipients will be required to prepare a Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP) at the initiation of implementation to outline how they will assess and evaluate performance and report on Proposal achievements. The PAEP lays out an evaluation and assessment process based on Proposal goals and outcomes, drawing from the results of grant products and deliverables. The purpose of Attachment 7 is to provide a preview of the information that will be included in the PAEP.

DRAFT

For Attachment 7, applicants are required to submit Project Performance Measures Tables specific to their Proposal. Project Performance Measures Tables should include: project goals, desired outcomes, output indicators (measures to effectively track output), outcome indicators (measures to evaluate change that is a direct result of the work), measurement tools and methods, and targets (measurable targets that are feasible to meet during the life of the proposal). Additional guidance, including example Project Performance Measure Tables, can be found at the following the State Water Board website:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/paep.html

A Project Performance Measures Table should be submitted for each project included in the Proposal. When multiple projects carry the same goals and outcomes, a combined table can be developed to cover those projects. The measurement parameters (metrics) should fit the performance evaluation needs of the Proposal. The metrics may include water quality measurements, measurement-based estimates of pollution load reductions, acres of habitat successfully restored, feet of stream channel stabilized, additional acre-feet of water supply, improved water supply reliability and flexibility, groundwater level measurements, stream flow measurements, improved flood control, or other quantitative measures or indicators.

If the applicant has a completed PAEP, Monitoring Plans (MP), or Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), those documents may be submitted with Attachment 7, as supporting documentation. DWR or the State Water Board must approve the PAEP, MP, and/or QAPP prior to initiation of any monitoring supported by grant funds.

Attachment 8 Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "WSWQBen" for this attachment. See Exhibit 3 for detailed guidance on the preparation of this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 8; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

This attachment deals with estimating and presenting the costs and benefits of water supply and water quality aspects of the Proposal. A qualitative analysis can be provided if it is not feasible to quantify the benefits and the applicant provides adequate justification. If possible, water supply and water quality benefits should be quantified either in economic terms or physical terms. The evaluation of water supply and water quality benefits is structured such that either water quality or water supply projects could achieve the highest score possible for this scoring criterion.

The information contained in Attachment 8 will be evaluated by DWR and the State Water Board against the Scoring Criterion and will be used for "comparative analysis" of one grant application against another grant application and not as a means for DWR and the State Water Board to select an individual project from within a Proposal for funding.

Attachment 9 Other Expected Benefits

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "OtherBen" for this attachment. See Exhibit 4 for detailed guidance on the preparation of this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 9; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

Benefits derived from the Proposal may extend beyond the water supply or water quality benefits described in Attachment 8 (see above). This attachment allows applicants to claim benefits other than water supply and water quality benefits. Qualitative analysis is acceptable if it is not feasible to quantify the benefits and the applicant provides adequate justification.

Note that commitment to providing the other expected benefits will become a term of the grant agreement if the proposal is selected for funding.

Attachment 10 Program Preferences

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "Preference" for this attachment. Attachment 10 must be no more than 10 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

Submit a discussion on how the Proposal assists in meeting the Program Preference(s) described in Guidelines, Section II.E. The discussion must identify the specific Program Preference(s) that the Proposal will meet; the certainty that the Proposal will meet the Program Preference(s); and the breadth and magnitude to which the Program Preference(s) will be met. Meeting the Program Preference(s) identified by the applicant will become a condition of the grant agreement in the event that the Proposal is awarded grant funding.

DRAFT

Attachment 11 Modification of River or Stream Channel (If Applicable)

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "ChannelMod" for this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 11; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

Attachment 11 must be completed for any Proposal that includes a project that modifies a river or stream channel. The applicant must provide documentation that the environmental impacts resulting from such modification will be fully mitigated, considering all of the impacts of the modification and any mitigation, environmental enhancement, and environmental benefit resulting from the project. Also, the applicant should address whether, on balance, any environmental enhancement or benefit equals or exceeds any negative environmental impacts of the project. If DWR and the State Water Board determine that on-balance environmental impacts of such modifications will not be fully mitigated, the corresponding portion of the Proposal will not be eligible for grant funding (Guidelines, Section IV.D).

Attachment 12 CALFED ROD Consistency (If Applicable)

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "CALFEDROD" for this attachment.

Attachment 12 must be completed for Proposals that assist in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals. Such Proposals must be consistent with the CALFED Programmatic ROD and must be implemented, to the maximum extent possible, through local and regional programs. Please complete Form 1 contained in Exhibit 5 of this PSP for each project within the Proposal that assists in meeting the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals (Guidelines, Section IV.F).

Attachment 13 Letters of Support or Opposition (If Applicable)

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "Letters" for this attachment.

Attachment 13 must be used to submit electronic copies of any letters of support for or opposition to the Proposal or individual projects contained within the Proposal. General letters of support or opposition will not be considered. Letters of support or opposition must clearly state how the implementation of the proposal/project will benefit or adversely impact the individual or entity providing the letter. All letters should be addressed to:

Ms. Shahla Farahnak
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Financial Assistance
1001 I Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Ms. Tracie Billington
Department of Water Resources
Division of Planning and Local Assistance
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Attachment 14 Request for Waiver or Reduction of Funding Match (If applicable)

For the "AttachmentName", in the application naming convention, See Appendix B, use "Waiver" for this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 14; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

Applicants requesting waiver or reduction of the funding match requirements for disadvantaged communities must demonstrate that the proposal is designed to provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities. Exhibit 6 provides information on the procedures to be used for applicants to receive credit for providing benefits to disadvantaged communities. For assistance regarding the requesting a funding match waiver, please contact the DWR Point of Contact listed in the Foreword.

DWR and the State Water Board will review Attachment 14 and consider this request when make any funding decisions. DWR or the State Water Board may revise the Benefit Factor and the associated Reduced Funding Match Factor and will applicant, if selected for grant funding, of the required funding match.

DRAFT

C.6 SCORING CRITERIA – STEP 2

The entire review process is discussed in detail in Guidelines, Section V. Applications will first be screened for eligibility and completeness. Applications that are complete and eligible will be scored based on the scoring criteria presented in Table C-5, Step 2 Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards. Each criterion will be scored based on the general scoring standard contained in Guidelines, Section V.F, Review Process, or as presented below.

The evaluation criterion labeled "Adoption of IRWM Plan and Formal Proof of Adoption" is a Pass/Fail ranking. If the application fails this criterion, then the application will not be scored or considered for funding.

DRAFT

Table C-5 – Step 2 Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards				
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption *Formal adoption must be documented by a resolution or other written documentation officially accepting the Plan, with signatures and dates of signatures for the regional agency or all of the agencies and organizations involved in the Plan.* Was the Plan adopted prior to submittal of the Step 2 application?	Pass/Fail			
Work Plan *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the Proposal.* Does the work plan contain an introduction that includes: a) goals and objectives of the proposal; b) a tabulated overview of projects which includes an abstract and project status; c) a map showing relative project locations; and d) a discussion of the synergies or linkages among projects? Are work items for each project of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented? Do the work items include appropriate work item submittals (i.e., quarterly and final reports, PAEP)? Do the work items collectively implement the Proposal? Does the Work Plan include a listing of permits and their status including CEQA compliance? Are the submitted plans and specifications consistency with the design tasks included in the Work Plan?	3	3–15	Standard Scoring Criteria See Guidelines, Section V.F	
Budget *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the Proposal.* Was a summary budget provided for the Proposal and detailed budgets provided for each project contained in the Proposal? Do the items shown in the budget generally agree with the work items shown in the Work Plan and Schedule? Are the detailed costs shown for each project reasonable? Are all the costs shown in the budget supported by documentation, if required, and is that documentation complete?	1	1–5	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded where the budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4; the costs are reasonable, and all the budget categories of Exhibit B are thoroughly supported.
			4	A score of 4 points will be awarded where the budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the budget categories of Exhibit B are not fully supported or lack detail.
			3	A score of 3 points will be awarded where the budgets for most of the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the budget categories described in Exhibit B.
			2	A score of 2 points will be awarded where the budgets for less than half the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking for all of the budget categories described in Exhibit B.
			1	A score of 1 will be awarded where there is no detailed budget information provided for any of the proposed projects.

DRAFT

Table C-5 – Step 2 Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards				
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
Funding Match *Scoring will based on the percent of funding match to the total proposal costs. The funding match percentage is presented in Exhibit B, Budget.* Is the funding match at least 10% of the total cost of the Proposal, unless a reduction or waiver in the funding match has been submitted? – *This is a Pass/Fail criterion.* What is the percentage of the funding match as compared to the total cost of the Proposal?	1	1–5	**For applicants that have requested a funding match reduction or waiver assign a score of 3. For all other applicant use the funding match percentage calculated in Table 2-1 to assign the score.**	
			5	60% or greater
			4	45–59.9%
			3	30–44.9%
			2	20–29.9%
			1	10.0–19.9 %
			Pass/ Fail	<10 – Proposal will not be reviewed and will not be considered for funding.
Schedule *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the Proposal and on the readiness to proceed with the Proposal.* Does the schedule correspond to the work items described in the Work Plan? Given the work item descriptions in Attachment 5, does the schedule seem reasonable? How many months occur between the assumed contract execution date and the start of construction for the earliest of the Proposal projects?	1	1–5	The exact dates to be used for this Scoring Standard**, *text shown in italics*, will be provided in the Step 2 Solicitation Notice and posted on the websites listed in the Foreword.**	
			5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of all elements of the Proposal by *six months after the contract start date*.
			4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation one or more of the elements of the Proposal by *six months after the contract start date.*
			3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after *six months after the contract start date* but before *12 months after the contract start date*.
			2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the schedule is clearly not consistent, not reasonably achievable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after *12 months after the contract start date* but before *18 months after the contract start date*.
			1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the schedule does not follow the work items presented in the work plan and budget, is clearly not reasonable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after *18 months after the contract start date*.

DRAFT

Table C-5 – Step 2 Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards				
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
Scientific and Technical Merit *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the Proposal has scientific and technical merit.* Was each project contained in the Proposal supported by thorough and well-documented studies and data? Does the information contained in the technical documents support the technical feasibility for each project? If feasibility or pilot studies have not been conducted for an individual project(s), was an explanation provided regarding what has been done to determine the project's feasibility? Were data gaps identified and are there items in Work Plan that fill the identified data gaps?	3	3–15	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if supporting studies and data descriptions are complete for all projects in the Proposal; this information supports project feasibility; all data gaps are identified and referenced to specific work items in the Work Plan; and the listed studies were provided. For those Proposals in which only one project is proposed, the above criteria will be used for each of the components of the project.
			4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if supporting studies and data descriptions are complete for most projects in the Proposal; this information supports project feasibility; some but not all data gaps are identified and referenced to specific work items in the Work Plan; and the listed studies were provided. For those Proposals in which only one project is proposed, the above criteria will be used for a majority of the components of the project.
			3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if supporting studies and data descriptions are not complete but sufficient information is provided to support project feasibility; some but not all data gaps are identified and referenced to specific work items in the Work Plan; or the application does not contain all listed studies. For those Proposals in which only one project is proposed, the above criteria will be used for less than a majority of the components of the project.
			2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if supporting studies and data descriptions are not complete; this information does not support project feasibility; data gaps are not identified or referenced to specific work items in the Work Plan; or a the application does not provide the listed studies or were provided in an unreadable format.
			1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the applicant does not respond directly to the Scientific and Technical Merit criteria.
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented an adequate monitoring and assessment program including performance measures that will allow a determination of whether the objectives are met.* Do the Project Performance Measures Tables include: project goals, desired outcomes, output indicators, outcome indicators, measurement tools and methods, and targets? Do the output indicators effectively track output? Are the outcome indicators adequate to evaluate change resulting from the work? Is it feasible to meet the targets within the life of the proposal?	1	1–5	Standard Scoring Criteria See Guidelines, Section V.F	

DRAFT

Table C-5 – Step 2 Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards				
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits *Scoring will be based on the Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits of the Proposal. The scores will be assigned relative to all other Proposals. Scoring is designed to not bias water supply and water quality projects with respect to each other.* Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the costs and water supply and water quality benefits of the Proposal? Are the costs and water supply and water quality benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?	3	3–15		The minimum score for this criterion is 1 point. The remaining 4 points will be allocated based on: 1) the water supply and water quality benefits realized through implementation of the Proposal and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits. Points will be awarded based on a comparison of qualitative and quantitative information describing the water supply and water quality benefits of the Proposals. Proposals will be scored as follows: 1) high levels of water supply or water quality benefits will receive 3 to 4 points; 2) average levels of water supply or water quality benefits will receive 2 to 3 points; and 3) low levels of water supply or water quality benefits will receive 1 point). The initial score will then be adjusted qualitatively based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. Unsubstantiated or poor quality analysis or documentation can result in the score being reduced by up to 4 points, provided that the final score is not less than the minimum score of 1.
Other Expected Benefits *Scoring will be based on the certainty that the Proposal will provide the benefits claimed, as well as the magnitude and breadth of the Other Expected Benefits.* Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the Other Expected Benefits of the Proposal? Are the Other Expected Benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?	2	2–10		The minimum score for this criterion is 1 point. The remaining 4 points will be allocated based on: 1) the benefits realized through implementation of the Proposal and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits. Points will be awarded based on a comparison of qualitative and quantitative information describing the benefits of the Proposals. Proposals will be grouped by the reviewers on the basis of physical quantification in Proposals with: 1) high levels of Other Expected Benefits will receive 3 to 4 points, 2) average levels of Other Expected Benefits will receive 2 to 3 points and 3) low levels of Other Expected Benefits will receive 1 point. The initial score will then be adjusted qualitatively based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. Unsubstantiated or poor quality analysis or documentation can result in the score being reduced by up to 4 points, provided that the final score is not less than the minimum score of 1. Proposals that do not have Other Expected Benefits will receive the minimum score of 1 point.
Program Preferences *Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal will implement one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program Preferences (See Guidelines, Section II.E). Proposals that demonstrate significant, dedicated, and well-defined projects that meet multiple Program Preferences will be considered more favorably than Proposals that demonstrate a significant potential to meet a single Program Preference or demonstrate a low degree of commitment or certainty to meeting Program Preferences* Does the Proposal include projects that implement Program Preferences? Did the applicant demonstrate a high degree of certainty that the Proposal will implement the Program Preferences? Did the applicant document the magnitude and breadth of Program Preferences that the Proposal will meet?	1	1–5	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the Proposal will implement multiple Program Preferences, demonstrates a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.
			4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes project(s) that implement a single Program Preference, demonstrate a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved, and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.
			3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes project(s) that implement multiple Program Preferences, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.
			2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes project(s) that implement a single Program Preference, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.
			1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the Proposal does not address any Program Preference or the Program Preferences are highly unlikely to be implemented.
Total Range of Points Possible	**16 – 80**			

DRAFT

EXHIBIT 1
WORK PLAN

This exhibit provides guidance for presenting, in Attachment 3, the Work Plan for the Proposal.

All proposals must include a detailed description of the proposed implementation project(s) for which funding will be requested. The goals and objectives of the proposal must be identified. Where requested funding is for a component of a larger project, this section must describe all of the components of the larger project and identify which elements of the project the IRWM grant is proposed to fund. Linkages to any other projects that must be completed first or that are essential to obtain the full benefits of the proposal must be discussed.

Based on the goals and objectives of the proposal, a description of all work that will be necessary to complete the project or suite of projects must be included in this section. The work plan should include a description of work items to be performed under each task and work item submittals for assessing progress and accomplishments. The description should include as much detail as possible, and explain all work items necessary to complete the proposal and how the applicant will coordinate with the granting agency.

A vicinity map must be provided to show the general location of the project or suite of projects. A more detailed map showing at a minimum the location of activities or facilities of the project(s), the groundwater basins and surface water bodies that will be affected; the natural resources that will be affected; and proposed monitoring locations must also be provided. Disadvantaged communities within the region should be identified on the detailed map.

The work items shown on the work plan must agree with the work items shown on the budget and schedule discussed in Attachments 4 and 5. Additionally, the application must describe how the proposal is consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan.

Attachment 3, Work Plan, should consist of two parts: an introduction and work items. Based on the goals and objectives of the Proposal, a description of all work that will be necessary to complete the Proposal must be included in this attachment. The Work Plan must include a summary of the entire Proposal as well as details for each project within the Proposal. Any supporting documentation necessary to substantiate work already completed should be submitted as appendices to Attachment 3.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction should provide information about the Proposal and shall include, but not be limited to the following items:

- A presentation of the Goals and Objectives of the Proposal.
- A description of how the Proposal is consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan.
- A table of specific projects in the Proposal, including, an abstract of each project, the current status of each project in terms of percent completion of design, the priority of those projects, and implementing agencies.
- A description of synergies or linkages between projects that result in added value, or require coordinated implementation or operation.
- A map showing the location of project(s) contained in the Proposal and also showing the regional boundaries.
- A description of the work that has been completed or is expected to be completed prior to January 1, 2009, the assumed contract execution date. For example, if CEQA/NEPA and other environmental compliance efforts have been completed discuss the environmental determination made by the lead agency and the documents that were filed.

Where requested funding is for a component of a larger project, this section must describe all of the components of the larger project and identify which project elements the IRWM grant is proposed to fund. Linkages to any other projects that must be completed first or that are essential to obtain the full benefits of the Proposal must be discussed.

DRAFT

WORK ITEMS

Work items are specific activities that will be performed to implement each project of the Proposal. The work items descriptions will be used as the scope of work in the grant agreement if the Proposal is selected for funding. The work item detail must be sufficient to demonstrate a high expectation of successful implementation and must allow the reviewer to fully understand the work to be performed in order to evaluate the adequacy of the Proposal. Additionally, the work items must provide sufficient detail to justify the project and Proposal cost estimates. Work items listed in the Work Plan should be consistent with those used in Attachment 4, Budget and Attachment 5, Schedule.

The work item section must contain the following items:

- For each project contained in the Proposal, include a description of work to be performed under each work item and the current status of the work item. The description should include as much detail as possible and explain all work necessary to complete each project and, collectively, the Proposal.
- Procedures by which the applicant will coordinate with its partner agencies and organizations that may receive funding from the grant including any contracts, MOUs, and other formal agreements.
- Detailed maps that show, at a minimum, the location of activities or facilities of the project(s), the groundwater basins and surface water bodies that will be affected including modifications to any river or stream channel; the water resources that will be affected; disadvantaged communities within the region; and proposed monitoring locations.
- A discussion of standards, such as construction standards, health and safety standards, laboratory analysis, or accepted classifications methods that will be used in implementation.
- Development of PAEPs, MPs, and QAPPs for the Proposal.
- A discussion of the status of acquisition of land or rights-of-way, if applicable.
- A discussion of the merits of the building materials or computational methods that were or will be used for project development, such as use of specific grades of building materials or use of specific, tested, and established models (or software). Also discuss the status of project design and bid solicitation efforts.
- Identification of all necessary permits and the status of securing such permit.
- A discussion of the status of preparation and completion of requirements to comply with the CEQA, NEPA, and other environmental laws. If environmental compliance efforts have not been completed, include a plan for environmental compliance. Discuss the status of environmental mitigation or enhancement actions.
- If a GWMP must be prepared, work items to complete the GWMP.
- A description of submittals to the granting agency for assessing progress and accomplishments, such as quarterly and final reports.
- Any other work items that may be applicable to describe implementation of the projects but are not listed above.

Additionally, the most recent plans and specifications should be referenced, including page or sheet numbers, in the Work Plan and copies of the plans and specifications must be submitted as part of the application, as detailed in Appendix B, Attachment Instructions.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT 2
BUDGET

The proposal must provide a detailed estimate of costs and funding sources. The estimate must at a minimum include the following for each individual project within the proposal:

- Land costs, planning and design costs, environmental compliance and documentation costs, construction costs shown by project task, or phase, and the contingency amount for the proposal;
- All sources of the funding match;
- The amount of funding match applied to each task; and
- Work items that are completely supported by funding match.

The detailed budget should be commensurate with the design stage that is being submitted and be broken out by work items used in the work plan. The detailed budget should clearly identify the amount of any contingencies amounts and provide an explanation for the rationale used to determine the percentage contingency used in the estimate. The work items shown on the budget must agree with the work items shown on the work plan and schedule discussed in Attachments 3 and 5.

Table 2-1 must be completed for each project in the Proposal and another Table 2-1 must be completed as a summary (roll-up) budget for the entire Proposal. The Summary Budget Table 2-1 must be clearly marked as such. Although the applicant should complete Row (j) for each individual project, the Minimum Funding Match requirement applies to the costs of the overall Proposal. Therefore, the 10 % minimum Funding Match must be met or exceeded on the Summary Budget Table 2-1; the percent funding match from that table only will be used for the Funding Match Scoring Criterion shown in Table C-5.

TABLE 2-1 – BUDGET
(INSERT EITHER "SUMMARY BUDGET" OR INSERT THE NAME OF THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT)

PROPOSAL TITLE:_____

PROJECT TITLE:_____

	Budget Category	Other State Funds[1)]	Non-State Share (Funding Match)	Requested Grant Funding	Total	% Funding Match
(a)	Direct Project Administration Costs					
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement					
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation					
(d)	Construction/Implementation					
(e)	Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement					
(f)	Construction Administration					
(g)	Other Costs					
(h)	Construction/Implementation Contingency					
(i)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)					
(j)	Calculation of Funding Match % (Used in Funding Match Scoring Criterion) *Optional for individual component projects.*					
Sources of Funds for Non-State Share (Funding Match) and Other State Funds		*Use as much space as required to show the source of the Non-State Share and Other State Funds*				

1) "Other State Funds" may be presented in Table 2-1 to demonstrate the full funding picture for the Proposal and, if presented, must be included in the total costs of the Proposal, which will be used to determine the percentage for the Funding Match Scoring Criterion.

DRAFT

For each of the categories shown in the Table 2-1 above, the applicant must provide supplemental detailed costs for each project as follows:

Row (a) Direct Project Administration Costs

Detail shall include hourly wage paid by discipline; number of hours to be expended for administration; and costs shown for equipment, supplies, or travel, with back-up data provided. Travel proposed to be reimbursed by the grant must be at or below the rates allowed for unrepresented State employees. If project administrative costs are shown as a percentage of a cost, include both: a) the total on which the project administration is based (i.e., total project costs, total construction cost, etc.) and b) how the percentage was determined (i.e., flat rate, based on prior experience, etc.). This budget category includes all such costs for the grant recipient and any partner agencies or organizations. Applicants are encouraged to limit administrative costs proposed to be reimbursed by the grant to less than 5% of the total Proposal costs. Such administrative expenses are the necessary costs incidentally but directly related to the Proposal.

Row (b) Land Purchase/Easement

Detail shall distinguish whether the cost is for purchase of land or an easement to use the land. If land purchase is to be included in the funding match, include whether it is a proposed acquisition or whether the land is already owned by the applicant or partner agency/organization. If the land is already owned by the applicant or partner agency/organization, indicate when the land was purchased and the purchase price. The purchase price for that portion of the land that will be dedicated to the Proposal may, in certain circumstances, be included as funding match.

Row (c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation

Detail shall include hourly wage paid by discipline, number of hours, and the total cost for the particular item (i.e., 60% design, final design [See below for discussion of design stages], engineering field investigations, preparation of CEQA documentation, PAEP preparation etc.). If any contingency amounts are used in the estimate, provide an explanation for the rationale used to determine the contingency percentage.

Row (d) Construction/Implementation

Provide a cost estimate commensurate with the design stage that is being submitted for the project. For example, if the applicant states that the design for a particular project is at the 60% design stage, then a cost estimate with appropriate detail based on that design stage must be included (See below for guidance on design stages). The estimate should include the quantity of materials used, unit cost, number of units, and, if possible, should have separate costs for labor, equipment, and materials. Do not show any construction/implementation contingency costs in this category. They will be shown in Construction/Implementation Contingency category. For any implementation costs, show as much detail as required to support the implementation costs shown.

Row (e) Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement

This item includes an estimate of all environmental compliance, mitigation, and enhancement costs. The estimate of costs for this work should be provided in the same format as shown for Construction/Implementation.

Row (f) Construction Administration

The costs to administer and manage construction of the project must be presented. Provide a discussion of the method used to determine this cost. If a percentage of construction costs is used here, indicate the percentage used. If the estimate will be based on expected hours of effort, list the hours, by discipline, unit cost, equipment costs, and total cost.

Row (g) Other Costs

Include detail for any legal services costs required to support the project. Include the costs for licenses and permits. Include any costs of monitoring and assessment required during the construction/initial implementation of the project and may include preparation of the necessary PAEPs, MPs, or QAPPs. Do not include any monitoring and assessment costs for efforts required after project construction is complete.

DRAFT

Row (h) Construction/Implementation Contingency

Normally these costs include costs to handle unknown conditions encountered during construction or implementation of the project and may cover items that are not yet shown in the design. Specify the percentage used for this cost, and provide a reason for using the percentage used. Include only those contingency costs for construction/implementation efforts here. All other contingency costs should be included in the appropriate cost category.

Row (i) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)

Sum each of the columns as shown in Table 2-1 to determine the grand total of costs for each project. Provide a separate table that summarizes, or rolls-up, the costs for each project in the Proposal. From this summary sheet use the grand total from the "Non-state Share (Funding Match)" column, and use this cost to include in Table 1 – FAAST Checklist, under the box entitled "Local Cost Match". Use the grand total from the "State Share (Grant Funding)" column, and use this cost to include in Table C-3, under the box entitled "Grant Funds Requested." Finally, use the grand total from the "Total" column, and use this cost to include in Table C-3, under the box entitled "Total Budget."

Row (j) Calculation of Funding Match %

DWR and the State Water Board will use the calculations of the Funding Match percentage from the Summary Budget Table 2-1 as the basis of the score for the Funding Match Criterion.

For purposes of this PSP, the following design stages are provided to assist applicants in determining their design percentage for projects under design:

- **10% (Conceptual) Design** – The 10% design shows project siting and the layout of major facilities. No specifications are provided. Design analysis has been started and is nearing completion. Background geologic, seismic literature research has been performed. A listing of project objectives, environmental or infrastructure constraints is provided.
- **30 % (Concept) Design –** The 30% design shows project siting and all project appurtenances. Some detail is provided for each of the disciplines (such as civil, structural, mechanical, and geology). Design analysis should be complete at this stage. A rough listing of specifications required for the project is provided. Preliminary Geologic and Foundation Studies have been performed.
- **60% Design** – The 60% design is the same as for the 30% design submittal, with more details provided for each design discipline, including electrical, and traffic control, if applicable. Standard details and outline specifications, including the front end and technical portion, are provided. Foundation studies completed, lab testing performed, structural analysis and/or modeling performed, permitting underway.
- **90% (Pre-final) Design** – The 90% design is the final, un-stamped, submittal. Complete plans and specifications are prepared, and a detailed itemized cost estimate is included.
- **100% (Final) Design** – The 100% design is the design package that will be advertised for project award for construction/implementation of project. The package consists of the complete, signed, and "As-Advertised" plans and specifications.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT 3
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS – WATER SUPPLY AND WATER QUALITY BENEFITS

This exhibit provides methods and formats for estimating and presenting, in Attachment 8, the costs and the water supply and water quality benefits of the Proposal.

The Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits may include, but are not limited to, the following benefit types:

- Water Supply
  - Avoided water supply purchases, including those for environmental purposes;
  - Avoided water supply projects;
  - Avoided water shortage costs;
  - Avoided operations and maintenance costs; and
  - Water revenue from sales to another purveyor or third party.
- Water Quality
  - Water quality improvements related to protecting, restoring, or enhancing beneficial uses;
  - Water quality improvements for impaired water bodies and sensitive habitats;
  - Avoided water quality projects costs;
  - Avoided water treatment costs;
  - Avoided wastewater treatment costs; and
  - Water quality improvements related to providing water supplies (if not already captured as a water supply benefit).

At a minimum, all applications must provide a narrative description of the expected water supply or water quality benefits of the Proposal. If possible, each such benefit should be quantified and presented in physical or economic terms, using existing information or reasonable effort. If benefits cannot be quantified, explain why and justify. Applicants may use the tables contained in this Exhibit to present the water supply or water quality benefits of the Proposal, or may use other formats if desired. Excel spreadsheet versions of following tables can be found at the links listed in the Foreword.

Each applicant must provide the following information:

- Narrative description of the Proposal's economic costs.
- Cost details for the entire Proposal using Table 3-3 and the information in Table 2-1.
- Narrative description of all of the Proposal's expected water supply and water quality benefits, including those achieved by restoring, protecting, or enhancing beneficial uses, particularly those on impaired water bodies (See "Water Quality Benefits" below), which shall address the following items:
  - Estimates of without-Proposal conditions; e.g. existing water quality or current and future water supplies and demand.
  - Estimates of with-Proposal conditions; e.g. improvements in water quality or new water supplies made available to meet demand.
  - Description of methods used to estimate without- and with-Proposal conditions.
  - Description of the distribution of local, regional, and statewide benefits.
  - Identification of beneficiaries.

DRAFT

- When the benefits will be received.
- Uncertainty of the benefits.
- Description of any adverse effects.

- Narrative discussion that describes, qualifies, and supports the values entered in the tables.
- If possible, quantified estimates of physical and economic benefits using Tables 3-4, 3-5, and 3-6, as applicable. Table 3-4 is used to present physical and economic benefits. Table 3-5 is used for the benefits in an avoided cost of future projects. Table 3-6 is used if the benefit is estimated in some other way (i.e., not using a unit monetary value or an avoided cost).
- Documentation to support information presented in the Proposal. Applicants may provide requested information for each project to help document the Proposal, including sing tables 3-3 through 3-6 on a project basis. However, the evaluation score will be determined based on the information provided for the Proposal in its entirety.
- If the Proposal includes a suite of projects, describe the relationship of each project to the overall Proposal costs and to the overall water supply and water quality benefits of the entire Proposal.

Applicants should take necessary care to provide realistic and supportable cost and benefits analyses. Other studies or documents used to support cost and benefit estimates should be clearly referenced. See Appendix B, Attachment Instruction for guidance on submitting studies, documents, or other reference materials.

Proposal Costs

This section provides guidance for describing all costs that will be incurred to implement and operate the Proposal and to achieve benefits from the Proposal. This includes costs funded by local, State, and federal agencies, non-profit organizations, and other entities. All costs, both initial investments and operational costs, associated with the Proposal necessary to accomplish full implementation of the Proposal and achievement of the stated benefits, must be included. All costs must be clearly documented to allow a reviewer to assess the accuracy and reasonableness of the analysis. If the reviewers find that some Proposal costs are not included in the analysis, a lower score will result. Applicants must use the following guidelines and assumptions in an economic analysis for the Proposal:

- *Consistency* – The economic analysis must be completed for the entire Proposal and must be consistent with other data and information provided in the Proposal.
- *With-Proposal and Without-Proposal Comparison* – The economic analysis should be based on a comparison of expected conditions with- and without-Proposal over the period of analysis.
- *Period of Analysis* – The economic analysis will be based on a Proposal life cycle specified by the applicant which shall include the construction period and operational life.
- *Economic Cost* – Any costs associated with the Proposal, regardless of who bears the cost and regardless of the funding source is considered an economic cost. Opportunity costs should be included, but sunk costs should be excluded.
- *Sunk Costs*– Sunk costs are costs spent in the past that have no salvage value; therefore, they cannot be recovered and should not be counted.
- *Opportunity Costs* – Opportunity cost is the benefit that a resource could provide in the without-Proposal condition and should be counted. For example, land already purchased for use in a project could be used for other purposes; therefore, a reasonable estimate of the market value of that land should be included as a cost. Note that any expenditure paid for an asset before March 20, 2007, cannot be included in Table 2-1 presented in Attachment 4, because it is not eligible for reimbursement. However, the current value of the asset should be included here as an economic cost.
- *Discount Rate* – Because costs and benefits are evaluated over the life of the Proposal, they must be discounted to reflect the value of money over time. All applicants must use a 6% discount rate. Table 3-1 provides the discount factors that must be used.

DRAFT

Table 3-1 - Discount Factors									
Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor
2007	1.06	2017	1.90	2027	3.40	2037	6.09	2047	10.90
2008	1.12	2018	2.01	2028	3.60	2038	6.45	2048	11.56
2009	1.19	2019	2.13	2029	3.82	2039	6.84	2049	12.25
2010	1.26	2020	2.26	2030	4.05	2040	7.25	2050	12.99
2011	1.34	2021	2.40	2031	4.29	2041	7.69	2051	13.76
2012	1.42	2022	2.54	2032	4.55	2042	8.15	2052	14.59
2013	1.50	2023	2.69	2033	4.82	2043	8.64	2053	15.47
2014	1.59	2024	2.85	2034	5.11	2044	9.15	2054	16.39
2015	1.69	2025	3.03	2035	5.42	2045	9.70	2055	17.38
2016	1.79	2026	3.21	2036	5.74	2046	10.29	2056	18.42

- *Dollar Value Base Year* – All costs and benefits will be expressed in 2006 dollars. When using economic data from past years, costs should be escalated to account for inflation. The update factors shown in Table 3-2 can be used to update economic data to 2006 dollars. If the applicant needs to update costs from years preceding 2000, please see the Foreword of the PSP for the DWR contact person. Other, more specific indices (such as the Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index) can be used if justified by the applicant.

Table 3-2 - Update Factors	
Year	Update Factor
2000	1.16
2001	1.13
2002	1.11
2003	1.09
2004	1.06
2005	1.03
2006	1.00

TABLE 3-3

The Proposal costs presented in this section must be consistent with Table 2-1 presented in Attachment 4 (Exhibit 2) of the grant application. Table 3-3 may augment initial costs from Table 2-1 if there are costs, such as opportunity costs, that are not eligible for reimbursement under this grant program. Note that cost savings realized as a result of the Proposal should be included as a benefit and not subtracted from the costs. To complete Table 3-3, the applicant should use the following steps:

- Modify the number of rows to match the estimated Proposal life, i.e. how long are the projects intended to operate and provide benefits.
- Columns (a) through (g): Enter costs for each applicable cost category in each year of the Proposal's lifecycle. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure, not the first year of operation.
- Column (h): Enter the sum of all costs for the year (Columns (a) through (g)).
- Column (i): These are the discount factors provided in Table 3-1.
- Column (j): Enter the result of dividing Column (h) by the discount factor in Column (i) for each year (each row).
- Bottom of Column (j): Total Present Value of Discounted Costs: Enter the sum of the Column (j) entries in the last row at the bottom of the table. This is the total present value of all costs discounted at 6%.
- Comment Box: Enter any sources and references; include page numbers, supporting the numbers used in this table.

DRAFT

Table 3-3 – Annual Cost of Proposal (All costs should be in 2006 Dollars)										
	Initial Costs		Operations and Maintenance Costs						Discounting Calculations	
YEAR	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
	Capital and Other Initial Costs from Table 2-1	Capital and Other Initial Costs Not Included in Table 2-1	Admin	Operation	Maintenance	Replacement	Oth er	Total Costs (a+b+…g)	Discount Factor	Discounted Costs (h÷i)
2007									1.06	
20078									1.12	
20088									1.19	
...									…	
...									…	
...									…	
Proposal Life									…	
Total Present Value of Discounted Costs (Sum of Column (j))										
Comment Box										

DRAFT

Proposal Benefits

This section provides guidance for displaying and describing the physical and economic water supply and water quality benefits of the Proposal.

Benefits Analysis

At a minimum, each water supply or water quality benefit must be described. If possible, each benefit should be quantified in physical terms. For each water supply or water quality physical benefit, the applicant should determine if a monetary value could be placed on each unit of benefit. For benefits that could not be quantified in physical terms, the applicant should still determine if an estimate of economic benefits is possible. In particular, avoided costs of other projects may be counted as a benefit even if the benefit cannot be physically quantified. A description of economic benefits should be provided even if monetary value cannot be quantified. The applicant must describe how economic benefits for the water supply or water quality benefits were calculated to allow the reviewers to assess the accuracy and reasonableness of the analysis. For benefits that can be quantified in dollars, applicants should present results in 2006 dollars. The applicant must avoid double-counting economic benefits.

The applicant should provide a description of economic factors that may affect or qualify the amount of economic benefits to be realized. The application should also include a discussion of any uncertainty about the future that might affect the level of benefits received.

Water Quality Benefits for Impaired Water Bodies and Sensitive Habitats:

One of the IRWM Grant Program Preferences (Guidelines, Section II.E) is to eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired water bodies and sensitive habitats. Impaired water bodies are identified by the State Water Board and also referred to as "303(d) listed impaired water bodies." The 303(d) impaired water body list is posted on the State Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html.

Proposals that restore, enhance, or protect beneficial uses of water consistent with the Regional Water Board's Basin Plans for each of the nine regions in the state may provide significant water quality benefits. However, it may be difficult in some instances to quantify benefits. To capture and characterize benefits from these projects, the applicant should specifically address where and how the water quality benefits will be achieved in the water body; what significant water quality improvements will be achieved; and the beneficial uses of that water body. For such water quality benefits, applicants should provide the information shown below to allow reviewers to assess the benefits claimed in the Proposal.

- Number of downstream water bodies affected.
- Water body names and water volumes.
- The fraction of each water body affected by the Proposal (if possible).
- Beneficial uses identified for the water bodies affected by the Proposal.
- Pollutants present in the affected water body.
- Concentrations of each pollutant in the affected water body.
- Sources of the pollutants.
- Beneficial use activities affected by each pollutant.
- The total load reduction of pollutants in the affected water body. Benefits determination for Proposals that, once implemented, lead to load reductions in impaired water bodies must focus on the expected load reductions.
- The change in pollutant concentrations in the affected water body.

DRAFT

- The change in the beneficial-use activity for the affected portion of the water body.
- Any other aspects of the Proposal that have a reasonable probability of affecting significant improvements in water quality – restoring beneficial uses.

TABLE 3-4

Table 3-4 should be used to present *Physically Quantifiable Benefits*, whether they are quantifiable in either physical or economic terms. To present only physically quantified benefits, the applicant should complete Columns (b) through (d) of Table 3-4. If the applicant also wishes to claim economic benefits based on unit dollar value, then also complete columns (e) through (i). To complete Table 3-4, the applicant should use the following steps:

- Format a table that will display the various water supply and water quality benefits that are claimed in the Proposal. For each individual benefit, repeat a full block of row for each year of the project lifecycle, including the column headings.
- Identify the benefit and measure (e.g., units) of that benefit in the boxes provided. This must be completed for each benefit claimed.
- Once the table has been appropriately formatted, the applicant should provide the following information for each year of the Proposals life:
  - Column (b): identify the level (units) of the water supply or water quality benefit for the without-Proposal condition.
  - Column (c): identify the level (units) of the water supply or water quality benefit for the with-Proposal condition.
  - Column (d): enter the result of subtracting Column (b) from Column (c) to determine the change in the water supply or water quality resource resulting from the Proposal.
  - Columns (e) through (i): complete these columns only if the applicant has identified a monetary value for the benefit.
  - Column (e): enter the per unit monetary value for the benefit claimed.
  - Column (f): enter the result of multiplying the value in Column (d) by the value in Column (e).
  - Column (g): enter the sum of the individual "Annual $ Values" listed in Column (f) for each benefit claimed. For example, if the Proposal has monetary values for water supply benefits and two different types of water quality benefits, the sum of the three values would be entered into Column (g).
  - Column (h): these are the discount factors provided in Table 3-1.
  - Column (i): enter the result of dividing each value in Column (g) by the discount factor in Column (h).
  - Column (i) Bottom of the Table: enter the total of all Column (i) values in the "Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits" row
  - Comment Box: enter any sources and references, including page numbers, supporting the numbers used in this table.

DRAFT

Table 3-4 - Annual Benefits of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits **(All benefits should be in 2006 dollars)**								
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
YEAR	Benefit: _____ *Replicate columns and headers for full range of year rows for each benefit.*			*Complete these columns if claiming economic benefits based on dollar value.*				
	Measure of Benefit:_____ (Identify units for each water supply or water quality benefit to be measured)			Complete these 2 columns if claiming $ Value for the Benefit		Discounting Calculations for Economic Benefits (If claiming $ Value for the Benefit)		
	Without Proposal	With Proposal	Change Resulting from Proposal (c - b)	Unit $ Value	Annual $ Value (d x e)	Total Benefits (Sum of Annual $ Value for each benefit)	Discount Factor	Discounted Benefits (g ÷ h)
2007							1.06	
2008							1.12	
2009							1.19	
...							…	
...							…	
...							…	
Proposal Life							…	
Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits Based on Unit Value (Sum of the values in Column (i) for all Benefits shown in Table)								
Comment Box								

TABLE 3-5

Table 3-5 should be used if the applicant wishes to present *Benefits from Avoided Costs of Future Projects*. This type of benefit applies to the extent to which the Proposal will cause other water supply or water quality projects to be avoided, delayed, or scaled down. This table should also be used to present the avoided cost of water shortages or the avoided cost of future operations, such as treatment costs. To claim this type of benefit, the applicant should provide documentation that the avoided cost would actually be incurred in the absence of the Proposal. To estimate a benefit from avoided costs of future projects, shortages, or operations complete Table 3-5. While this is a benefit, the estimate will require a cost estimate for the avoided project. Estimates from existing studies, updated to 2006 dollars, can be used to complete Table 3-5. The applicant should show that those cost estimates are reasonably comparable to the standards and procedures described in the cost section of this exhibit.

Below, the project(s) that would be avoided because of the Proposal are called alternative(s). Note that a precise quantification of physical benefits is not required to claim costs of alternative(s) as a benefit; however, the alternative(s) should provide approximately the same types and levels of benefits as the Proposal. An applicant should compare the amount and timing of physical benefits from the Proposal with the alternative to make sure they are comparable. If an alternative provides a physical benefit larger than that of the Proposal, the applicant must make adjustments to the alternative to make it similar to the Proposal. Without an adjustment, only a portion of the cost of the alternative can be claimed as a measure of benefit. If the alternative provides an amount of physical benefit smaller than that of the Proposal, an additional benefit might be claimed (see Table 3-5, 2nd to last row – "% Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal"). If the alternative provides physical benefits at times (e.g. year types or season) different from those of the Proposal, additional adjustments may be needed or the alternative may simply not be a reasonable alternative to the Proposal. If the alternative would delay action until a future time within the

DRAFT

planning horizon, enter the delayed costs when they are avoided as a benefit, and enter them again as a cost at the time they would be paid with the Proposal.

To complete Table 3-5, the applicant must:

- Format a table that will display all alternatives that apply by copying Columns (b) through (e) of Table 3-5 for each individual alternative.
- Describe the alternative in the box provided. This must be completed for each alternative.
- Once the table has been appropriately formatted, the applicant should provide the following information for each year of the alternative life:
  - Column (b): enter capital costs for each year of the alternative life. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure of any cost, not the first year of operation.
  - Column (c): enter replacement costs for each year of the alternative life. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure of any cost, not the first year of operation.
  - Column (d): enter O&M costs for each year of the alternative. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure of any cost, not the first year of operation.
  - Column (e): enter the sum of costs contained in Columns (b), (c), and (d).
  - Column (f): enter the sum of "Total Cost Avoided for Individual Alternatives" for each alternative.
  - Column (g): these are the discount factors provided in Table 3-1.
  - Column (h): enter the result of dividing the value in Column (f) by the number provided in Column (g) for each year (each row).
- Bottom of Column (h): to represent the net present value of all costs discounted at 6% and to take into account the percentage of the alternative claimed, do the following:
  - Enter the sum of all values in Column (h) in the row marked "Total Present Value of Discounted Costs." This represents the net present value of all costs discounted at 6%.
  - In the next row, enter the "% Claimed by Proposal." This is the percentage of the cost of the alternative that the applicant is claiming for the Proposal. If claiming the entire cost, enter 100%.
  - In the final row labeled "Total Present Value of Discounted Costs Claimed by Proposal," enter the result of multiplying the "Total Present Value of Discounted Costs by the % Annual Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal."
- Comment box: enter any sources and references, including page numbers, supporting the numbers used in this table.

DRAFT

Table 3–5 - Annual Costs of Avoided Projects **(All avoided costs should be in 2006 dollars)**							
	Costs				Discounting Calculations		
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
YEAR	Alternative (Avoided Project Name): _____ *Replicate this column block with headers for each avoided alternative*				Total Cost Avoided for All Alternatives (Sum of Total Cost Avoided for Individual Alternatives)	Discount Factor	Discounted Costs (f) ÷ (g)
	Avoided Capital Costs	Avoided Replacement Costs	Avoided Operations and Maintenance Costs	Total Cost Avoided for Individual Alternatives (b) + (c) + (d)			
2007						1.06	
2008						1.12	
2009						1.19	
…						…	
…						…	
…						…	
Proposal Life						…	
Total Present Value of Discounted Costs (Sum of Column (h))							
% Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal							
Total Present Value of Discounted Avoided Project Costs Claimed by Proposal (Total Present Value of Discounted Costs x % Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal)							
Comment Box							

TABLE 3-6

Table 3-6 should be used if the applicant wishes to present *Other Water Supply or Water Quality Benefits*. Other Water Supply or Other Water Quality Benefits are those benefits that do not meet the criteria for Physically Quantifiable Benefits or Benefits from Avoided Costs of Future Projects. Because there is less tabular information for these benefits, it is important to provide sufficient documentation or narrative information to support the benefit estimates. To complete Table 3-6, applicants should use the following steps:

- Column (b) top: identify the type of Other Water Supply or Other Water Quality benefit claimed. If multiple benefits are anticipated, additional blocks of rows may be added (including headers) to Table 3-6 to document each benefit.
- Column (b) middle: describe the benefit in qualitative terms and the basis for associated monetary value of the benefits over the life of the Proposal.
- Column (b) bottom: enter the dollar value of the monetary benefit claimed for each year.
- Column (c): these are the discount factors provided in Table 3-1.
- Column (d): enter the result of dividing each value in Column (b) by the discount factor in Column (c).

DRAFT

- Column (d) Bottom: enter the total of all Column (d) values in the "Total Present Value of Discounted Other Benefits" Row (last row).
- Comment Box: provide citations and qualitative information to support the benefit claimed. Enter any sources or references, including page numbers, supporting the number used in this table.

Table 3-6 - Annual Benefits of Other Water Supply or Other Water Quality Benefits **(In 2006 Dollars)**			
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
YEAR	Type of Benefit Claimed:_____ *Replicate headers and rows for each benefit type* Describe the Benefit Claimed: _____ Annual Benefit ($)	Discount Factor	Discounted Benefits (b ÷ c)
2007		1.06	
2008		1.12	
2009		1.19	
…		…	
…		…	
…		…	
Proposal Life		…	
		Total Present Value of Discounted Other Benefits (Sum of the values in Column (d))	
Comments:			

DRAFT

EXHIBIT 4
OTHER EXPECTED BENEFITS

This exhibit provides methods and formats for estimating and presenting, in Attachment 9, the Other Expected Benefits of the Proposal.

All Proposals that have Other Expected Benefits must describe those benefits in Attachment 9. If the Proposal does not have Other Expected Benefits; then simply state so in Attachment 9. For Proposals with Other Expected Benefits, applicants must describe such benefits. If possible, each such benefit should also be quantified and presented in physical or economic terms. If not possible to quantify the benefits, please include an explanation and justification of why it cannot be done. In addition to Table 4-1 below, the applicant should provide the following items:

- Narrative discussion of the estimates of without-project physical conditions.
- Narrative discussion of the estimates of with-project physical conditions.
- Description of methods used to estimate without- and with-project conditions.
- Description of the distribution of local, regional, and statewide benefits.
- Identification of beneficiaries.
- When the benefits will be received.
- Uncertainty of the benefits.
- Description of any adverse effects.

Applicants should attempt to make descriptions as clean, detailed, and quantitative as possible using existing information or reasonable effort. Computer models can be used to provide quantitative analyses of benefits but such detailed analysis is not required. For presenting analysis clear, concise tables and narrative descriptions are preferred.

The Other Expected Benefits may include, but are not limited to, the following benefit types:

- Ecosystem Restoration – Ecosystem restoration includes habitat restoration, ecosystem improvements and preservation, and fish and wildlife enhancement. If a Habitat Evaluation Procedure has been performed, enter information from that analysis. A Habitat Evaluation Procedure for ecosystem restoration is preferred but not required. For ecosystem restoration analysis, applicants may count benefits from both restoration and preservation of high-quality existing habitat. The ecosystem benefits analysis should take into account both structural and functional elements of the ecosystem being protected or restored. Without- and with-project conditions for ecosystem restoration could include the acreage of habitat, the quality of that habitat, and the special-status species considered in the analysis.
- Flood Control – For flood control benefits, the applicant should document historical flood damage and projected with-project flood risk. If the physical system has changed significantly since the last flood, without-project flood damage should also be estimated. Estimates may be determined though the use of computer software packages with the help of maps and information from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, local flood control agencies, and others.
- Recreation and Public Access – Recreation and public access benefits should be documented on a with- and without-project basis. With- and without-project conditions could include the types and quality of recreational activities, visitor days, and unit day values.
- Power Cost Savings and Production – Power cost savings and power production benefits should be based on market value of power. Document the quantity and the unit value of the power saved or produced. Include

DRAFT

information on when the savings or production would occur (time of year, time of day), change in capacity, or other factors that influence the cost savings or production benefit.

- Other – If the Proposal has benefits not already accounted for, please describe them in detail. Some benefits, such as in-stream flow, may be difficult to categorize. In such cases, the applicant should attempt to place it in the most appropriate category or categories, or describe it as an "Other" benefit.

TABLE 4-1

An Excel spreadsheet version of Table 4-1 can be found at the links listed in the Foreword. Table 4-1 should be used to present *Other Expected Benefits*, whether they are quantifiable in either physical or economic terms. To present only physically quantified benefits, then the applicant should complete Columns (b) through (d) of Table 4-1. If the applicant also wants to claim economic benefits based on unit dollar value, then also complete columns (e) through (i). To complete Table 4-1, the applicant should use the following steps:

- Format a table that will display the various other expected benefits that are claimed in the Proposal. For each individual benefit, repeat a full block of rows, including column headings and the Proposal expected life.
- Identify the benefit and measure (e.g., units) of that benefit in the boxes provided. This must be completed for each benefit claimed.
- Once the table has been appropriately formatted, the applicant should provide the following information for each year of the Proposals life:
  - Column (b): identify the level (units) of the other expected benefit for the without-Proposal condition.
  - Column (c): identify the level (units) of the other expected benefit for the with-Proposal condition.
  - Column (d): enter the result of subtracting Column (b) from Column (c) to determine the change in the resource conditions resulting from the Proposal.
  - Columns (e) through (i): complete these columns only if the applicant has identified a monetary value for the benefit.
  - Column (e): enter the per unit monetary value for the benefit claimed.
  - Column (f): enter the result of multiplying the value in Column (d) by the value in Column (e).
  - Column (g): enter the sum of the individual "Annual $ Values" listed in Column (f) for each benefit claimed.
  - Column (h): these are the discount factors provided in Exhibit 3, Table 3-1.
  - Column (i): enter the result of dividing each value in Column (g) by the discount factor in Column (h).
  - Column (i) Bottom of the Table: enter the total of all Column (i) values in the "Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits" row.
  - Comment Box: enter any sources and references, including page numbers, supporting the numbers used in Table 4-1.

DRAFT

Table 4- 1 – Other Expected Benefits **(All benefits should be in 2006 dollars)**								
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
YEAR	Benefit: _____ *Replicate columns and headers for full range of year rows for each benefit.*			*Complete these columns if claiming economic benefits based on dollar value.*				
	Measure of Benefit:_____ (Identify units for each Other Expected Benefit to be measured)			Complete these 2 columns if claiming $ Value for the Benefit		Discounting Calculations for Economic Benefits (If claiming $ Value for the Benefit)		
	Without Proposal	With Proposal	Change Resulting from Proposal (c - b)	Unit $ Value	Annual $ Value (d x e)	Total Benefits (Sum of Annual $ Value for each benefit)	Discount Factor	Discounted Benefits (g ÷ h)
2007							1.06	
2008							1.12	
2009							1.19	
…							…	
…							…	
…							…	
Proposal Life							…	
Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits Based on Unit Value (Sum of the values in Column (i) for all Benefits shown in Table)								
Comments:								

DRAFT

EXHIBIT 5
CALFED ROD CONSISTENCY

The Bay-Delta Region and CALFED Solution Area are described in the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Final Programmatic EIS/EIR, Chapter 1.3 Program Description, available on the California Bay-Delta Authority website at:

http://calwater.ca.gov/CALFEDDocuments/Final_EIS_EIR.shtml

Complete the following form for each project within the Proposal that assists in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals, is consistent with the CALFED Programmatic ROD, and can be implemented, to the maximum extent possible, through local and regional programs.

FORM 1
CALFED ROD CONSISTENCY

<Insert Project Title> is located in (check appropriate box):

❒ Sacramento–San Joaquin Bay-Delta Region or

❒ The CALFED Solution Area.

<Insert Project Title> will assist in meeting the following CALFED Bay-Delta Program Goals (Objectives) (select one or more goals, as appropriate):

❒ Provide good water quality for all beneficial uses;

❒ Improve and increase aquatic and terrestrial habitats and improve ecological functions in the Bay–Delta to support sustainable populations of diverse and valuable plant and animal species;

❒ Reduce the mismatch between Bay–Delta water supplies and current and projected beneficial uses dependent on the Bay–Delta system; or

❒ Reduce the risk to land use and associated economic activities, water supply, infrastructure, and the ecosystem from catastrophic breaching of Delta levees.

Include with Form 1 the following items:

- A description of how the Proposal assists in meeting one or more of the goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program;
- A description of how the project will be consistent with the CALFED ROD.
- A description of how the project will, to the maximum extent possible, be implemented through local and regional program.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT 6
REQUESTS FOR WAIVER OR REDUCTION OF FUNDING MATCH DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES – IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Exhibit is to provide a method for requesting a waiver or reduction of the funding match for IRWM implementation grants. DWR and the State Water Board will review the information submitted by the applicant and decide, based on the information provided, whether to grant, amend, or deny, the request for the waiver or reduction. Applicants must demonstrate that a 10% funding match will be provided unless a waiver or reduction of the funding match Requirements has been requested.

For assistance on this topic, please contact the DWR point of contact listed in the foreword.

At a minimum, the following information must be included in Attachment 14 of the Step 2 application:

- Describe the methodology used in determining total population of the region and the total population of the disadvantaged communities in the region. The applicant must include what census geographies (i.e., census designated place, census tract, census block) were used, and how they were applied. Also, the applicant must explain how the disadvantaged communities were identified.
- Provide annual MHI data for disadvantaged communities in the region.
- Provide sample calculations showing how the proposed reduced funding match was derived.
- Provide information on amount and type of direct benefit(s) each project within the proposal provides to the disadvantaged community(ies).
- Include descriptions or information on disadvantaged communities' involvement, such as past, current, and future efforts to include disadvantaged community representatives in the future planning and implementation process.
- Letters of support from representatives of disadvantaged communities indicating their support for the portion of the proposal designed to provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged communities and acknowledging their inclusion in the planning and future implementation process.

The following data requirements must be met:

- MHI and population data sets must be from the 2000 Census or more recent;
- MHI data used in analysis must be from the same time period and geography as the population data.

ALLOWANCES

- Applicants may estimate total and disadvantaged community population numbers by whatever means that are accessible to them as long as the above requirements are met.
- In determining MHI and population for disadvantaged communities and the region, applicants may use a single type of census geography or combinations of 2000 Census geographies that best represent the region. However, the census geography used must be consistent for both MHI and population for a particular community. In general use of the geography of "place" is recommended. However, other official census geographies, such as census tract and block group, are also acceptable. The intent of allowing this flexibility is to afford applicants a choice, so that population and income data in the region can be accurately represented.

DEFINITIONS

Block Group – means a census geography used by the USCB that is a subdivision of a census tract. A block group is the smallest geographic unit for which the USCB tabulates sample data. A block group consists of all the blocks within a census tract with the same beginning (block) number.

DRAFT

Census Designated Place – means a census geography used by the USCB that is a statistical entity, defined for each decennial census according to USCB guidelines, comprising a densely settled concentration of population that is not within an incorporated place, but is locally identified by a name. Census designated places are delineated cooperatively by state and local officials and the USCB, following USCB guidelines.

Census Tract – means a census geography used by the USCB that is a small, relatively permanent statistical subdivision of a county delineated by a local committee of census data users for the purpose of presenting data. Census tract boundaries normally follow visible features, but may follow governmental unit boundaries and other non-visible features in some instances; they always nest within counties. Census tracts are designed to be relatively homogeneous units with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions at the time of establishment. Census tracts average about 4,000 inhabitants.

Community – for the purposes of this grant program, a community is a population of persons residing in the same locality under the same local governance.

Disadvantaged Community – a community with an annual MHI that is less than 80% of the statewide MHI (CWC § 79505.5 (a)). For example, using Census 2000 data, 80% of the statewide annual MHI is $37,994 and using USCB data for 2003, 80% of the statewide annual MHI is $38,752.

Place – A census geography used by the USCB that is a concentration of population either legally bounded as an incorporated place, or identified as a Census Designated Place.

Region – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a geographic area.

Step A. Screening based on Maximum Grant Amount:

The implementation grants awarded under this program have a maximum limit of $25,000,000 regardless of disadvantaged community status.

Step B. Documentation of the Presence of Disadvantaged Communities:

Disadvantaged communities must be contained in the region. **If there are no disadvantaged communities in the region, please do not apply for a reduced funding match**. Disadvantaged communities should be identified in the description of the region contained in the IRWM Plan or equivalent document. The applicant can provide references to the IRWM Plan indicating where this information is located or include the information in Attachment 14. Applicants should ensure the description of the disadvantaged communities is adequate to determine whether the communities meet the definitions of this Exhibit. Disadvantaged communities should also be shown on maps of the region. In describing disadvantaged communities, include their relationship to the regional planning objectives. Include information that supports the determination of disadvantaged communities in the region.

Step C. Documentation of Disadvantaged Community Representation and Participation:

The mere presence of disadvantaged communities in the region is not sufficient cause to grant a waiver or reduction of the funding match. Disadvantaged communities must be involved in the planning and implementation process. Supporting information that demonstrates how disadvantaged communities are, or will be, involved in the IRWM planning and implementation process must be included. Information must demonstrate how disadvantaged communities or their representatives are participating in the planning process. As indicated above, include letters of support from disadvantaged community representatives that verify support, inclusion, and participation in the process. **If an applicant cannot demonstrate disadvantaged community representation or participation in the planning process, please do not apply for a reduced funding match.**

Step D. Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Communities:

Applicants should explain anticipated benefits and impacts to disadvantaged communities in their region from the specific project(s) in their proposal. The explanation should include the nature of the anticipated benefit(s), the certainty that benefit(s) will accrue if the project is implemented, and which disadvantaged communities in the region will benefit.

DRAFT

Step E. Calculating a Reduced Funding Match:

The required funding match for implementation grants is 10% of the total proposal cost. Where the project directly benefits a disadvantaged community, a reduction in the required funding match may be allowed. To reduce the required funding match, the applicant must determine the Disadvantaged Community Ratio (DCR), Benefit Factor (BF), and the Reduced Funding Match Factor (RFMF). The details of determining the DCR, BF, and RFMF, and example calculations are provided below.

Determining the DCR for THE Region

Applicants can use any method that is reproducible and logical in determining populations in the region as long as the requirements of this Exhibit are met and the method is consistently applied. To calculate the DCR:

- Determine the total population of the region. The total population in the region = P_R
- Determine the total population of the disadvantaged communities (e.g. MHI greater than zero but less than 80% of the statewide annual MHI) in the region. The disadvantaged community population = P_D
- DCR = P_D/P_R

In determining populations and MHI for disadvantaged communities, applicants must ensure that population and MHI values of zero are appropriate for use in data sets. Text, data, and other information that supports selection of areas as disadvantaged communities must be provided. Include the method used for population determination, the population of the region, the population of disadvantaged communities in the region, MHI data for disadvantaged communities, and the calculation of the reduced funding match.

Determining the BF for the Region

The BF is a function of the percentage of disadvantaged communities within the region receiving direct benefit from the proposal. As described above, applicants must discuss and document direct benefits to disadvantaged communities from specific proposal elements as part of Attachment 14. Select the BF that applies to your region from the following table for use in the RFMF calculation:

Percentage of Disadvantaged Communities in the Region Directly Benefited by the Proposal	Benefit Factor
More than 50%	1
25% - 50%	0.5
More than 0% but less than 25%	0.25

Determining the RFMF for the Region

The RFMF is a function of the DCR and BF and is calculated as follows:

- RFMF = 0.10 – (0.10 × DCR × BF)

Where:

- 0.10 = the minimum funding match for implementation grants;
- DCR = P_D/P_R;
- BF = 1, 0.5, or 0.25 as presented in the table above; and
- Round the RFMF to the nearest 0.01.

The RFMF is then multiplied by the total proposal cost to determine the reduced funding match. The reduced funding match should be used in the budgets presented for the proposal. Example calculations are shown below.

DRAFT

Example: Agency A is requesting a reduced funding match for an implementation grant proposal that has a total cost of $26,000,000.

P_R = 1,000,000
P_D = 750,000
DCR = 750,000/1,000,000 = 0.75
BF = 0.5[1]
RFMF = 0.10 – (0.10 × 0.75 × 0.5)
= 0.10 – (0.0375)
= 0.0625 rounded to 0.06 (or 6%)

Total Project Cost	Grant and Fund Match Using the Minimum Funding Match Requirement (10% of total)		Grant and Funding Match Using a Reduced Funding Match (6% of total)	
	Funding Match	Grant Funds	Funding Match	Grant Funds
$52 Million	0.10 x $26 M = $2.6 M	$26 M – $2.6M = $23.4 M	0.06 x $26M = $1.56M	$26M – $1.56M = $24.44

[1] Assuming 25-50% of the disadvantages communities in the region directly benefit from the proposal.

Accessing And Using 2000 Census Data

Applicants are allowed to use whatever tools they have to access and use 2000 Census data. The procedures and suggestions presented here are meant to assist applicants. The use of these procedures is not mandatory and does not translate into any preference over any other method.

Determining Census Places in the Region

For the purposes of this supplement, a community is assumed to be represented as the census geography of "place." Places include populous incorporated and unincorporated areas. There is a variety of ways to determine what places are included in the region. Applicants can use other census geographies that better represent their region. Access to other census geographies is similar to what is presented here for place.

If an applicant's agency has GIS capability, it can access shapefiles for different census geographies including places at:

http://www.census.gov/geo/www/cob/bdy_files.html

Using GIS tools, the applicant can layer the region and the place shape files (or other geographies) to determine what places exist in the region.

Another way to determine census places or other geographies in the region is to use the mapping feature at the USCB website:

http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

DRAFT

APPENDIX D
DEFINITIONS

Adopted IRWM Plan – means an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan that has been formally accepted, as evidenced by a resolution or other written documentation, by:

- The governing body of the regional agency authorized to develop the Plan and has responsibility for implementation of the Plan; **or**
- The governing bodies of the agencies and organizations that participated in the development of the Plan and have responsibility for implementation of the Plan.

Applicant – means an entity that files an application for funding under the provisions of Proposition 50 with the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Resources Control Board.

Areas of Special Biological Significance – means areas designated by the State Water Resources Control Board as requiring protection of species or biological communities to the extent that alteration of natural water quality is undesirable. All areas of special biological significance are State Water Quality Protection Areas as defined in Public Resources Code § 36700(f). There are 34 designated areas of special biological significance, which are listed in the California Ocean Plan.

Bay-Delta – is as defined in § 79006 of the California Water Code.

CALFED Bay-Delta Program – refers to the collaborative State-federal program to address ecosystem restoration and water management issues in the San Francisco Bay/Sacrament-San Joaquin Delta system. The CALFED Program is being implemented under the guidance of the California Bay-Delta Authority, by a consortium of State and federal agencies with management and regulatory responsibilities in the Bay and Delta, pursuant to the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Record of Decision (August 28, 2000).

California Bay-Delta Authority – refers to the State agency that was established by legislation enacted in 2002 (CWC §79400 et seq.) to oversee implementation of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Disadvantaged Community – means a community with an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income (CWC § 79505.5 (a)).

Environmental Justice – means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies (California Government Code §65040.12(e)).

Granting Agency – means the agency that is funding a proposal, with which a grant recipient has a grant agreement, and will be either Department of Water Resources or State Water Resources Control Board.

Impaired Water Body – means surface waters identified by the Regional Water Board as impaired because water quality objectives are not being achieved or where the designated beneficial uses are not fully protected after application of technology-based controls. A list of impaired water bodies is compiled by the State Water Board pursuant to § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

Management Measures – means economically achievable measures for the control of the addition of pollutants from existing and new categories and classes of non-point sources of pollution, which reflect the greatest degrees of pollutant reduction achievable through the application of the best available non-point pollution control practices, technologies, processes, siting criteria, operating methods, or alternatives.

Non-point Source Pollution – means a diffuse discharge of pollutants throughout the natural environment.

DRAFT

Non-point Source Pollution Plan (NPS Plan) – means a State Water Board-adopted plan developed in collaboration with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards and the California Coastal Commission to meet the requirements of § 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 and § 319 of the Clean Water Act. The Plan addresses California's NPS pollution by assessing the State's NPS pollution problems/causes and implementing management programs.

Northern California – means those counties not listed below as "Southern California".

Proposition 50 – is the "Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002", as set forth in Division 26.5 of the California Water Code (commencing at § 79500).

Region – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a geographic area. The physical area, efficacy, and benefits derived from a regional plan are impacted by many variables (physical, political, environmental, societal, and economic) therefore no physical size or dimension will be prescribed for this term. Rather an IRWM Plan and associated applicant must define its region and explain why the geographic area encompassed is appropriate and yields effective, synergistic, efficient water management planning.

Regional Agency – means public agencies with statutory authority over land-use or water management whose jurisdiction encompasses an area greater than the jurisdictional boundaries of any one local public agency.

Regional Water Management Group – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a group that, at a minimum, includes three or more local public agencies, at least two of which have statutory authority over water management, which may include but is not limited to water supply, water quality, flood control, or storm water management. The Regional Water Management Group members may participate by means of a joint powers agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other written agreement, as appropriate, that is approved by the governing bodies of those public agencies. Other entities, including but not limited to tribal entities or privately owned water utilities regulated by the Public utilities Commission may also be part of a Regional Water Management Group.

Reimbursable Costs – means costs that may be funded under Proposition 50. Reimbursable costs include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement, legal fees, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, and project implementation. Costs that are <u>not reimbursable with</u> grant funding include, but are not limited to:

a. Costs, other than those noted above, incurred prior to effective date of a grant agreement with the State;

b. Operation and maintenance costs, including post construction project performance and monitoring costs;

c. Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project;

d. Establishing a reserve fund;

e. Purchase of water supplies;

f. Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs;

g. Support of existing agency requirements and mandates;

h. Purchase of land in excess of the minimum required acreage necessary to operate as an integral part of the project, as set forth and detailed by engineering and feasibility studies, or land purchased prior to effective date of a grant agreement with the State; and

i. Payment of principal or interest of existing indebtedness or any interest payments unless the debt is incurred after effective date of a grant agreement with the State, the granting agency agrees in writing to the eligibility of the costs for reimbursement before the debt is incurred, and the purposes for which the debt is incurred are otherwise reimbursable project costs.

DRAFT

Scoring Criteria – means the set of requirements used to choose a project for a given program or for funding; the specifications or criteria used for selecting or choosing a project based on available funding.

Selection Panel – means a group of Department of Water Resources and the State Water Board representatives at the supervisory or management level assembled to review and consider proposal evaluations and scores developed by the Technical Reviewers and to make initial funding recommendations.

Southern California – means the Counties of San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, Orange, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

Stakeholder – is an individual, group, coalition, agency or others who are involved in, affected by, or have an interest in the implementation of a specific program or project.

Technical Reviewers – means a group of agency representatives assembled to evaluate the technical competence of a proposed project and the feasibility of the project being successful if implemented.

303(d) List – refers to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act that requires each state to periodically submit to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a list of impaired waters. Impaired waters are those that are not meeting the state's water quality standards. Once the impaired waters are identified and placed on the list, § 303(d) requires that the State establish Total Daily Maximum Loads that will meet water quality standards for each listed water body.

Total Maximum Daily Load – is generally a means for recommending controls needed to meet water quality standards for a particular water body. Establishing a Total Maximum Daily Load is an important step in watershed protection because it sets quantified goals for water quality that may then determine what actions are needed to restore or protect the health of the water body. More specifically, a Total Maximum Daily Load identifies the maximum quantity of a particular pollutant that can be discharged into a water body without violating a water quality standard, and allocates allowable loading amounts among the identified pollutant sources.

Urban Water Supplier – means a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, that provides water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually. (CWC § 10617)

DRAFT

APPENDIX E
USEFUL WEB LINKS

Regional Water Board Program Priorities/Watershed Management Initiative Chapters

Region 1:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/programs/watermanageinit.html
Region 2:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/2004grants.doc
Region 3:	www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/WMI/WMI 2002, Final Document, Revised 1-22-02.pdf
Region 4:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/html/fundings.html
Region 5:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/available_documents/watershed/R5_WMI_chapter.html
Region 6:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/WMI/WMI_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/wmi.html
Region 8:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/html/wmi.html
Region 9:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/wmc.html

Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans)

Region 1:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/programs/basinplan/basin.html
Region 2:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/basinplan.htm
Region 3:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/BasinPlan/Index.htm
Region 4:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/html/meetings/tmdl/Basin_plan/basin_plan.html
Region 5:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/available_documents/index.html#anchor616381
Region 6:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/BPlan/BPlan_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/documents/RB7Plan.pdf
Region 8:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/html/basin_plan.html
Region 9:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/basinplan.html

State Water Board Program Priorities:

303d List:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/docs/2002_cwa_section_303d_list_wqls_020403.pdf
TMDL List:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/docs/tmdllist.doc
NPS Program:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/protecting.html
NPS Plan:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/5yrplan.html
Critical Coastal Areas Program:	http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-nps.html
Watershed Action Plan Outline	http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-plan-outline.pdf
California's Ocean Plan:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/plnspols/oplans.html
USEPA Watershed Plan Elements:	http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/

State Water Board Statewide Data Management Programs

Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/swamp/index.html
Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/

DWR

Home Page:	http://www.water.ca.gov/
floodSAFE California	http://www.floodsafe.water.ca.gov/
California Water Plan	http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov
Division of Planning & Local Assistance:	http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov
Northern District:	http://www.nd.water.ca.gov/index.cfm
Central District:	http://www.cd.water.ca.gov/
San Joaquin District:	http://www.sjd.water.ca.gov/
Southern District:	http://wwwdpla.water.ca.gov/sd
Grants & Loans:	http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/
Water Use and Planning:	http://www.water.ca.gov/nav.cfm?topic=Water_Use_and_Planning
Bulletin 118 California's Groundwater:	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov/bulletin118
Groundwater Information Center:	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov
Floodplain Management Task Force:	http://fpmtaskforce.water.ca.gov/
Desalination Task Force:	http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/desal/desal.cfm
Recycling Task Force:	http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/index.cfm

DRAFT

CEQA Information

Environmental Information: http://ceres.ca.gov/index.html
California State Clearinghouse Handbook: http://www.opr.ca.gov/planning/PDFs/sch_handbook.pdf

CALFED Bay-Delta Program

http://calwater.ca.gov/
http://calwater.ca.gov/Archives/GeneralArchive/RecordOfDecision2000.shtml

California Watershed Portal

http://cwp.casil.ucdavis.edu/index.pl

Department of Industrial Relations

http://www.dir.ca.gov/lcp.asp

DRAFT