



GUIDELINES AND PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE

San Joaquin River Water Quality Grant Program

DRAFT

Funded by Proposition 84

This page is left blank intentionally.

Foreword

This document contains the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package (Guidelines and PSP) for the San Joaquin River Water Quality (SJRWQ) Grant Program. This program is funded by Proposition 84, The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Act).

These Guidelines and PSP apply specifically to Section 75029(a) of the Act for projects that improve water quality in the San Joaquin River and Delta by reducing or eliminating discharges of subsurface agricultural drainage water from the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.

This document details the eligibility requirements, program requirements, available funding, funding-match requirements, application process, review and scoring criteria, and schedule for the SJRWQ Grant Program. The application process for this solicitation is a one-step process. All qualified parties are encouraged to submit a grant proposal.

Due Date

The complete application, attachments, and supporting documents must be submitted both electronically and in hard copy. Electronic submittals will be performed using DWR's Grants Review and Tracking System (GRanTS). Hardcopies should be sent to the California Department of Water Resources, Integrated Regional Water Management, South Central Region Office, 3374 East Shields Avenue, Fresno, California 93726, Attn: Maggie Dutton.

Electronic submittals must be completed and hardcopies must be postmarked or hand delivered by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 15, 2016.

Contacts

The SJRWQ Grant Program is managed through the Agricultural Drainage Program in DWR's South Central Region Office in Fresno, California. For questions regarding this grant program, call (559) 230-3303 or e-mail AgDrainageGrants@water.ca.gov. For questions and assistance regarding GRanTS, please contact the GRanTS Administration Team at (888) 907-4267 or by e-mail at grantsadmin@water.ca.gov. For questions regarding Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs), Assembly Bill (AB) 1420, or Water Meter Implementation compliance, please contact Betsy Vail at (916) 651-9667 or by e-mail at betsy.vail@water.ca.gov.

Website

The SJRWQ Grant Program website is: <http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage/grants/sjrwq>.

Mailing List

In addition to the website, DWR will distribute information and updates via e-mail. If you wish to be placed on the Agricultural Drainage Program contact list, please send an e-mail to AgDrainageGrants@water.ca.gov.

Table of Contents

I. Purpose	1
II. Introduction	1
A. Delta, San Joaquin River, and Sacramento River Water Quality Grant Program Guidelines (2010)	2
B. Usage of Terms	2
C. Competition	2
III. Eligibility	3
A. Eligible Grant Applicants	3
B. Eligibility Criteria	3
C. Eligible Project Types	5
i. Program Preferences	5
ii. Geographic Scope	5
D. Human Right to Water	6
IV. General Program Requirements	6
A. Conflict of Interest	6
B. Confidentiality	6
C. Labor Code Compliance	6
D. Required Permits and CEQA Compliance	6
E. Greenhouse Gas Compliance	7
V. Funding	8
A. Maximum Grant Amount	8
B. Minimum Funding-Match Requirements	8
i. Funding-Match Requirements for DAC Projects	9
ii. Calculating Funding-Match Requirements	9
C. Eligible Costs for Reimbursement	9
VI. Proposal Solicitation	10
A. Draft Guidelines and PSP	10
B. Final Guidelines and PSP	10
C. Applicant Assistance Workshops	10
VII. Application Instructions	10
A. Electronic Submittal – Grants Review and Tracking System	11
B. Hard Copy Submittal	12
C. What to Submit	12
D. Attachment Instructions	18
i. Attachment 1. Authorization and Eligibility Requirements	18
ii. Attachment 2. Work Plan	19
iii. Attachment 3. Budget	19
iv. Attachment 4. Schedule	21
v. Attachment 5. Scientific and Technical Merit	21
vi. Attachment 6. Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures of Physical Benefits	21

vii. Attachment 7. Disadvantaged Community Assistance.....	23
VIII. Review and Scoring Criteria	23
A. Completeness and Eligibility Review	23
B. Review Process	24
C. Scoring Criteria	24
D. Tie-Breaker Points	24
IX. Funding Awards.....	34
X. Agreement Requirements	34
XI. Schedule	35
Exhibit A – Authorization and Eligibility Requirements	36
Exhibit B – Work Plan	40
Exhibit C – Budget	46
Exhibit D – Disadvantaged Community Assistance	49
Exhibit E – Useful Web Links	52
Exhibit F – Audits and Record Keeping Requirements.....	53

Item	List of Tables	Page
Table 1 – Grant Application Checklist		13
Table 2 – Project Budget.....		20
Table 3 – Proposal Summary Budget.....		20
Table 4 – Project Performance Monitoring Table		22
Table 5 – Evaluation Criteria for Grants		26
Table 6 – Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule		35

Acronyms and Abbreviations

§	Code or Regulatory Section
AB	Assembly Bill
ACS	American Community Survey
Act	The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006
AWMP	Agricultural Water Management Plan
BMP	Best Management Practice
CASGEM	California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CLC	California Labor Code
CUWCC	California Urban Water Conservation Council
CWC	California Water Code
DAC	Disadvantaged Community
DWR	Department of Water Resources
EIF	Environmental Information Form
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GRanTS	Grants Review and Tracking System
GWMP	Groundwater Management Plan
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
JPA	Joint Powers Agreement
LSJR	Lower San Joaquin River
MB	Megabyte
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
PRC	Public Resources Code
PSP	Proposal Solicitation Package
SB	Senate Bill
SBx7-7	Senate Bill x7-7, the Steinberg Water Conservation Act of 2009
SJRWQ	San Joaquin River Water Quality
SLR	Sea Level Rise
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
UWMPA	Urban Water Management Planning Act

San Joaquin River Water Quality Grant Program Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of these Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package (Guidelines and PSP) is to establish the process, procedures, and criteria that the Department of Water Resources (DWR) will use to implement the San Joaquin River Water Quality (SJRWQ) Grant Program. This document contains specific information on the eligibility requirements; program requirements; available funding; funding-match requirements; how to apply; solicitation, submittal, review, and scoring of grant applications; funding awards; and schedule.

II. INTRODUCTION

The SJRWQ Grant Program provides funding for implementation projects that will improve water quality in the San Joaquin River and the Delta. The program targets subsurface agricultural drainage water from the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, an area of primary concern for protecting the water quality of the San Joaquin River.

The presence and impacts of subsurface agricultural drainage on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley have been well documented and studied. *Subsurface* drainage water is defined as surplus water removed from the soil by natural or artificial means, such as by drains placed below the surface to lower the water table below the root zone.¹ Furthermore, subsurface *agricultural* drainage water is subsurface drainage that is created primarily as a result of agricultural practices.

The issues associated with subsurface agricultural drainage in the San Joaquin Valley are not new to the region and have been persistent in parts of the valley for more than a century.² The presence and mismanagement of subsurface agricultural drainage can negatively impact agriculture, the environment, drinking water quality, and public health. Subsurface agricultural drainage can negatively impact crop productivity by impeding crop root zones; raise environmental and biological concerns because of contamination from high concentrations of metals and of naturally-occurring elements; result in fallowing of land due to over-salinization; and degrade surface water sources such as the San Joaquin River. Because the San Joaquin River is the natural drainage pathway for the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, it is imperative that production of subsurface agricultural drainage be reduced or eliminated to help protect that water supply and the Delta.

The funding disbursed through the SJRWQ Grant Program is intended to support projects that will result in direct, measureable water quality improvements to the San Joaquin River by reducing or eliminating discharges of subsurface agricultural drainage. Previous studies suggest that source control, drainage reuse, evaporation and disposal systems, land retirement, groundwater management, and institutional changes are all used in the management of subsurface drainage and drainage-related problems on the

¹ Source: U.S. Department of the Interior & California Resources Agency. (1990). *A Management Plan for Agricultural Subsurface Drainage and Related Problems on the Westside San Joaquin Valley*.

² Ibid.

west side of the San Joaquin Valley.³ A total of \$36.6 million is available for eligible projects to accomplish SJRWQ Grant Program goals (see Section V for information on available funding).

A. Delta, San Joaquin River, and Sacramento River Water Quality Grant Program Guidelines (2010)

The SJRWQ Grant Program is one of four grant programs prescribed by legislation that must implement Delta water quality improvement projects that protect drinking water supplies. Previous Guidelines—“Delta, San Joaquin River, and Sacramento River Water Quality Grant Program Guidelines” (2010 Guidelines, adopted in July 2010)—were prepared to provide guidance for all four grant programs listed in Public Resources Code (PRC) §75029. However, the information provided in these Guidelines and PSP will supersede the 2010 Guidelines for the SJRWQ Grant Program. Therefore, these Guidelines and PSP stand alone and no previous documents should be referenced for information concerning the SJRWQ Grant Program.

B. Usage of Terms

To help with understanding and clarity, DWR will use the following terms consistently in these Guidelines and PSP:

- ↪ “Applicant” means the entity that is formally submitting a grant application. This is the same entity that would enter into an agreement with the State should the grant application be funded (becoming the grantee).
- ↪ “Application” refers to the electronic or hard copy submission to DWR that requests grant funding for a proposal that the applicant intends to implement.
- ↪ “Project Proponent” refers to an entity that can receive grant funds through their relationship or partnership with the grant applicant, serving as a sub-consultant on the proposed project.
- ↪ “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. A project may also refer to a study or design.
- ↪ “Funding Source” refers to the bond measure providing funding.

C. Competition

Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis using the specific criteria contained in these Guidelines and PSP. For this grant solicitation, DWR will make funding decisions based on overall application scores and need. In order to ensure wise investments of State general obligation bond funds and that quality proposals are awarded funding, minimum scores for various criteria may be implemented. At DWR’s discretion, if minimum scores are applied, proposals that do not meet minimum scoring standards may receive less than their requested funding amounts or may not be funded.

³ Ibid.

III. ELIGIBILITY

A. Eligible Grant Applicants

Eligible grant applicants are local agencies that satisfy all requirements of these Guidelines and PSP, including, but not limited to, minimum funding-match requirements. Local agency refers to any city, county, city and county, special district, joint powers authority, or other political subdivision of the State, a public utility as defined in Public Utilities Code §216, or a mutual water company as defined in Public Utilities Code §2725. (California Water Code [CWC] §10535.) Federally recognized tribes can be members of a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), per Government Code §6500 *et seq.*

At DWR's discretion, other entities including, but not limited to, State and federal agencies, universities, non-profit organizations, tribes, partner entities, or stakeholders, as defined in CWC §10541(g), may be project proponents. Project proponents may collaborate with a local agency and perform work with the grant funds as long as the local agency is designated as the responsible entity and controls all activities related to the grant. The grant applicant is the local agency that would enter into an agreement with the State if the application is successful.

B. Eligibility Criteria

Applications for the SJRWQ Grant Program must meet all relevant criteria (listed below) in order to be considered for funding. If an eligibility criterion applies to a grant applicant, the applicant is required to submit any certifications or documentation required to prove eligibility. Additional information on required self-certification for the eligibility criteria is provided in Exhibit A.

- ↪ **Urban Water Suppliers: Urban Water Management Planning Act (UWMPA) Compliance.** Water suppliers who were required by the UWMPA (CWC §10610 *et seq.*) to submit an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) to DWR must have submitted a complete UWMP to be eligible for State funding. Applicants and project proponents that are urban water suppliers must have a 2010 UWMP that has been verified as complete by DWR before a grant agreement will be executed. *If applicable, the applicant must self-certify (with a narrative or description) that they are in compliance with UWMPA requirements. Note: The 2015 UWMPs are due to be submitted to DWR by July 1, 2016.*
- ↪ **Urban Water Suppliers: Assembly Bill (AB) 1420 and Best Management Practice (BMP) Compliance.** AB 1420 (Stats. 2007, Ch. 628) establishes that an urban water supplier may receive a water management grant or loan only if the urban water supplier implements the water demand management measures described in CWC §10631. DWR has determined that implementation of the California Urban Water Conservation Council's (CUWCC's) BMPs will fulfill the requirements of AB 1420. An urban water supplier may be eligible for a water management grant or loan if the urban water supplier demonstrates that BMPs have been implemented or scheduled, or are in the process of being implemented or scheduled. Urban water suppliers applying to use grant funds for implementation of BMPs must ensure that they have submitted all necessary information. Therefore, urban water suppliers who are applicants or project proponents in a grant application must supply additional information via a self-certification form. A link to the self-certification form is provided in Exhibit A. *If applicable, the applicant must self-certify (with a signed and submitted self-certification form) that they are in compliance with BMP requirements.*
- ↪ **Urban Water Suppliers: Water Meter Compliance.** CWC §529.5 requires that any urban water supplier applying for State grant funds for wastewater treatment projects, water use efficiency

projects, drinking water treatment projects, or for a permit for a new or expanded water supply shall demonstrate that they meet the water meter requirements in CWC §525 *et seq.* Water meter requirements apply to State Water Project contractors, Central Valley Project contractors, local, community, and private water suppliers. Grant applicants must complete a self-certification form to certify that water meter compliance requirements are met. A link to the self-certification form is provided in Exhibit A. *If applicable, the applicant must self-certify (with a signed and submitted self-certification form) that they are in compliance with water meter requirements.*

↪ **Agricultural Water Suppliers: Agricultural Water Management Plan (AWMP) Compliance.** Beginning July 1, 2013, an agricultural water supplier is not eligible for a water grant or loan that is awarded or administered by the State unless the supplier complies with Senate Bill (SB) x7-7 water conservation requirements (CWC §10608 *et seq.*). SBx7-7 requires that on or before December 31, 2012, an agricultural water supplier must prepare and adopt an AWMP. Applicants and project proponents that are agricultural water suppliers must prepare and adopt an AWMP and comply with submission requirements. Specific requirements for AWMP are described in CWC §10800 *et seq.* See Exhibit A for additional description of this eligibility requirement and web links to the compliance requirements of the SBx7-7. *If applicable, the applicant must self-certify (with a narrative or description) that they are in compliance with AWMP requirements.*

↪ **Surface Water Diverters: Surface Water Diversion Reporting Compliance.** Beginning January 1, 2012, a diverter of surface water is not eligible for a water grant or loan that is awarded or administered by the State unless it complies with the surface water diversion reporting requirements outlined in CWC §5100. Applicants and project proponents that are surface water diverters must submit surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), which is the responsible entity for tracking the diversion reporting requirement. *If applicable, the applicant must self-certify (with a narrative or description) that they are in compliance with surface water diversion reporting requirements.*

↪ **Groundwater Users or Projects: California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM).** CWC §10920 *et seq.* establishes a groundwater elevation monitoring program designed to monitor and report groundwater elevations in California's groundwater basins. CASGEM requirements also limit the ability of counties and entities (CWC §10927 subd. [a]-[d], inclusive) to receive State grants or loans in the event that DWR is required to perform groundwater elevation monitoring functions pursuant to CWC §10933.5. Applicants and project proponents that are groundwater users must meet the reporting requirements of DWR's CASGEM program. See Exhibit A for additional description of this eligibility requirement and web links to information on the requirements of the CASGEM Program. *If applicable, the applicant must self-certify (with a narrative or description) that they are in compliance with CASGEM requirements.*

↪ **Groundwater Users or Projects: Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) Compliance.** For groundwater projects or other projects that directly affect groundwater levels or quality, the applicant or the project proponent responsible for these projects must self-certify that they have prepared and implemented a GWMP in compliance with CWC §10753.7; they have participated or consented to be subject to a GWMP, basin-wide management plan, or other Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) program or plan that meets the requirements of CWC §10753.7(a); the proposal includes development of a GWMP that meets the requirements of CWC §10753.7 and will be completed within one year of the grant application submittal date; or they conform to the requirements of an adjudication of water rights in the subject groundwater

basin. *If applicable, the applicant must self-certify (with a signed and submitted self-certification form) that they are in compliance with water meter requirements.*

C. Eligible Project Types

Eligible projects include those that reduce or eliminate discharges of subsurface agricultural drain water from the west side of the San Joaquin Valley for the purpose of improving water quality in the San Joaquin River and the Delta.⁴ PRC §75029(a) specifies that the reduction or elimination of subsurface agricultural drainage to the San Joaquin River should result in the reduction or elimination of salt, dissolved organic carbon, pesticides, pathogens, and other pollutants. Eligible proposals must include projects that will provide a public benefit (PRC §75004) and that will satisfy all other requirements of these Guidelines and PSP.

Examples of eligible projects include, but are not limited to, those that use drainage collection systems and water treatment technologies to reduce or eliminate drainage to the San Joaquin River from west side irrigators. Projects involving reuse of collected subsurface drainage water, water treatment projects targeting salinity and other constituent reduction, and implementation of BMPs may also be evaluated. Other types of eligible projects that meet the objectives of the prior paragraph will also be considered.

i. Program Preferences

Preference will be given to specific project types. These program preferences are reflected in the evaluation criteria (see Section VIII) and will be considered during the proposal review and scoring process. Preference will be given to projects that:

- ↻ Protect water quality and the environment.
- ↻ Improve water supply reliability.
- ↻ Integrate multiple water quality strategies/benefits (e.g. agricultural water use, land use, watershed management, ecosystem restoration, and salt management).
- ↻ Improve water quality or water supply reliability for disadvantaged communities (DACs).
- ↻ Include regional projects or programs that are identified in an IRWM Plan that accomplish the regional goals defined by CWC §10537.⁵

ii. Geographic Scope

Funds will be available for eligible projects in the San Joaquin Valley that improve water quality of the San Joaquin River by reducing or eliminating discharge of subsurface agricultural drainage water. Geographically, projects must be located in the portion of the Lower San Joaquin River (LSJR) watershed that drains, either naturally or mechanically, into the San Joaquin River between Salt Slough (southern, upstream boundary) and Mossdale Bridge (northern, downstream boundary).⁶

⁴ Public Resources Code §75029, subdivision (a).

⁵ Pursuant to CWC §10544.

⁶ The staff report for the 2004 amendments to the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin Plan defines the subareas that drain into the LSJR downstream of Salt Slough. Eligible project subareas within the LSJR watershed include the Grassland drainage area, East Valley Floor drainage area, Northwest side of the San Joaquin Valley drainage area, and the drainage areas associated with the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers. Source: July 2004 Draft Final Staff Report for the Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for the Control of Salt and Boron Discharges into the Lower San Joaquin River.

D. Human Right to Water

The Human Right to Water Policy (CWC §106.3) states that every human being has the right to clean, affordable, and accessible water for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. In consideration of this policy, DWR is including projects that improve the water quality or water supply reliability of DACs as a program preference. Proposals that support the Human Right to Water Policy with water quality improvement and water supply reliability projects for DACs will receive additional points.

In additional consideration of this policy, DWR will reduce the funding-match requirement for projects that address the water quality improvement and water supply reliability needs of DACs. Applicants with proposals that include a project that specifically addresses a DAC need must submit Attachment 7 (described in Section VII.D.vii and Exhibit D) with their application. Applicants should reference Exhibit D for additional information about documentation of DAC projects.

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 statutes 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, any privacy rights, as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the proposal application package, will be waived.

C. Labor Code Compliance

PRC §75075 requires the body awarding a contract for a public works project that is financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 84 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program pursuant to California Labor Code (CLC) §1771.5(b). Compliance with applicable laws, including CLC provisions, will become an obligation of the grant recipient and sub-recipients (i.e., individual project proponents that will receive grant funds) under the terms of the grant agreement between the grant recipient and the granting agency. CLC §1771.8 states 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. Tribal governments and federal agencies may have other labor compliance requirements or obligations; tribes and federal agencies are encouraged to consult their legal counsel and the California Department of Industrial Relations to determine their specific labor compliance obligations. Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding CLC compliance. Refer to the California Department of Industrial Relations website listed in Exhibit E for more information.

D. Required Permits and CEQA Compliance

Project proponents funded by Proposition 84 are required to obtain all necessary permits, licenses, and approvals and are required to comply with all applicable environmental requirements. Once notified

whether an application has been approved, DWR will require that all successful applicants submit an Environmental Information Form (EIF), which requires the applicant to identify the status of the project's required permits. Grantees must consider all potential environmental, social, and economic impacts of the proposed project, including mitigation required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, PRC §21000 *et seq.*) and, if applicable, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The applicant should also consider compliance with all local, county, State, and federal permitting requirements.

Under CEQA, the lead agency (the grantee or the project proponent implementing the project) has principal responsibility for preparing environmental and permitting documents as well as submitting and circulating the documentation prior to dispersal of grant funds by DWR. As a funding agency, DWR serves as a CEQA responsible agency, which has discretionary approval over project funding and independently reviews and approves all CEQA documents. DWR relies on the analysis completed by the lead agency as the basis for making its findings but also conducts its own independent analysis as a responsible agency. DWR performs this independent analysis to ensure the adequacy of the CEQA documents before it can approve project funding; therefore, early coordination between the lead agency and DWR during the preparation of the CEQA documents will help expedite DWR's review and approval process.

The lead agency must notify DWR if it believes that the actions described in the proposal would not be considered a project under CEQA⁷ or that the project might qualify for a CEQA exemption. If CEQA or other environmental permitting documentation cannot or will not be completed until after a grant agreement has been executed, the grant agreement will include language that provides an opportunity for DWR to review the project after CEQA compliance is completed and to decide whether to continue to fund the project. Projects that do not comply with CEQA requirements will not be funded.

Work that is subject to CEQA and environmental permitting shall not proceed until the grantee submits copies of all necessary environmental permits (including CEQA and/or NEPA, if applicable) as indicated on the EIF to DWR; DWR completes its independent CEQA and overall environmental review as a responsible agency; the grantee receives DWR's written concurrence of the lead agency's CEQA certification; and DWR verifies that the permit record is complete. For general information about environmental compliance, refer to the websites provided in Exhibit E.

Applicants seeking Proposition 84 funding should note that PRC §75102 requires lead agencies to notify tribal entities prior to adoption of Negative Declarations or Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) if traditional tribal lands are within the area of the proposed project.

E. Greenhouse Gas Compliance

In 2005, California Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-3-05 committed the State to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. One year later, the Governor signed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), which legally obligates the State to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

⁷ California Code of Regulations §15378 defines a project under CEQA.

Analysis of GHG emissions was made a requirement in the CEQA Guidelines in December 2009 and became effective on March 18, 2010.

To comply with current CEQA Guidelines regarding GHG analysis, a lead agency's final CEQA document must include an analysis of GHG emissions and a determination of significance of the environmental impact. As a responsible agency, DWR must evaluate potential GHG emissions for the proposed project before exercising its discretion to give final approval for a grant. There is a helpful guidance document available to assist grantees with GHG analysis requirements called *Informal Guidance for DWR Grantees: GHG Assessment for CEQA Purposes* (link to guidance document provided in Exhibit E). The guidance document provides an overview of DWR's role as a responsible agency in reviewing of CEQA documents related to grant-funded projects; a lay-out of the process DWR has established internally for analyzing GHG emissions and assessing significance; and an overview of how DWR approaches GHG emissions analysis in CEQA documents related to its grant-funded projects.

See Exhibit E for web links to additional CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook.

V. FUNDING

In 2006, the voters of California approved Proposition 84, the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act (Act; PRC §75001 *et seq.*) which identifies \$130 million for grant projects to implement Delta water quality improvement projects that protect drinking water supplies. Subsection PRC §75029(a) specifies that not less than \$40 million of those funds shall be available for projects that reduce or eliminate discharges of subsurface agricultural drain water from the west side of the San Joaquin Valley for the purpose of improving water quality in the San Joaquin River and the Delta.

On June 20, 2014, the Governor signed SB 852 that appropriates \$36.6 million from bond revenues authorized by Proposition 84 to DWR for local assistance for projects specified in PRC §75029(a). This grant funding will be provided to eligible grant recipients to develop and implement projects that meet the requirements of these Guidelines and PSP.

A. Maximum Grant Amount

There is no maximum grant amount per proposal specified for this solicitation. Only one proposal per applicant will be accepted. Proposals may include multiple projects that meet the eligibility requirements of these Guidelines and PSP. However, the proposal review committee (described in Section VIII Review and Scoring Criteria) may recommend reducing award amounts from that requested by the applicant in order to equitably distribute funding and stay within available funding limitations.

B. Minimum Funding-Match Requirements

Local agencies are required to provide a cost share to fund their proposed project (PRC §75029). *Cost share* is the portion of the total project costs that are not funded by this grant. Cost share is comprised of *funding match* (from non-State-funded sources i.e. private, federal, local, etc.) and additional cost share that helps make up the remaining cost of the project (can be State-funded i.e. another State grant or loan).

The minimum required funding match for the SJRWQ Grant Program is 25 percent of the total proposal cost.

Funding match may include, but is not limited to, federal funds, local funding, or donated (in-kind) services from non-State sources. Donated services used for funding match must be directly related to the scope of work presented in the grant proposal. Funding-match expenses must meet reimbursable cost requirements, and project costs must be incurred after June 20, 2014, to be considered as funding match.

i. Funding-Match Requirements for DAC Projects

Proposals that include one or more projects that meet the needs of a DAC may request a reduction of the required minimum funding match to 1 percent for the applicable project(s) (see Section VII.D.vii for DAC Assistance Attachment Instructions and Exhibit D for information regarding determining DAC status and application requirements).

ii. Calculating Funding-Match Requirements

The 25-percent minimum funding-match requirement will be calculated based on the total proposal cost, minus any total project costs for qualified DAC projects. For proposals containing multiple projects, the funding match is still based on the total cost of the proposal. For example, if the total proposal cost is \$10 million and the proposal includes a DAC project cost of \$1 million, then the new total proposal cost for calculating the minimum 25-percent funding match would be \$9 million. To calculate the minimum required funding match for the DAC project, the applicant would calculate 1 percent of the total DAC proposal cost of \$1 million.

C. Eligible Costs for Reimbursement

For this solicitation, only costs incurred after the execution of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Reimbursable costs may include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement, legal fees, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, and project implementation including administrative costs and incidental costs. The only costs that are considered reimbursable occurring prior to the execution of the grant agreement are reasonable costs directly associated with grant application preparation, which may include the costs of conducting income surveys for the purpose of establishing disadvantaged community status.

Costs that are not reimbursable with grant funding include, but are not limited to:

- ↪ Costs for preparing and filing a grant application belonging to another solicitation.
- ↪ Operation and maintenance costs, including post-construction project performance and monitoring costs.
- ↪ Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project.
- ↪ Establishing a reserve fund.
- ↪ Purchase of water supplies.
- ↪ Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs.
- ↪ Support of existing punitive regulatory agency requirements or mandates in response to negligent behavior.
- ↪ 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.
- ↪ Payment of principal or interest of existing debt unless the debt is incurred after effective date of a grant agreement with the State, the State 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 eligible costs.

- ↪ Overhead not directly related to project costs.
- ↪ Meals, food items, or refreshments.
- ↪ Costs associated with travel, mileage, lodging, or per diem.

Advance funds will not be provided.

VI. PROPOSAL SOLICITATION

This section provides information regarding the proposal solicitation process for the SJRWQ Grant Program. DWR has developed a new Guidelines and PSP for this funding cycle for this grant program and shall develop a new PSP for each funding cycle for each grant type (PRC §75100[a]). Applicants must submit a new application for each funding cycle; DWR will not consider applications previously submitted for different solicitations when making its funding decisions.

A. Draft Guidelines and PSP

Prior to issuance of the Final Guidelines and PSP, the Draft Guidelines and PSP will be issued for public review and comment. The Draft Guidelines and PSP will be posted on the program website listed in the Foreword and will be available for public review and comment for at least 45 days. During the public review period, DWR will conduct at least two public meetings to solicit comments on the Draft Guidelines and PSP for interested parties. Following consideration of public comments and approval from DWR management, DWR staff will issue the Final Guidelines and PSP.

If you are not already on the Agricultural Drainage Program mailing list and wish to be included, please send your contact information to AqDrainageGrants@water.ca.gov. Contacts on the mailing list will receive updates when new information is posted on the website for the grant program.

B. Final Guidelines and PSP

DWR will solicit grant proposals with the release of the Final Guidelines and PSP, which will be available on the DWR website listed in the Foreword. Once the Final Guidelines and PSP are released, a notification will be posted on the program website and e-mailed to contacts on the Agricultural Drainage Program mailing list.

C. Applicant Assistance Workshops

Once the Final Guidelines and PSP is released, DWR staff will conduct at least one informational workshop for interested parties to address applicant questions and to provide general assistance to applicants in preparing grant applications. The date and location of the workshop(s) will be posted on the program website and sent out via e-mail to the program mailing list. In addition to the informational workshops, applicants are encouraged to seek assistance from DWR's grant program staff (contact information in the Foreword) in understanding the grant requirements and completing grant applications.

VII. APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

Applicants must submit a complete application, both electronically and in hardcopy. Both formats of the complete application must be received by DWR no later than 5:00 p.m. on the date specified in the schedule (Section XI).

For both the electronic and hardcopy submittals, all forms, attachments, and supporting documentation described in this PSP must be submitted together at one time. **Applications and supporting documentation received after the due date will not be reviewed or accepted and will be returned to the applicant.** Successful applicants will be determined based on the review and scoring criteria described in Section VIII.

A. Electronic Submittal – Grants Review and Tracking System

Applicants must submit a complete application online using DWR's Grants Review and Tracking System (GRanTS). GRanTS can only be accessed with Internet Explorer or Google Chrome. The online GRanTS application can be accessed at the link provided in Exhibit E. Applicants are encouraged to review the GRanTS Public User Guide, Quick Start Guide, and Frequently Asked Questions prior to completing the online application. Applicants must create an account and register their organization in GRanTS before filling in the application. Information on the account setup and registration process is described in the GRanTS User Manual.

The grant application in GRanTS consists of four sections or “tabs,” which are outlined and described in Table 1. In GRanTS, various pull-down menus, text boxes, or multiple-choice selections will be used to input answers to the application questions. GRanTS will allow applicants to type text, or cut and paste information, from other documents directly into a GRanTS submittal screen.

Along with the required entries in the four “tabs” in GRanTS, the applicant will be required to submit additional attachments that contain specific information. When uploading an attachment in GRanTS, the following naming convention must be used:

Att#_SJR_AttachmentName_#ofTotal#

Where:

- ↪ “Att#” is the Attachment #.
- ↪ “SJR” is the code for this solicitation.
- ↪ “AttachmentName” is the name of the attachment as specified in Section VII.D.
- ↪ “#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 Attachment 5 – Scientific and Technical Merit for the applicant is made up of two files, the second file in the section would be named “Att5_SJR_Merit_2of2”.

File size for each attachment submitted via GRanTS is limited to 50 megabytes (MB). Breaking documents into components such as chapters or logical components so that files are less than 50 MB will aid in uploading files. Files formatted using MS Word, MS Excel, MS Project, or Adobe Acrobat are acceptable. PDF files should be generated, if possible, from the original application file rather than a scanned hard copy.

Applications may include attachments with supplemental documentation to support the claims made in the application. Applicants must submit supporting documentation in an electronic and hard copy format.

If an applicant has questions about the content or the information requested in the PSP, or questions or problems with GRanTS, please refer to the phone number or e-mail listed in the Foreword.

B. Hard Copy Submittal

Applicants must submit one hard copy (preferably double-sided) of a complete application by the application deadline listed in the schedule (Section XI). The original hard copy should include wet signatures on attachments requiring signatures. Failure to submit any required attachment will make the application incomplete, and it will not be reviewed or considered for funding. Submit all information by courier, U.S. Postal Service, or hand delivery to:

California Department of Water Resources
South Central Region Office
3374 East Shields Avenue, Room 3
Fresno, California 93726
Attn: Maggie Dutton

C. What to Submit

A complete application consists of all of the following items:

- ↪ Electronic submittal of an entire application through GRanTS.
- ↪ One hard copy (preferably double-sided) of the GRanTS questionnaire and applicable attachments.

Table 1 provides the Grant Application Checklist, which describes the content and organization of the grant application, and is provided as a guide for the applicants to ensure that they submit the required information for a complete application. The content in Table 1 is parallel to the application that the applicant will complete in GRanTS.

Attachments to the grant application are listed at the end of Table 1, and a discussion of each of these attachments is provided following Table 1. **Failure to submit any required attachment will make the proposal incomplete, and it will not be reviewed or considered for funding.**

Table 1 – Grant Application Checklist

APPLICANT INFORMATION TAB		
<i>The following information applies to the applicant and the overall proposal. Project-specific information should be detailed in the separate "Projects Tab" provided in the GRanTS application.</i>		
APPLICANT INFORMATION		
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<u>Organization Name</u> : Provide the name of the agency/organization responsible for submitting the application. Should the proposal be successful, this agency/organization will be the grantee.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<u>Tax ID</u> : Tax ID is automatically displayed for registered organizations. Verify the applicant's federal tax ID number.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<u>Point of Contact</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select "Existing Register Users" to select the registered user associated with the organization specified above. The rest of the contact information (Division, Address, E-mail, etc.) are automatically populated once the above registered user is selected. • Select "Add New User" to add an unregistered user. Please select Division (address will be automatically populated) and type the First Name, Last Name, E-mail, and Phone (Direct) of the new user. Please note that the e-mail address will be the new user's login name.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<u>Point of Contact Position Title</u> : Position title.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<u>Proposal Name</u> : Provide the title of the proposal (<i>maximum character limit: 150</i>)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<u>Proposal Abstract</u> : Provide an abstract of the proposal. Briefly describe the proposed work to be completed and how the proposal helps achieve the program objectives. (<i>maximum character limit: 2000</i>)
PROPOSAL BUDGET		
<i>For the proposal, the following budget items should be taken from Attachment 3 where applicable.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<u>Amount Requested</u> : Provide the amount of total grant funds requested.
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<u>Total Funding Match</u> : Provide the total funding match that will be committed to funding the proposal. Funding match may include, but is not limited to, local funding, donated (in-kind) services that are funded by non-State sources, or federal funds. This program requires a minimum local contribution of 25 percent of total proposal cost unless the proposed project(s) addresses a qualifying DAC need. Projects benefiting a DAC have a reduced funding-match requirement of 1 percent.
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<u>Local Contribution (Funding Match)</u> : Provide the local funding match that will be committed to funding the proposal.
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<u>In-kind Contribution (Funding Match)</u> : Provide the total dollar amount of in-kind services. In-kind contribution refers to services or work performed by the grantee for work that is directly related to the scope of work presented in the grant proposal. In-kind services can include costs incurred by a State agency that are directly related to the scope of work, as long as the expenses are not otherwise funded by a State grant or loan. If there is no in kind contribution, then enter zeroes in this field.
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	<u>Federal Contribution (Funding Match)</u> : Enter federal funds being used. If none, enter zero.
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	<u>Additional Cost Share</u> : Provide the amount of additional funds not included in the following funding categories, such as from State-funded grants or loans. If there is no additional contribution, enter zero.
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	<u>Total Proposal Cost</u> : Provide the total proposal cost, in dollars. This amount must agree with the total proposal cost shown in Attachment 3. Total proposal cost is automatically calculated based on the contribution amounts entered above.

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

GRanTS requests latitude and longitude in degrees, minutes, and seconds. You may use converters on the web such as <http://transition.fcc.gov/mb/audio/bicke/DDMMSS-decimal.html>. A mapping tool is available at <http://www.water.ca.gov/grants/map.cfm>.

<input type="checkbox"/>	14	<u>Latitude</u> : Enter the Latitude of the location that best represents the center of the projects contained in the proposal.
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	<u>Longitude</u> : Enter the Longitude of the location that best represents the center of the projects contained in the proposal.
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	<u>Longitude/Latitude Clarification</u> : Only use if necessary. <i>(maximum character limit: 250)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	<u>Location</u> : Describe the approximate location that best represents the center of the project. <i>(maximum character limit: 100)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	<u>County(ies)</u> : Provide the county in which the project is located. If the project covers multiple counties, hold the control key down and select all that apply.
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	<u>Groundwater Basins</u> : Provide the groundwater basin(s) as listed in the current version of DWR Bulletin 118 (http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118.cfm) in which your project(s) is located. For proposals covering multiple groundwater basins, hold the control key down and select all that apply.
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	<u>Hydrologic Regions</u> : Provide the hydrologic region in which your project(s) is located as listed in Bulletin 160 (http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/previous/b160-98/TOC.cfm ; see Executive Summary Chapter 1 for hydraulic region map and descriptions). For proposals covering multiple hydrologic regions, hold down the control key and select all that apply.
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	<u>Watershed(s)</u> : Provide the name of the watershed the region covers. A map of California watersheds can be found at the following link: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wp/Documents/CALFED_Watershed_Map[1].pdf . If your proposal covers multiple watersheds, you may only provide one "Unique Watershed Number" as listed on the watershed map.

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Enter the State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. Congressional Districts in which the project(s) is located (use district numbers only, not the name of the Legislator). For projects that include more than one district, hold the control key down and select all that apply.
--------------------------	----	---

PROJECTS TAB

This section contains information about the projects contained in the proposal. Each project in the proposal should be detailed on a separate project tab. Applicants may generate as many project tabs as necessary. The following questions will be used to gather information on each specific project.

PROJECT INFORMATION

<input type="checkbox"/>	23	<u>Project Name</u> : Provide the project name. <i>(maximum character limit: 125 characters)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	<u>Implementing Organization</u> : Select the name of the implementing organization from the dropdown menu.
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	<u>Secondary Implementing Organization</u> : Enter the name of the secondary implementing organization, if applicable. <i>(maximum character limit: 125 characters)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	<u>Proposed Start Date</u> : Enter the project start date.
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	<u>Proposed End Date</u> : Enter the project end date.
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	<u>Scope Of Work</u> : Enter a brief description of the scope of work. <i>(maximum character limit: 500 characters)</i>

<input type="checkbox"/>	29	<u>DAC Funding-Match Reduction Request.</u> Does the project benefit a DAC? If yes, fill out and submit Attachment 7 with the grant application.
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	<u>Project Description:</u> Provide a brief description of the project. (Maximum Character Limit: 2000 characters)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	<u>Project Objective:</u> Provide a brief description of the project objective(s). (Maximum Character Limit: 500 characters)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	<u>Eligibility:</u> Describe how this project will improve water quality in the San Joaquin River by reducing or eliminating discharges of subsurface agricultural drainage. (Maximum Character Limit: 500 characters)
PROJECT BUDGET		
<i>For each project, the following budget items should be based on the information in Attachment 3 where applicable.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	<u>Project Budget:</u> Enter individual budget items for each project in the same manner as described for the “Applicant Information Tab.” The sum of the budget items must agree with the total project budget. If only one project is being proposed, use the “Copy Budget Data from Applicant Info” feature to automatically populate previously entered data.
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	<u>Scalability:</u> Depending on the number of applicants, range of proposal scores, amount of submitted proposal costs, and competitiveness of proposals, some grants may be awarded to applicants for less than the amount requested in the proposal. Describe the scalability of this project if less than the full amount of funding is available and the awarded grant amount is less than the proposed costs. For example, can the project be split into phases or components that can be funded independently, or can the project be downsized from the proposed scale? Applicants will not be scored on their responses to this question – it is for informational purposes only.
GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION		
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Enter the geographical information for each project (latitude and longitude in degrees, minutes, and seconds).
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	<u>Geographical Scope:</u> Does the proposed project(s) meet the geographical requirements stated in these Guidelines and PSP? Eligible projects are those in the San Joaquin Valley that improve water quality of the San Joaquin River by reducing or eliminating discharge of subsurface agricultural drainage water. Geographically, projects must be located in the portion of the Lower San Joaquin River (LSJR) watershed that drains, either naturally or mechanically, into the San Joaquin River between Salt Slough (southern boundary) and Mossdale Bridge (northern boundary). The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins defines the subareas that drain into the LSJR downstream of Salt Slough. Eligible project subareas within the LSJR watershed include the Grassland drainage area, East Valley Floor drainage area, Northwest side of the San Joaquin Valley drainage area, and the drainage areas associated with the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers. (Maximum Character Limit: 500 characters)
PROPOSAL TAB		
<i>The answers to these questions will be used in processing the application, determining eligibility and completeness, and evaluating the application using the scoring criteria. The character limit for each response field is 4,000 characters.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	<u>Proposal Description:</u> Provide a description of the proposal, including a list of individual project titles. Please note which projects, if any, directly address water supply or water quality issues for DACs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	<u>Project Director:</u> Provide the name and contact information of the person responsible for executing the grant agreement for the applicant. Persons that are subcontractors to be paid by the grant cannot be listed as the Project Director.
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	<u>Project Manager:</u> Provide the name and contact information of the project manager from the applicant agency or organization who will be the day-to-day contact on this application.

<input type="checkbox"/>	40	<u>Applicant Information:</u> Provide the agency name, address, city, state, and zip code of the applicant submitting the application.
<input type="checkbox"/>	41	<u>Objectives:</u> Describe the objectives for the proposal and proposed project(s). Describe how the objectives address the major water-related issues within the project region, including, at a minimum, the reduction or elimination of discharges of subsurface agricultural drainage water to the San Joaquin River from the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	<u>Need:</u> Describe the need for the proposed project(s) and how the proposal will help meet those needs. Relate to the existing water quality and the expected long-term water quality needs of the project(s)'s geographic area over the estimated useful life of the proposed project(s). Consider the local and regional economic and environmental conditions that contribute to the need for the project(s). Discuss critical short and long-term impacts that will occur if the proposal is not implemented.
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	<u>Program Preferences:</u> If applicable, clearly describe how the proposed project(s) satisfies one or more of the following program preferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Protect water quality and the environment. ☞ Improve of water supply reliability. ☞ Integrate multiple water quality strategies/benefits. ☞ Improve water quality or water supply reliability for disadvantaged communities (DACs). ☞ Include regional projects or programs that are identified in an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) that accomplish the regional goals defined by CWC §10537.
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	<u>Stakeholder Involvement:</u> Discuss how the proposed project(s) will incorporate stakeholder involvement in project development or implementation. Include a list of proposed stakeholders, how stakeholders were or will be identified, how they can participate in the planning and implementation, and how they may influence water quality decisions. Discuss a process by which additional stakeholders may be identified, describe specific outreach activities, and identify the target groups. If any water related entities within the project area are not included in the planning process, discuss why they were omitted.
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	<u>Relation to Local Planning:</u> Identify existing local planning documents that will be considered during development and implementation of the project(s), and how these local planning documents relate to the project(s).
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	<u>Environmental Compliance:</u> Describe a plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements including any California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) obligations (see Exhibit E for related links). Describe the current status of the CEQA obligations associated with the proposal. Also, address the status and plan for compliance with local, county, State, and federal permitting requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	47	<u>Implementability/Feasibility:</u> Identify how the proposed project(s) will be implemented, including ongoing or planned actions, projects, studies, and institutional structures that will ensure successful project implementation. Identify the responsible parties for project implementation, and clearly identify linkages or interdependencies with other projects if applicable. Demonstrate economic and technical feasibility at a programmatic level. Identify the current status of each project, such as if the project uses existing or planned infrastructure, is a pilot or demonstration project, is completed or in progress design, etc.
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	<u>Data and Technical Analysis:</u> Include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses that will be used to develop and implement the project(s). Assess the state of the existing monitoring efforts for water quantity and water quality, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed. Include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public. Include a discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs.

<input type="checkbox"/>	49	<p>Impacts and Benefits: Provide a summary of the impacts and benefits from the project implementation. Include an evaluation of the expected impacts and benefits within the project(s)'s geographical area and in adjacent areas, including the Delta. Benefits should be focused primarily on, but not limited to, improvements to local and regional water quality, including projected seasonal and year-round variations and effect on long-term water quality objectives for the San Joaquin River and the Delta. Describe how the proposed project(s) provides a public benefit (PRC §75004).</p> <p>Include an evaluation of impacts and benefits to other applicable resources, such as air quality, energy, etc. If applicable, discuss any environmental justice concerns and considerations. If applicable, discuss the impacts and benefits to DACs that are affected by the project. Include a discussion of how future conditions could change the project impacts or benefits. Also include a discussion about how climate change affects the project impacts or benefits, including the potential future impacts of climate change on the project(s), how the project performance would be affected by sea level rise (SLR),⁸ and changes in hydrology expected from climate change.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	<p>Finance Plan: Applicants are required to provide a finance plan for their proposed project(s), including an enumerated list of all the costs of planning, design, implementation, long-term operation and maintenance of the proposed project(s), and the economic benefits related to water quality expected to be derived directly from the project(s). The economic benefits may be quantified in monetary terms. If economic benefits cannot be assigned, the applicant may quantify the benefits in physical terms. This finance plan shall demonstrate, to DWR's satisfaction, the applicant's ability to finance the initial and long-term project costs.</p>

⁸ The California Ocean Protection Council has adopted a resolution stating that agencies implementing projects or programs funded by the state should incorporate consideration of the risks posed by SLR into all decisions regarding areas or programs potentially affected by SLR. This resolution provides estimates of projected SLR that should be used for planning purposes. More information available at: http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/OPC_SeaLevelRise_Resolution_Adopted031111.pdf

APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS TAB

Provide the attachments listed below by attaching files to the GRanTS application. When attaching files, please use the naming convention found in PSP Section VII.A Electronic Submittal – Grants Review and Tracking System (GRanTS). For instructions on attaching files, please refer to the GRanTS User Manual. Requirements for information to be included in these attachments are found in PSP Section VII.D Attachment Instructions.

Files formatted using MS Word, MS Excel, MS Project, or PDF are acceptable. PDF files should be generated, if possible, from the original application file rather than scanned hardcopy. **All portions of the application, GRanTS submittal and hardcopies, must be received by the application deadline. Late submittals will not be reviewed or considered for funding.**

Maps, photographs, documents, and reports should be formatted with no component larger than 50 MB. However, DWR strongly recommends that you limit the file size to 20 MB for faster uploading speed. Documents greater than 50 MB should be divided into parts (e.g., cover page, table of contents, chapters, figures, photos, appendices).

Attachment #		Attachment Title	Additional Information in Exhibits
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	Attachment 1 Authorization and Eligibility Requirements	Exhibit A
<input type="checkbox"/>	52	Attachment 2 Work Plan	Exhibit B
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	Attachment 3 Budget	Exhibit C
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	Attachment 4 Schedule	
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	Attachment 5 Scientific and Technical Merit	
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	Attachment 6 Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures of Physical Benefits	
<input type="checkbox"/>	57	Attachment 7 Disadvantaged Community Assistance	Exhibit D, required if the proposal addresses the needs of a DAC and is requesting a funding-match reduction.

D. Attachment Instructions

Applicants are required to submit Attachments 1 through 6 to complete the grant application. Submission of Attachment 7 is required if applicable to the proposed project(s). A discussion of each of the attachments is provided below.

i. Attachment 1. Authorization and Eligibility Requirements

For the “AttachmentName” in the naming convention of GRanTS, use “Eligible” for this attachment.

Attachment 1 is mandatory and consists of authorization and eligibility documentation that describe the applicant’s status of compliance with multiple program requirements. While some items require only a description about the status of compliance, some items require submission of self-certification documents that must be completed and included in Attachment 1. If applicable, please submit the following types of documentation:

-  Authorizing Documentation.
-  Eligible Applicant Documentation.
-  Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption.
-  Project Consistency with an adopted IRWM Plan.
-  Urban Water Management Compliance.

- ↪ Agricultural Water Management Compliance.
- ↪ Surface Water Diverter Compliance.
- ↪ Groundwater Management Compliance.
- ↪ CASGEM Compliance.
- ↪ Water Conservation Programs and Measures.

See Exhibit A for descriptions of the required documentation and self-certification forms.

ii. Attachment 2. Work Plan

For the “AttachmentName” in the naming convention of GRanTS, use “WorkPlan” for this attachment.

Attachment 2 is mandatory. The work plan must contain descriptions of the tasks necessary to complete each project in the proposal and should include appropriate detail to explain what all tasks will entail. All project tasks (and corresponding descriptions) should be organized into four budget categories:

- ↪ Direct Project Administration.
- ↪ Land Purchase/Easement.
- ↪ Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation.
- ↪ Construction/Implementation.

The budget categories in the work plan will correspond with the organization of the project budget. In addition to a description of each task, the work plan should identify the anticipated deliverables for each task. Also include a discussion of the current status of the project and each project task, including permitting activities. The work plan is limited to five pages per project using minimum 10-point type font. Maps and figures will not count against the page limit. The work plan must be consistent with the budget (Attachment 3) and schedule (Attachment 4). Exhibit B provides an example of how the work plan should be structured and the level of detail necessary for each task description.

iii. Attachment 3. Budget

For the “AttachmentName” in the naming convention of GRanTS, use “Budget” for this attachment.

Attachment 3 is mandatory and provides the estimated capital costs of each project in the application. This attachment consists of Table 2—Project Budget and Table 3—Proposal Summary Budget, as well as a corresponding narrative that provides an explanation of proposed project costs and supporting documentation to show how costs were developed. Table 2 must be completed for each project in the proposal, and Table 3 must be completed as a summary budget for the entire proposal. The budget must be consistent with the project(s) and tasks identified in the work plan, must include a description explaining how cost estimates were derived, and must include supporting documentation. Refer to Exhibit C for guidance on how to prepare Attachment 3. The narrative accompanying the budget must not exceed two pages per project using minimum 10-point type font.

Project Budget

For each project contained in the proposal, use Table 2—Project Budget to provide an estimate of the cost for each budget category and the amount of each category that will be funded using non-State and State funds. The costs in this table must be broken down in a way that is consistent with how tasks are

presented in the work plan. If applicable, additional rows should be added under each budget category to present the cost of each task described in the work plan.

Table 2 – Project Budget

Proposal Title: _____					
Project Title: _____					
Does the project serve a need of a DAC? <u>Yes/No</u>					
	Budget Category	(a) Requested Grant Amount	(b) Funding Match (Non-State Source) ¹	(c) Additional Cost Share ¹	(d) Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration				
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement				
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation				
(d)	Construction/Implementation				
(e)	Grand Total	(sum rows [a] - [d])	(sum rows [a] - [d])	(sum rows [a] - [d])	(sum rows [a] - [d])
Total					
<u>Notes:</u>					
(1) List sources of funding. Funding match and cost share definitions are provided in Section V.B Minimum Funding-Match Requirements.					

Proposal Summary Budget

Table 3—Proposal Summary Budget will be used to present the funding match for the proposal, including documentation that the proposal will meet the minimum funding-match requirement of at least 25 percent of the total proposal cost. The requirement for 25-percent funding match may be reduced to 1 percent for projects that meet a need of DACs. See Exhibit D for more information on how to request a funding-match reduction for DAC projects.

Table 3 – Proposal Summary Budget

Proposal Title: _____					
Category	(a) Requested Grant Amount	(b) Funding Match (Non-State Source) ¹	(c) Additional Cost Share ¹	(d) Total Cost	(e) % Funding Match
Project A				<i>(column a+b+c)</i>	<i>Column b/Column d</i>
Project B				<i>(column a+b+c)</i>	<i>Column b/Column d</i>
Project C, etc.				<i>(column a+b+c)</i>	<i>Column b/Column d</i>
Proposal Total				<i>(column a+b+c)</i>	<i>Column b/Column d</i>
DAC Total	—	<i>(Sum only for DAC projects)</i>	—	<i>(Sum only for DAC projects)</i>	<i>Column b/Column d</i>
Non-DAC Total	—	<i>(Sum non-DAC cost)</i>	—	<i>(Sum non-DAC cost)</i>	<i>Column b/Column d</i>
<u>Notes:</u>					
(1) List sources of funding. Funding match and cost share definitions are provided in Section V.B Minimum Funding-Match Requirements.					

iv. Attachment 4. Schedule

For the “AttachmentName” in the naming convention of GRanTS, use “Schedule” for this attachment.

Attachment 4 is mandatory and includes a schedule for proposal implementation that shows the sequence and timing of each of the proposed projects. Attachment 4 must include a project schedule for each project, a description of each project schedule, and an overall proposal schedule. If only one project is proposed, the project schedule and overall proposal schedule can be combined. The description of the project schedule should explain how each project schedule is realistic, reasonable, and appropriate for the type of work proposed as well as the stages of the project development (such as design, permitting and environmental documentation, construction, etc.). The schedule description should not exceed more than two pages per project using minimum 10-point type font.

The project schedule must show the start and end dates as well as milestones for each task contained in the work plan. This schedule may be in a table, horizontal bar, or Gantt chart format. The project schedule must also be organized consistently with how the tasks are presented in the work plan and budget. For example, if the work plan describes projects at the subtask level, the project schedule must also show the start and end dates at the subtask level. The schedule should illustrate any dependencies or predecessors by showing links between tasks. Applicants must include a reasonable estimate of the end date, based on their proposal, including time for any final reports and invoicing. If multiple projects are proposed, applicants must also include a schedule that summarizes the proposal’s overall schedule. The schedule must be consistent with the work plan (Attachment 2) and budget (Attachment 3).

v. Attachment 5. Scientific and Technical Merit

For the “AttachmentName” in the naming convention of GRanTS, use “Merit” for this attachment.

Attachment 5 is mandatory. For this attachment, applicants must submit supporting documentation and studies that demonstrate the scientific and technical merit of the proposed project(s). Applicants should include the following documentation, including but not limited to:

- ↪ Copies of reports and studies prepared for the proposal that form the basis for or include information pertaining to the project(s).
- ↪ A brief summary of the types of information in each reference.
- ↪ Provide copies of the most complete design plans and specifications for the proposed project(s).

If feasibility and pilot studies have not been completed for the proposed project(s), the applicant must provide an explanation of what has been done to prove the project(s)’s scientific and technical merit.

vi. Attachment 6. Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures of Physical Benefits

For the “AttachmentName” in the naming convention of GRanTS, use “Measures” for this attachment.

Attachment 6 is mandatory. Using this attachment, the applicant must present the planned methods of monitoring the project’s physical benefits, strategies to assess the significance and success of the physical benefits, and ways to measure performance of the physical benefits. This analysis of the project’s physical benefits must demonstrate that the proposal will meet its intended goals, achieve measurable outcomes, and provide value to the State of California.

Physical benefits should be based on estimated measures of project accomplishments over the period of analysis and be consistent with the project need described in the proposal. Examples of physical benefits include, but are not limited to:

- ↪ Amount of water supply produced, saved, or recycled.
- ↪ Amount of drainage water permanently diverted from the San Joaquin River.
- ↪ Types (constituents) and amounts of water quality improvement provided, and the amount of water treated or improved.
- ↪ Types and amounts of environmental benefits provided, such as the types of species and their numbers benefited, acreage of habitat or floodplain improved, restored or protected, amount of flow provided, or habitat units restored or protected.
- ↪ Amount of energy produced or saved, and amount of greenhouse gases that can be avoided.

In this attachment, describe the performance measures that will be used to quantify and verify project performance. Performance measures are the measurable accomplishments resulting from the physical benefits of the project. 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 project performance as well as meet the overall goals and objectives of the proposal.

For Attachment 6, applicants are required to submit a Project Performance Monitoring Table for each project included in the proposal. These tables must be used to present physically quantifiable benefits, and the monitoring, assessment, and measurement strategies proposed for each benefit. The Project Performance Monitoring Table should include the following items:

- ↪ Physical Benefits – proposed physical benefits of the project.
- ↪ Performance Indicators – quantitative measurements and qualitative indicators to evaluate change that is a direct result of the project being implemented.
- ↪ Measurement Tools and Methods – tools and methods that will be used to measure the physical benefit and effectively track performance.
- ↪ Measurable Targets – measurable targets (quantitative and qualitative) that are feasible to meet during the life of the project(s).

Table 4 – Project Performance Monitoring Table

Project: _____			
Location: _____			
Physical Benefits	Performance Metrics	Measurement Tools & Methods	Measurable Targets
<i>Example: reduction of drainage volume to San Joaquin River</i>	<i>Example: AFY</i>	<i>Example: flow meter at discharge point to the San Joaquin River</i>	<i>Example: 5,000 AFY project midpoint reduction; 13,000 AFY total reduction</i>

A Project Performance Monitoring Table should be submitted for each project included in the proposal. The performance metrics for each physical benefit should be suitable for completing the performance evaluation needs of the proposal. The metrics may include water quality measurements, measurement-based estimates of pollution load reductions, acre-feet of water supply added, water supply reliability and flexibility improvements, acres of habitat successfully restored, feet of stream channel stabilized, groundwater level measurements, stream flow measurements, flood control improvements, or other quantitative measures or indicators.

Project Performance Monitoring Plan

Establishing performance measures and a monitoring plan help ensure that the proposed project will meet its intended physical benefit(s). If the grant application is successful, upon implementation of the proposal and execution of a grant agreement, the Project Performance Monitoring tables will be used to develop a Project Performance Monitoring Plan to track performance of each project. Project Performance Monitoring Plans must accomplish the following:

- ↪ Describe the tools that will be used to monitor project performance and set interim targets (or milestones) that will be used to track the project's pace in meeting the physical benefits claimed in Table 4.
- ↪ Indicate where the data will be collected and the types of analyses to be used
- ↪ Explain how the monitoring tools and targets are appropriate for the physical benefits claimed.
- ↪ Include a discussion of how monitoring data will be used to measure performance.

Complete Attachment 6 such that it may be used as the basis to develop a Project Performance Monitoring Plan for each project if the grant application is successful.

vii. Attachment 7. Disadvantaged Community Assistance

For the "AttachmentName" in the naming convention of GRanTS, use "DAC" for this attachment.

Attachment 7 is required only if the proposal includes a project that specifically addresses a DAC need. See Exhibit D for instructions on preparations for this attachment. DWR will use the information in Attachment 7 to evaluate the application with regard to DAC program preference and reduction of funding match (if requested). If a DAC funding-match reduction is granted, a term of the grant agreement will require the grantee to verify (at the completion of the proposed project) that the claimed DAC benefits have been provided.

VIII. REVIEW AND SCORING CRITERIA

A. Completeness and Eligibility Review

First, applications will be screened for completeness and eligibility. Completeness will be determined by the presence of the required information listed in Section VII.C What to Submit. Eligibility will be determined by the information provided by applicants in GRanTS, in Attachment 1 of the application, and by compliance with the Eligibility Criteria described in Section III Eligibility. Applications that are determined to be incomplete or ineligible will not be reviewed or considered for funding. All complete and eligible applications will then be evaluated as described below.

B. Review Process

All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers. The technical reviewers assigned to each proposal will include representatives from DWR, and may include technical reviewers from other agencies such as the SWRCB and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. At least two technical reviewers will be assigned to each eligible proposal.

After completing individual proposal evaluations, reviewers will participate in a consensus meeting in which reviewers develop a consensus score based on the comparison of their individual evaluations. Following the consensus meeting, a DWR panel of supervisory and management-level personnel will generate a preliminary ranking list and draft funding recommendations. The draft funding recommendations will be posted electronically, and the applicants will be notified of the availability of the recommended funding list. Following a public comment period and after considering public comments on the draft funding recommendations, DWR staff will prepare a final funding recommendation list and make the associated funding commitments.

C. Scoring Criteria

Applications that are complete and eligible will be scored based on the qualitative or quantitative evaluation criteria in Table 5. The review panel will use a “Pass/Fail” scoring method for the Category A – Qualitative Criteria subcategory. These two criteria must be satisfied to obtain a score of “Pass.” Proposals that do not meet these criteria will receive a “Fail” and will be rejected.

The review panel will use a quantitative scoring method for Category B – Quantitative Criteria subcategory. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 0 to 5, with a 0 being “low” and a 5 being “high.” The score for each criterion will then be multiplied by the weighting factor associated with the scoring criteria. A higher weighting factor indicates a higher importance of the criterion over those with a lower weighting factor.

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 documentation and logical rationale.
- ↪ A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but 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 or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.
- ↪ A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient.
- ↪ A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed and not documented.
- ↪ A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

D. Tie-Breaker Points

In the event that two or more applications receive a tied score, up to two points may be awarded to aid in the distribution of funds at the discretion of DWR staff. Tie-breaker points will be assigned by the supervisory-level reviewers after consensus technical reviews are completed. Tie breaker points can only

be used to break a tied score, not to elevate a proposal's score above other proposals that received a higher initial score.

Tie breaker points will be added to scores for proposals from applicants that have not yet received Proposition 84 grant funding or to applicants that have received the least amount of funding in comparison to the tied proposal's applicant. For example, if three proposals receive an equivalent initial proposal score, the proposals will be ranked from least funding previously awarded to most funding previously awarded of Proposition 84 funds. The proposal with the least amount of awarded funding would receive 2 tie-breaking points, the middle proposal would receive 1 tie-breaking point, and the proposal awarded the most amount of previous funding would receive 0 tie-breaking points.

Table 5 – Evaluation Criteria for Grants

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRANTS Application Checklist
Category A – Qualitative Criteria				
<p>A-1 Applicant Authority <i>This evaluation will be based on whether the applicant has proper authority.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Has the applicant provided a written statement certifying that they are a local agency as defined in the Guidelines and PSP? ☞ Does the applicant have the legal authority to conduct the work of the proposed project and to receive and spend State grant funds? ☞ Has the applicant provided a resolution adopted by the applicant’s governing body designating an authorized representative to submit the application and execute an agreement with the State of California for a Proposition 84 grant? 	--	--	Pass/Fail	52 (Attachment 1, Authorization and Eligibility Requirements, Exhibit A)
<p>A-2 Funding Match <i>This evaluation will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated that it will provide a funding match.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Did the applicant propose a funding match of the total proposal costs? ☞ Does the applicant propose at least the minimum required funding match of the total proposed costs: 25 percent for non-DAC projects and 1 percent for DAC projects (applicant must show that they meet the criteria of a DAC in Attachment 7)? 	--	--	Pass/Fail	7 – 13 (Proposal Budget) 54 (Attachment 3, Budget)
<p>A-3 Attachments <i>This evaluation will be based on whether the applicant has submitted the required attachments to the application.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Did the applicant include Attachments 1 through 6 in its application package? 	--	--	Pass/Fail	--
Maximum Score - Criteria A			Pass	
Category B – Quantitative Criteria				
<p>B-1 Description & Objectives <i>Scoring will be based on whether the proposal includes an adequate proposal description and on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific objectives.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the application include proposal and project descriptions? 	2	0-5	0-10	6 (Proposal Abstract) 30 (Project Description)

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRanTS Application Checklist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↕ Does the proposal description indicate which projects, if any, directly address a water supply or water quality need of a DAC? ↕ Are the objectives detailed and specific? ↕ Are the objectives appropriate for the type and scale of the project(s)? ↕ Do the objectives describe how the project addresses the major water-related issues within the region, including, at a minimum, the reduction or elimination of discharges of subsurface agricultural drainage water to the San Joaquin River from the west side of the San Joaquin Valley? 				<p style="text-align: center;">31 (Project Objective)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">37 (Proposal Description)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">41 (Objectives)</p>
<p>B-2 Need <i>Scoring will be based on the need for the proposed project(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↕ Does the proposal describe the need for the proposed project(s) and how the project(s) will help meet those needs? ↕ Does the proposal describe the current and expected long-term water quality needs of the project's geographic area over the estimated useful life of the proposed project? ↕ Does the proposal discuss the local and regional economic and environmental conditions relative to the need for the project? ↕ Does the proposal identify critical short and long-term impacts that would result from not completing the project(s)? 	2	0-5	0-10	42 (Need)
<p>B-3 Program Preferences <i>Scoring will be based on the extent that the proposal meets the specified Program Preferences and whether the applicant adequately documents why the Program Preferences are met. One point will be awarded for every Program Preference that is relevant, up to 5 points total for this evaluation criteria. The proposal must specifically identify which Program Preferences are met by the proposed project(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↕ Does the proposed project(s) meet some or all of the Program Preferences below (described in PSP Section III.C.i): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protect water quality and the environment? ○ Improve water supply reliability? ○ Integrate multiple water quality strategies/benefits (e.g. agricultural water use, land use, watershed management, ecosystem restoration, and salt management)? ○ Improve water quality or water supply reliability for disadvantaged communities (DACs)? 	2	0-5	0-10	43 (Program Preferences)

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRanTS Application Checklist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include regional projects or programs that are identified in an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) that accomplish the regional goals defined by CWC §10537? ☞ Does the applicant provide sufficient documentation and an explanation to describe how the proposed project(s) meet the Program Preferences? 				
<p>B-4 Stakeholder Involvement <i>Scoring will be based on the extent of stakeholder involvement planned through implementation of the project(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the proposal discuss how the proposed project(s) will incorporate stakeholder involvement in project development or implementation? ☞ Does the proposal include a list of proposed stakeholders, how stakeholders were or will be identified, how they can participate in the planning and implementation, and how they may influence water quality decisions? ☞ Does the proposal discuss a process by which additional stakeholders may be identified, describe specific outreach activities, and identify the target groups? 	1	0-5	0-5	44 (Stakeholder Involvement)
<p>B-5 Environmental Compliance <i>Scoring will be based on whether the proposal adequately prepares for all relevant CEQA and NEPA obligations, including permit requirements.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the proposal include an adequate plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements including any CEQA and/or NEPA obligations? ☞ Does the proposal describe the current status of CEQA obligations associated with the project(s)? ☞ Does the proposal's environmental compliance plan address compliance with local, county, State, and federal permitting requirements? 	1	0-5	0-5	46 (Environmental Compliance)
<p>B-6 Implementability/Feasibility <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed how the project will be implemented, status of implementation, and the technical and economic feasibility of the project(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the proposal identify how the project(s) will be implemented, including specific actions, projects, and studies (ongoing or planned) by which the project will be implemented? ☞ Does the proposal identify the responsible parties for project implementation? 	1	0-5	0-5	47 (Implementability/ Feasibility)

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRanTS Application Checklist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↕ If applicable, does the proposal clearly identify linkages or interdependencies with other projects? ↕ Does the proposal demonstrate the project's economic and technical feasibility at a programmatic level? ↕ Does the proposal identify the current status of the project? 				
<p>B-7 Data and Technical Analysis <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant describes the data collection, technical methods, and analyses used to implement the project(s), as well as existing and future monitoring efforts.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↕ Does the proposal discuss the data, technical methods, and analyses used to develop and implement the project? ↕ Does the proposal assess the state of existing monitoring efforts for water quantity and water quality? ↕ Does the proposal identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed? ↕ Does the proposal describe mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public? ↕ Does the proposal discuss how data collection will support local and statewide data needs? 	1	0-5	0-5	48 (Data and Technical Analysis)
<p>B-8a Impacts & Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant clearly and fully describes the local and regional impacts and benefits of the proposed project(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↕ Does the proposal describe impacts and regional benefits of the project? ↕ Does the proposal evaluate the expected impacts and benefits within the project(s)'s geographical area and in adjacent areas (including the Delta) that will result from its implementation? ↕ Does the proposal discuss the benefits to local and regional water quality, including projected seasonal and year-round variations, and the effects on long-term water quality objectives for the San Joaquin River and the Delta? ↕ Does the proposal describe how the project(s) will provide a public benefit (PRC §75004)? ↕ Does the proposal evaluate impacts and benefits to other applicable resources, such as air quality, energy, etc.? ↕ If applicable, does the proposal discuss any environmental justice concerns and considerations? ↕ If applicable, does the proposal describe the impacts and benefits to DACs? 	1	0-5	0-5	49 (Impacts and Benefits)

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRanTS Application Checklist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the proposal discuss how future conditions, other than those caused by climate change, could change the project impacts or benefits? 				
<p>B-8b Impacts & Benefits from Climate Change <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant describes the impacts and benefits of the proposed project(s) specifically due to climate change.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the proposal discuss how climate change affects the project impacts and benefits? ☞ Does the proposal discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the potential future impacts of climate change on the project? ○ How would the project performance be affected by sea-level rise? ○ What changes in hydrology are expected from climate change? 	1	0-5	0-5	49 (Impacts and Benefits)
<p>B-9 Finance Plan <i>Scoring will be based on the applicant's demonstration of their ability to finance the project(s)'s initial and long-term costs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the proposal provide a finance plan for the proposed project(s), including an enumerated list of all the costs of planning, design, implementation, long-term operation and maintenance of the proposed project, and the economic benefits related to water quality expected to be derived directly from the project? ☞ Are the economic benefits quantified (in monetary or physical terms)? ☞ Does the finance plan demonstrate the applicant's ability to finance the initial and long-term project costs? 	1	0-5	0-5	50 (Finance Plan)
<p>B-10 Work Plan <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has provided a comprehensive and specific work plan that adequately documents the tasks needed to complete proposed project(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Is the work plan organized by the four budget categories specified in the Guidelines and PSP? ☞ Does the work plan provide a concise description of each task needed to complete the project? Do the descriptions include the status of each task? ☞ Does the work plan include appropriate grant reporting tasks and deliverables (progress reports, invoices, project/grant completion reports, post-performance reports)? ☞ Does the work plan include procedures for coordinating with partner agencies and organizations? 	3	0-5	0-15	52 (Attachment 2, Work Plan)

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRanTS Application Checklist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Does the work plan include an overview of applicable standards and methods that will be used in project implementation? ☞ Does the work plan include the creation of a Project Performance Monitoring Plan for each project? ☞ Does the work plan list all necessary permits and the status of acquiring the permits? ☞ Does the work plan include a plan for preparation and completion of environmental permitting and compliance requirements? ☞ If applicable, does the work plan include a plan for implementing the required tribal notification requirement? ☞ Does the work plan include a plan for submittal of design plans and specifications? ☞ Does the work plan identify deliverables associated with each task and sub-task, if applicable? ☞ Is the work plan consistent with the major tasks and sub-tasks identified in the budget (Attachment 3) and schedule (Attachment 4)? 				
<p>B-11 Budget <i>Scoring will be based on whether the costs of the proposed project(s) are well documented, explained, and reasonable.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☞ Are the Project Budget Tables (one for each project) and Proposal Summary Budget Table provided with the budget information? ☞ Are the budget tables appropriately completed and organized by the budget categories specified in the Guidelines and PSP? ☞ Does the budget correspond to the design stage that is being submitted? ☞ Does the budget adhere to relevant labor code compliance and prevailing wage requirements? ☞ Does the budget include appropriate supplemental information and documentation to support the costs in each budget category? ☞ Does the supplemental information and documentation provide sufficient explanation of how the costs were developed? ☞ Are finance planning and monitoring costs (those necessary for the successful design, selection, and implementation of the project[s]) less than 10 percent of funds allocated to each project (PRC §75072)? ☞ Does the proposal explain the rationale used to determine contingency percentages or amounts? ☞ Are the estimated costs for each project and task reasonable? 	2	0-5	0-10	53 (Attachment 3, Budget)

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRanTS Application Checklist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✦ Is the budget organized by, and consistent with, the major tasks and sub-tasks identified in the work plan (Attachment 2) and schedule (Attachment 4)? 				
<p>B-12 Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on whether the schedule is reasonable, appropriate, and supports the tasks of the proposed project(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✦ Does the schedule show the sequence and timing of the proposed project(s)? ✦ Does the schedule include a schedule for each proposed project, a description of the project schedule(s), and an overall proposal schedule (if applicable)? ✦ Is the schedule realistic, reasonable, and appropriate for the type of work proposed? ✦ Does the description provide an adequate explanation of project's schedule? ✦ Does the schedule show the start and end dates as well as milestones for each task contained in the work plan? ✦ Is the schedule organized consistently with how the tasks are presented in the work plan (Attachment 2) and budget (Attachment 3)? ✦ Does the schedule illustrate dependencies or predecessors by showing links between tasks? ✦ Does the schedule provide a reasonable end date of the project(s)? 	2	0-5	0-10	54 (Attachment 4, Schedule)
<p>B-13 Scientific and Technical Merit <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project(s) has scientific and technical merit.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✦ Does the proposal include supporting documentation that demonstrates that the project has the scientific and technical merit? ✦ Based on the supporting documentation, does the proposal have scientific and technical merit? ✦ If no studies have been performed for the proposed project(s), did the applicant provide an explanation of what else has been done to prove the project(s)'s scientific and technical merit? 	1	0-5	0-5	55 (Attachment 5, Scientific and Technical Merit)

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Factor	Points Range	Scoring Range	Line Item from GRanTS Application Checklist
<p>B-14 Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures of Physical Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on whether the proposal includes adequate monitoring methods, assessment strategies, and performance measures of the project(s)'s physical benefits.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Does the proposal include a Project Performance Monitoring Table for each proposed project? Are the tables complete and appropriately completed? <input type="checkbox"/> Are the proposed physical benefits consistent with the project need described in the proposal? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the proposal identify and discuss the planned methods of monitoring the project(s)'s physical benefits? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the proposal identify and discuss strategies to assess the significance and success of the project(s)'s physical benefits? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the proposal identify and discuss ways to measure performance of the project(s)'s physical benefits? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the proposal indicate where the measured data will be collected and the types of analyses will be used? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the discussion of the project(s)'s physical benefits demonstrate that the proposal will meet its intended goals, achieve measureable outcomes, and provide its intended value? <input type="checkbox"/> Will the proposed quantitative performance measurements adequately indicate the success of the proposed project(s) in improving water quality in the San Joaquin River? 	3	0-5	0-15	56 (Attachment 6, Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures of Physical Benefits)
Total Maximum Score			130	
<p>Tie-Breaker Up to two points may be awarded to aid in the distribution of funds.</p>	1	0-2	0-2	Not applicable.

IX. FUNDING AWARDS

DWR staff will develop final funding recommendations based on individual proposal evaluations, the draft funding recommendations of the DWR supervisory review panel, and the comments received during the public review period on the draft funding recommendations. DWR's Director will approve a final funding recommendation list and the associated funding commitments. Following approval by the Director, the selected grant recipients will receive a commitment letter officially notifying them of their selection and the grant amount. When the applicant indicates acceptance of the funding in writing, the applicant will become the grantee. Final award is subject to the execution of a grant agreement.

X. AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS

Following the funding commitment, DWR will execute a grant agreement with the grant recipient. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by the grantee's authorized representative and DWR. Grant agreements for Proposition 84 funds will be executed with one grant recipient (the grant applicant) who will then provide funding to its project proponents that are responsible for implementing the project.

Grant recipients must sign a grant agreement with DWR before the State can disburse the grant money. The agreement will include all terms and conditions for the grant, a work plan, a schedule, a budget, and additional standard State and DWR agreement language. Information from the applicant's proposal may be used to develop the work plan, budget, and schedule for the grant agreement. The agreement will also specify eligible and ineligible costs that will be considered for reimbursement; funding-match, environmental, and reporting requirements; and monitoring, assessment, and performance measures that the grantee will be required to perform.

Both the financial statement and CEQA conditions (described below) must be met for at least one project contained in the proposal prior to execution of a grant agreement. For each remaining project(s), both conditions must be met prior to the disbursement of grant funds. Additional details of these conditions include:

- ↳ **Financial 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 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. Equivalent documentation may be considered at DWR's discretion.
- ↳ **CEQA/NEPA:** The grantee must demonstrate that they have a plan to comply with all applicable requirements of CEQA and NEPA, as well as a schedule that outlines when the appropriate environmental documents will be completed. DWR staff will review the CEQA documentation available at the time of the grant agreement execution for each project contained within the proposal. Each project subject to CEQA shall not proceed until documents that satisfy the CEQA process are received by DWR and DWR has completed its CEQA compliance review. DWR's concurrence is fully discretionary and shall constitute a condition precedent to any work for which it is required. Once CEQA documentation has been completed, DWR will consider the

environmental documents and decide whether to continue to fund the project or to require changes, alterations, or other mitigation.

As part of the grant agreement, grant recipients and associated project proponents will be required to provide information regarding their projects for Bond Accountability reporting.

XI. SCHEDULE

The schedule in Table 6 shows the timeline from the release of the Draft SJRWQ Grant Program Guidelines and PSP through the approval of awards. Updates for the events listed in this schedule may be required. Therefore, check the program website (listed in the Foreword) for the most up-to-date schedule. Updates may also be advertised through e-mail announcements and news releases.

Table 6 – Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule

Milestone or Activity	Schedule
Draft Guidelines and PSP Released to Public	August 2015
Public Workshops Held on Draft Guidelines and PSP	Modesto – September 9, 2015 Fresno – September 10, 2015
Public Comments on Draft Guidelines and PSP Due	September 2015
Final PSP Released	November 2015
Applicant Assistance Workshops are Held	December 2015
Applications Due	Friday, January 15, 2016
Draft Funding Recommendations Released	May 2016
Public Meeting on Draft Funding Recommendations	May 2016
Public Comments on Draft Funding Recommendations Due	May 2016
Final Funding Recommendations Released	July 2016
Begin Grant Agreement Process	July 2016

EXHIBIT A – AUTHORIZATION AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

San Joaquin River Water Quality (SJRWQ) Grant Program applicants must submit authorization and eligibility documentation that describes the applicant’s status of compliance with multiple program requirements. While some items require a description about the status of compliance (self-certification), some items require submission of form documents that must be completed and included in Attachment 1. Therefore, if applicable, please provide self-certification or form documentation for the following:

1. Authorizing Documentation – authorizing resolution.
2. Eligible Applicant Documentation – local agency verification.
3. Urban Water Management Compliance – (a) Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), (b) Assembly Bill (AB) 1420 (*form submittal required*), (c) water meter compliance (*form submittal required*).
4. Agricultural Water Management Compliance – Agricultural Water Management Plan (AWMP).
5. Surface Water Compliance – surface water diverting reporting.
6. Groundwater Management Compliance – Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) (*form submittal required*).
7. California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) Compliance.

Links to required form documents are provided in the descriptions below.

1. Authorizing Documentation – The applicant must provide a resolution adopted by the applicant’s governing body designating an authorized representative to submit the application and execute an agreement with the State of California for a Proposition 84 grant. The following text provides an 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 to obtain a Proposition 84 Grant through the San Joaquin River Water Quality Grant Program pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Public Resource Code Section 75001 *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 the application, and execute a grant agreement with California Department of Water Resources.

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: _____

2. Eligible Applicant Documentation – Eligible applicants are local agencies that have an eligible proposal for a project(s) that will provide public benefit(s) (PRC §75004). Local agency refers to any city, county, city and county, special district, joint powers authority, or other political subdivision of the State, a public utility as defined in Public Utilities Code §216, or a mutual water company as defined in Public Utilities Code §2725 (CWC §10535). Federally recognized tribes can be members of a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), per Government Code §6500 *et seq.*

If DWR determines 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 the application will not be reviewed.

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

- ↪ Is the applicant a local public agency as defined in the above description? Please explain.
- ↪ What is the statutory or other legal authority under which the applicant was formed and is authorized to operate?
- ↪ Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State of California?
- ↪ Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.

3. Urban Water Management Compliance – List the urban water suppliers that will receive funding from the proposed grant. If there are none, so indicate. For each urban water supplier, please provide the agency name, a contact phone number, and an e-mail address.

(a) Urban Water Management Plan – For the listed urban water suppliers, include documentation, from DWR, that verifies that each supplier’s 2010 UWMP addresses the requirements of the CWC. If an urban water supplier’s 2010 UWMP has not been verified by DWR, explain why it has not been verified and provide the anticipated date for having a 2010 UWMP that addresses the requirements of the CWC. For additional information on the UWMP review process, visit:

<http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/urbanplan/index.cfm>.

(b) AB 1420 – Listed urban water suppliers must self-certify their compliance with the demand management measure (or best management practice [BMP]) requirements contained in AB 1420 (CWC §10631.5). The AB 1420 self-certification documentation and instructions can be found online at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/finance/>. The applicant must determine, based on the instructions provided, whether to submit AB 1420 Compliance Table 1, 2, or 3 based on its current status of BMP implementation. Because DWR is both the funding agency and the approval agency, **only one hard copy (with wet signature) submittal per project is required for this attachment.**

(c) Water Meter – Listed urban water suppliers must self-certify their compliance with the water metering requirements as contained in CWC §525 *et seq.* The Water Metering compliance self-certification form and instructions can be found online at: www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resourceslinks.cfm. Each urban water supplier proposing wastewater projects, water use efficiency projects, or drinking water projects must complete the form. **Only one hard copy (with wet signature) submittal per project is required for this attachment.** If any of the

listed urban water suppliers have submitted AB 1420 compliance tables and supporting documentation to DWR on or after July 1, 2013, then please list the urban water supplier and the grant program, and do not include a new self-certification form.

4. Agricultural Water Management Compliance – List the agricultural water suppliers that will receive funding from the proposed grant. If there are none, so indicate. For each agricultural water supplier, please provide the agency or organization name, a contact phone number, and an e-mail address. For the listed agricultural water suppliers, include documentation, from DWR, that verifies that each supplier's AWMP addresses the requirements of the CWC. If an agricultural water supplier's AWMP has not been verified by DWR, explain why it has not been verified and provide the anticipated date for having an AWMP that addresses the requirements of the CWC. For additional information on compliance with this section of the CWC, visit: <http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/finance/>.

5. Surface Water Compliance – List the surface water diverters that will receive funding from the proposed grant. If there are none, so indicate. Please provide the agency or organization name, a contact phone number, and an e-mail address. For the listed surface water diverters, state whether they have submitted surface water diversion reports to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in compliance with CWC §5100. If a surface water diverter has not, explain why diversion reports have not been submitted and provide the anticipated date for meeting the requirements.

6. Groundwater Management Compliance – List the groundwater users that will receive funding from the proposed grant. Please provide the agency or organization name, a contact phone number, and an e-mail address. If there are none, so indicate. If the proposal contains a groundwater project or other project that does not directly affect groundwater levels or quality, so indicate and include a justification for such a conclusion. For projects that directly affect groundwater levels or quality, the applicant or the participating agency responsible for the projects must self-certify compliance with CWC §10753 regarding GWMPs. Agencies must prepare the GWMP self-certification documentation in accordance with the instructions found at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage/grants/sjrwq/templatesforms.cfm>. **Only one hard copy (with wet signature) submittal per project is required for this attachment.**

7. CASGEM Compliance – Grant applicants and project proponents must be in compliance with CASGEM requirements to be eligible to receive grant funding. The CASGEM Program description can be found online at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/casgem/>.

DWR has prioritized the groundwater basins, as well as CASGEM monitoring entities. For the high and medium priority basins that do not have a CASGEM monitoring entity, the grant applicant and project proponent that match the list of potential monitoring entities identified in CWC §10927, along with the counties whose jurisdictions include unmonitored high and medium priority basins, will not be eligible to receive grant funding (CWC §10933.7(a)). DWR will take into consideration whether a monitoring entity has already been proposed and is in the process of being established for the relevant basin(s) when determining eligibility. Consistent with CWC §10933.7(b), if the entire service area of the grant applicant or the individual project proponent's service area is demonstrated to be a DAC, as defined herein these Guidelines and PSP, the project will be considered eligible for grant funding notwithstanding CASGEM compliance.

To demonstrate CASGEM eligibility, the following must be included for each project:

- ↪ Project location and implementing agency's service area boundary. Project latitude and longitude coordinates and a service area boundary GIS shape file must be provided.
- ↪ Groundwater basin that each project overlies. Identify the basin priority as determined by the CASGEM Program.
 - If the basin is a high or medium priority basin, please specify the name of the organization that has assumed the role of monitoring entity.
 - If there is no monitoring entity, please indicate whether the project proponent is an eligible monitoring entity per CWC §10927.

EXHIBIT B – WORK PLAN

This exhibit provides guidance for developing Attachment 2—Work Plan of the grant application. If applicants are successful, the work plan will be incorporated in this format into the grant agreement. The work plan must include the tasks, and sub-tasks as necessary, for each project within the grant agreement. The work plan must be organized by the following four budget categories:

- ✦ Direct Project Administration.
- ✦ Land Purchase/Easement.
- ✦ Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation.
- ✦ Construction/Implementation.

The work plan must also contain the following items:

- ✦ For each project, a concise description of each task needed to complete the project and the current status of each task (including estimated percent complete). Also include a brief overview of work already completed and work needed to be performed.
- ✦ Grant reporting tasks including the submittal of Quarterly Progress Reports, Invoices, Final Reports, and Post-Performance Reports.
- ✦ Procedures for coordinating with partner agencies and organizations that may receive funding from the grant including any contracts, memorandums of understanding (MOUs), and other formal agreements.
- ✦ Brief overview of standards, such as construction standards, health and safety standards, laboratory analysis, or accepted classification methods that will be used in implementation.
- ✦ Project Performance Monitoring Plan for the project(s) listed in the proposal. The requirements are discussed in Section VII.D.vi Attachment 6. Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures of Physical Benefits.
- ✦ Discussion of the status of acquisition of land or rights-of-way. If a funded project requires land to be purchased or an easement to be acquired, include a list of needed parcels for each project and the status of the acquisition. If land or easement acquisition is not applicable, so indicate.
- ✦ List of all necessary permits and the status of acquiring the permits.
- ✦ Plan for the preparation and completion of requirements to comply with the CEQA, NEPA, and other environmental laws. If environmental compliance efforts have not been completed, include tasks needed for environmental compliance. Include any environmental mitigation or enhancement actions or tasks necessary to comply with recommended mitigation measures.
- ✦ Description of the required tribal notification requirement (PRC §75102), if applicable. If deemed not applicable, describe the basis for that conclusion. See Section IV.D Required Permits and CEQA Compliance for additional information.
- ✦ Plan for submittal of necessary design plans and specifications.

An example of a typical work plan that may be submitted for this grant program is provided below. Individual tasks may vary; however, they must be consistent with the budget and schedule that will also be incorporated into the grant agreement. The language is suggested, not required, text and is not comprehensive. Please use text as appropriate for proposed projects.

If the proposal includes more than one project, especially if the projects will be carried out by different project proponents, it is suggested that a separate project be included in the work plan specifically for grant administration. The work plan example below provides a sample where Project 1 of the work plan is grant administration, and Project 2 is the planned implementation project.

PROJECT 1: Grant Administration

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: {GRANTEE}

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: {GRANTEE} will act as the grant manager for the Proposition 84 San Joaquin River Water Quality Grant Program grant.

{GRANTEE} will administer these funds and respond to DWR's reporting and compliance requirements associated with the grant administration. This office will act in a coordination role and will be responsible for: disseminating grant compliance information to the project managers responsible for implementing the projects contained in this agreement, obtaining and retaining evidence of compliance (e.g., CEQA/NEPA documents, reports, monitoring compliance documents, labor requirements, etc), obtaining data for progress reports from individual project managers, assembling and submitting progress reports to the State, and coordinating all invoicing and payment of invoices.

Budget Category (a): Direct Project Administration

Task 1 - Agreement Administration

{GRANTEE} will respond to DWR's reporting and compliance requirements associated with the grant administration and will coordinate with the project managers responsible for implementing the projects contained in this agreement.

Task 2 - Invoicing

{GRANTEE} will be responsible for compiling invoices for submittal to DWR. This includes collecting invoice documentation from each of the project proponents and compiling the information into a DWR invoice packet.

Task 3 - Progress Reports, Project Completion Report(s), and Post-Performance Reports

{GRANTEE} will be responsible for compiling progress reports for submittal to DWR. {GRANTEE} will coordinate with project proponent staff to retain consultants as needed to prepare and submit progress reports, final project completion reports for each project, grant completion reports upon grant completion, and post-performance reports.

Reports will meet the generally accepted professional standards for technical reporting and the requirement terms of the contract with DWR outlined in the grant agreement. For example, progress reports will include: the status of the project; summary of the work completed for the project during the reporting period; activities and milestones achieved; and accomplishments and any problems encountered in the performance of work. Project completion reports will

include: documentation of actual work done; changes and amendments to each project; a final schedule showing actual progress versus planned progress; and copies of final documents and reports generated during the project. Post-performance reports will be submitted annually for a total of 10 years after the completed project begins operation and will include: status of the project operation; monitoring data collection and analysis of the data collected; status of the intended physical benefits of the project; issues related to operation and maintenance; and planned activities for next operating year.

Deliverables:

- Executed Grant Agreement.
- Invoices and associated backup documentation.
- Progress Reports.
- Draft and Final Project Completion Report.
- Post-Performance Reports.

PROJECT 2: {Project 2 Name}

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: {Agency Name}

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: What work will be done, where, and what benefits will be provided.

Budget Category (a): Direct Project Administration

Task 1 - Project Management

Manage grant agreement including compliance with grant requirements, and the preparation and submission of supporting grant documents and coordination with {GRANTEE}. Prepare invoices including relevant supporting documentation for submittal to DWR via {GRANTEE}. This task also includes administrative responsibilities associated with the project such as coordinating with partnering agencies and managing consultants/contractors.

Deliverables:

- Environmental Information Form (EIF).
- Financial Statements.
- Invoices.
- Other Applicable Project Deliverables.

Task 2 - Labor Compliance Program

Take all measures necessary to ensure compliance with the California Labor Code requirements, including the preparation and implementation of a labor compliance program or any payments to the Department of Industrial Relations under Labor Code §1771.3.

Deliverables:

- Proof of labor compliance upon request.

Task 3 - Reporting

Prepare progress reports detailing work completed during reporting period as outlined in the grant agreement. Submit reports to {GRANTEE} for review and inclusion in a progress report to be submitted to DWR.

Prepare draft Final Project Completion Report and submit to DWR via {GRANTEE} for DWR Project Manager's comment and review no later than 90 days after project completion. Prepare Final Report addressing {GRANTEE}/DWRs comments. The report shall be prepared and presented in accordance with the provisions described in the grant agreement.

Deliverables:

- Quarterly Project Progress Reports.
- Draft and Final Project Completion Report.
- Post-Performance Report.

Budget Category (b): Land Purchase/Easement

Task 4 – Land Purchase

Approximate area of land to be purchased or easement to be acquired. {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- Documentation supporting property value (if purchased).
- All relevant documentation regarding property ownership transfer or acquisition of easement including final recorded deed, title report, etc.

Budget Category (c): Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation

Task 5 - Feasibility Studies

Project Feasibility Studies were completed as part of the project development process. {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- Relevant Feasibility Studies.

Task 6 - CEQA Documentation

Prepare and circulate a Notice of Preparation (including tribal notification to the California Native Heritage Commission). Prepare draft Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) and release document for public review. File Notice of Completion with State Clearinghouse. Prepare letter stating no legal challenges (or addressing legal challenges). {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- Copy of Notice of Preparation.
- Draft and Final EIR.

- Copy of Notice of Completion.
- No Legal Challenges letter.

Task 7 - Permitting

Acquire {specific permits}. {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- All required permits.

Task 8 - Design

Complete preliminary design including a description of the following supporting work: geotechnical investigation, topographic survey, and basis of design report. The basis of design report will provide the overall project concept for use in development of final design, plans, and specifications including: preliminary earthwork calculations, preliminary design details for tank foundation, preliminary design details for other applicable components, and 100-percent (Final) design, plans, and specifications. {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- Geotechnical Report.
- Topographic Survey.
- Basis of Design Report.
- Updated Project Cost Estimate.
- 100-Percent Design Documents.

Task 9 - Project Performance Monitoring Plan

Develop and submit a Project Performance Monitoring Plan. The Project Performance Monitoring Plan will include baseline conditions, a brief discussion of monitoring systems and types of analysis to be used, interim targets or milestones to measure project performance, methodology and frequency of monitoring, location of monitoring points, and a discussion of how the monitoring data will be used to measure performance and achieve claimed physical benefits. {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- Project Performance Monitoring Plan.

Budget Category (d): Construction/Implementation

Task 10 - Contract Services

Activities necessary to secure a contractor and to award the contract include: developing bid documents, preparing advertisement and contract documents for construction contract bidding, conducting a pre-bid meeting, opening and evaluation of the bid, selecting a contractor, awarding of the contract, and issuing of notice to proceed. {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- Bid documents.
- Proof of Advertisement.
- Award of contract.
- Notice to proceed.

Task 11 - Construction Administration

This task includes managing contractor submittal review, answering requests for information, and issuing work directives. A full-time engineering construction observer will be on site for the duration of the project. Construction observer duties include: documenting of pre-construction conditions, keeping a daily construction diary, preparing change orders, addressing questions of contractors on site, reviewing and updating the project schedule, reviewing contractor log submittals and pay requests, forecasting cash flow, and notifying contractor if work is not acceptable. {Add applicable detail}

Deliverables:

- Notice of Completion.

Task 12 - Construction/Implementation Activities

Construction activities are outlined below.

12(a): Mobilization and Demobilization. {Add applicable detail}.

12(b): Site preparation will include. {Add applicable detail}.

12(c): Install, construct, excavate. {Add applicable detail}.

12(d): Improve {Add applicable detail}.

Deliverables:

- Photographic documentation.
- Engineers Certification.

EXHIBIT C – BUDGET

This exhibit provides guidance for developing Attachment 3—Budget and the supporting documentation required to be submitted with Table 2—Project Budget and Table 3—Proposal Summary Budget. Supporting documentation and discussion is required to be provided with the budget to aid in the development of the grant agreement (if the applicant is successful) and as verification of project costs identified in the proposal. Applicants must prepare Attachment 3 and Tables 2 and 3 so that costs are organized in a way that is consistent with the work plan (see Exhibit B for additional information) and schedule. In general, and at a minimum, the budget must include the following for each individual project in the proposal:

- ✦ Costs related to direct project administration, land purchase and easement, planning and design, engineering, environmental compliance and documentation, construction (shown by task or phase), implementation, and contingencies.
- ✦ Subject to DWR approval, funding match (i.e., grantee’s non-State cost share) can include eligible costs borne by the applicant or individual project proponent after June 20, 2014. The minimum funding match for each proposal is 25 percent of the total costs of the proposal. The funding match for DAC projects may be reduced to 1 percent based on providing accurate and adequate information that confirms the DAC meets the median household income requirement. See Section V.B Minimum Funding-Match Requirements and Exhibit D Disadvantaged Community Assistance for more details on calculating funding match and how to request a DAC funding-match reduction. Any other State funds being used that will not come from this grant should be entered in column (c) of Tables 2—Project Budget and Table 3—Proposal Summary Budget. State Revolving Funds (SRF) are considered State funds; therefore, cannot be used as funding match and should be entered in column (c) of Tables 2 and 3. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds are not considered State funds and may be used as funding match (entered in column [b] of Tables 2 and 3).
- ✦ Tasks that are completely supported by funding match.

The budget should correspond to the design stage that is being submitted and be organized by the same tasks that are used in the work plan. Also, the costs shown in the budget must reflect the relevant labor code compliance requirements and the applicability of prevailing wage laws as explained in Section IV.C Labor Code Compliance.

In addition to submitting Tables 2 and 3, supplemental information and documentation should be included to support the costs included in each budget category and to provide an explanation of how the costs were developed. The following provides an explanation of the detail and supporting documentation that grantees should provide for each project and budget category.

Row (a) Direct Project Administration

Detail and supporting documentation must be included that describes the hourly wage paid by discipline, number of hours to be expended for administration, and costs shown for equipment or supplies. If administrative costs are shown as a percentage of a cost, include both of the following:

- ✦ The total on which the project administration is based (i.e., total project costs, total construction cost, etc.).

- ✎ How the percentage was determined (i.e., flat rate, based on prior experience, etc.).

This budget category includes all administrative costs for the grant recipient and any project proponents (partner agencies or organizations). Grantees are encouraged to limit administrative costs proposed to be reimbursed by the grant to less than 5 percent of the total proposal costs. Eligible administrative expenses are necessary costs incidentally, but directly, related to the project including an appropriate pro-rata allocation of overhead and administrative expenses that are regularly assigned to similar projects in accordance with the standard accounting practices of the grantee.

Row (b) Land Purchase/Easement

Detail and supporting documentation must 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 (to be eligible as funding match it must be after June 20, 2014), the purchase price, and what methodology was used to determine the land value.

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

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

The following design stages are provided to assist applicants in determining their design percentage for applicable projects:

- ✎ 10-percent (Conceptual) Design – The 10-percent conceptual 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 and seismic literature research has been performed. A list of project objectives, environmental, or infrastructure constraints is provided.
- ✎ 30-percent (Concept) Design – The 30-percent concept design shows project siting and all project materials. Some detail is provided for each of the disciplines (such as civil, structural, mechanical, and geological). Design analysis should be complete at this stage. A preliminary list of specifications required for the project is provided. Preliminary geologic and foundation studies have been performed.
- ✎ 60-percent Design – The 60-percent design is the same as for the 30-percent concept design submittal, but 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 have been completed, lab testing has been performed, structural analysis and/or modeling have been performed, and permitting is underway.

- ✎ 90-percent (Pre-final) Design – The 90-percent pre-final design is the final, un-stamped, submittal. Complete plans and specifications are prepared, and a detailed itemized cost estimate is included.
- ✎ 100-percent (Final) Design – The 100-percent final 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.

Row (d) Construction/Implementation

The detail and supporting documentation should include the quantity of materials used, unit cost, number of units, and, if possible, should have separate costs for labor, equipment, and materials. An estimate of all environmental compliance, mitigation, and enhancement costs should also be included.

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 the construction costs is used to determine administration costs, indicate the percentage used and how the percentage was determined. If the estimate will be based on expected hours of effort, list the hours by discipline, unit cost, equipment costs, and total cost.

The budget should clearly identify any contingency amount (i.e. contingency percentage) applied to the project budget for construction or implementation. If a percentage of the construction costs is used to determine the contingency amount, indicate the percentage used and how the percentage was determined.

Include cost detail for any legal services required to support the project. Include the costs associated with obtaining licenses and permits. Include any costs of monitoring and assessment required during the construction/initial implementation of the project. Do not include any monitoring and assessment costs for efforts required after project construction is complete as those costs are ineligible. Finance planning and monitoring costs necessary for the successful design, selection, and implementation of the project(s) cannot exceed 10 percent of funds allocated to any project (PRC §75072).

For any implementation costs, show as much detail as required to support the implementation costs shown in Row (d).

EXHIBIT D – DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE

The purpose of this exhibit is to provide guidance to applicants for documenting information regarding a project that addresses a need in a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Along with the information provided in Attachment 7, the applicant must also provide relevant DAC project information in the work plan, schedule, and budget sections of the grant application, or in other sections where DAC information is specifically required.

For this grant program, assistance to DACs comes in several forms:

- ↪ *DAC Program Preference* – Meeting program preferences yields additional points for an applicant in the application ranking process.
- ↪ *Funding-Match Reduction* – The required minimum funding match may be reduced from 25 percent for non-DAC-related projects to 1 percent for projects that meet the needs of a DAC.

For assistance on any portion of this exhibit, please contact the DWR point-of contact listed in the foreword.

Determining the DAC Status

DACs are defined as communities with an annual Median Household Income (MHI) that is less than 80 percent of the Statewide annual median household income (PRC §75005 [g]). The American Community Survey (ACS) of the U.S. Census is a source of estimates of MHI for use in determining if a community is a DAC. The most recent and comprehensive data available is for the five-year period between 2009 and 2013. The ACS data gives estimates of MHI for different census geographies, such as for states, counties, census places (incorporated cities and unincorporated towns), census tracts, and census block groups. Using the ACS data for the years 2009-2013, 80 percent of the Statewide MHI is \$48,875. For additional information on the ACS, visit: <http://www.census.gov/acs>.

DWR has developed a mapping tool that utilizes 2009-2013 ACS data to show the location and boundaries of DACs in the State, at the census place, tract, and block group level. The tool allows users to view different geographies or combinations of geographies, using different base maps and to zoom in to various scales. Applicants are encouraged to use the DAC Mapping Tool, available at the following link, to determine if the project area includes a DAC using the most recent data available: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_dac.cfm

For individuals with GIS capabilities, also provided at this link are GIS files representing the ACS data (and DAC status) for the three census geographies.

How to Show Whether a Project Serves a DAC

The applicant may use ACS data at the census place, census tract, or census block group geography levels to show whether a project serves a DAC, based on what geography is the most representative for that community. The allowable alternative geographies are:

1. The project serves an area that is contained within a census place for which the MHI is less than \$48,875.
2. The project serves an area that is contained within one or more census tracts and the MHI of each census tract is less than \$48,875.
3. The project serves an area that is inscribed within one or more census block groups and the MHI of each block group is less than \$48,875.
4. The project serves an area that is inscribed in one or more census tracts or block groups and some (but not all) of the census tracts or block groups have an MHI of less than \$48,875.

In alternative number 4 above, if a project serves a DAC and is divided among several adjoining census tracts or block groups, and some of the project area tracts or block groups do not meet the DAC criterion, the project will be considered a DAC project for the purpose of reducing funding-match requirements in proportion to the population served that meets the DAC criterion. For some projects, it may be more appropriate to use the project cost or area served as the basis for proportioning the project into DAC and non-DAC segments, for instance, when there are differences in population density or in project costs to serve different segments of the project population.

In cases where the ACS five-year survey data does not identify a community as a DAC, DWR will consider use of other data that shows the community as a DAC. For instance, the use of third-party survey data that supports the population served by the project has an MHI of less than \$48,875. In these instances, please contact DWR for a determination of how alternative data may be used to determine whether a community is a DAC.

Meeting a Critical Water Supply or Water Quality Need

To meet the requirements for DAC program preference, in addition to demonstrating that a project area is serving a DAC, the applicant must also describe how a project benefits the water supply or water quality needs of a DAC. Applicants must show how the proposed project(s) addresses a water supply or water quality need that currently poses a threat to the health and safety of the DAC.

Completing Attachment 7

Applicants should ensure the description of the DAC is adequate for DWR to determine whether the communities meet the requirements specified in this exhibit. Applicants are solely responsible for verifying all DAC-provided data is complete and accurate. Grant applicants should provide the following information as Attachment 7:

- ↪ **Identification as DAC.** Include information that identifies the DAC status as shown using the available MHI data or other appropriate data.
 - Where the lack of representative census data that adequately represents the community can be documented, income surveys may be substituted.
 - In determining the MHI for DACs, applicants may use a single type of census geography or combination of census geographies that best represent the DAC.
- ↪ **DAC Project Area.** Include information that supports the determination of DACs in the project area, such as a map or shapefile that shows the project service area is congruent with a DAC. For the applicants with GIS capability, the GIS data files used within the DAC Mapping Tool are

available to download and use from the link above. These GIS files allow applicants to combine project area shapefiles with DAC data layers and will help applicants show the extent of overlap or project areas with DACs.

- ↪ **Regional Projects.** If a regional project is proposed, describe how the regional project provides targeted water supply or water quality benefits. DWR will consider regional projects as meeting a need of DACs in proportion to the extent that the project serves DACs and meets a critical water supply or water quality need. Since the intent of DAC assistance is to provide targeted benefits, presenting the entire county as a DAC is discouraged. This is because there may be census geographies (i.e., places, tracts, and block group) contained in areas of a county that have an MHI greater than the 80 percent of the statewide MHI and thus would not meet the definition of a DAC. It may also be difficult for applicants to demonstrate how a specific project would have targeted water supply or water quality benefits on a county-wide scale.
- ↪ **Letter of Support from DAC.** Include a letter of support from a DAC's representative indicating their support for the proposal or portion of the proposal designed to provide targeted benefits to the DACs.
- ↪ **Critical Water Supply/Water Quality Needs.** Describe the critical water supply or water quality needs of the DACs you have identified.

EXHIBIT E – USEFUL WEB LINKS

Department of Water Resources

Agricultural Drainage Program	http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage/
Bond Accountability	http://bondaccountability.ca.gov/
DWR Home Page	http://www.water.ca.gov/
Grants & Loans Information	http://www.water.ca.gov/funding/
Grants Review and Tracking System (GRanTS)	http://www.water.ca.gov/grants/
San Joaquin River Water Quality (SJRWQ) Grant Program	http://www.water.ca.gov/drainage/grants/sjrwq

CEQA & Environmental Compliance

California State Clearinghouse Handbook	http://opr.ca.gov/docs/SCH_Handbook_2012.pdf
Environmental Information	http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/
Frequently Asked Questions: CEQA Process for DWR Grant Programs	http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/CEQA-GHG_FAQs-Final_8-12.pdf
Informal Guidance for DWR Grantees: GHG Assessment for CEQA Purposes	http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/Guidance%20For%20Grantees-%20Calculating%20GHGs%20for%20CEQA2011.pdf

Eligibility Forms & Application Documentation

AB1420 & Water Metering Self-Certification Forms	http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/finance/
California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM)	http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/casgem/
Department of Industrial Relations	http://www.dir.ca.gov/lcp.asp
Environmental Information Form (EIF)	http://water.ca.gov/drainage/grants/sjrwq/docs/EnvInfoForm.pdf
Environmental Justice	http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/
SBx7-7 Compliance and Agricultural Water Management Plans	http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/finance/
Urban Water Management Review Process	http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/urbanplan/index.cfm
Water Use Efficiency	http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/

Relevant Legislative Codes

California Water Code (CWC)	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=wat&codebody=&hits=20
Public Resource Code (PRC)	http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cacodes/prc.html

EXHIBIT F – AUDITS AND RECORD KEEPING REQUIREMENTS

State Audit Document Requirements and Funding-Match Guidelines for Funding Recipients

The list below details the documents or records that State auditors would need in the event that a grant or loan were to be audited. Grantees and borrowers should ensure that such records are maintained for each funded project. Where applicable, this list of documents also includes documents relating to the borrower/grantee funding match which may be required for audit purposes.

Funding Documentation

Internal Controls:

1. Organization chart (e.g. agency's overall organization chart and organization chart of the staff and stakeholders involved in the grant or loan-funded program or project).
2. Written internal procedures and flowcharts for the following:
 - a. Receipts and deposits.
 - b. Disbursements.
 - c. State reimbursement requests.
 - d. Grant or loan expenditure tracking.
 - e. Guidelines, policies, and procedures on grant or loan-funded program or project.
3. Audit reports of the agency internal control structure or financial statements within the last two years.
4. Prior audit reports on State-funded program or project.

State Funding:

1. Original funding agreement, amendment(s), and budget modification documents.
2. A listing of all bond-funded grants, loans, or subventions received from the State.
3. A listing of all other funding sources for each program or project.

Contracts:

1. All subcontractor and consultant contracts and related or partners documents, if applicable.
2. Contracts between the agency and member agencies as related to the State-funded program or project.

Invoices:

1. Invoices from vendors and subcontractors for expenditures submitted to the State for payments under the funding agreement.
2. Documentation linking subcontractor invoices to State reimbursement, requests, and related funding agreement budget line items.
3. Reimbursement requests submitted to the State for the funding agreement.

Cash Documents:

1. Receipts (copies of warrants) showing payments received from the State.
2. Deposit slips (or bank statements) showing deposit of the payments received from the State.
3. Cancelled checks or disbursement documents showing payments made to vendors, subcontractors, consultants, or agents under the funding agreement.

Accounting Records:

1. Ledgers showing entries posted for loan receipts and cash disbursements.

2. Ledgers showing entries posted for receipts and cash disbursements of other funding sources.
3. Bridging documents that tie the general ledger to requests for funding agreement reimbursement.

Administration Costs:

1. Supporting documents showing the calculation of administration costs.

Personnel:

1. List of all contractors and agency staff that worked on the State-funded program or project.
2. Payroll records including timesheets for contractor staff and the agency personnel who provided services charged to the program.

Project Files:

1. All supporting documentation maintained in the project files.
2. All funding agreement-related correspondence.

Funding-Match Documentation

Funding match (often referred to as borrower/grantee-cost share) consists of non-State funds including in-kind services. In-kind services are defined as work performed (i.e., dollar value of non-cash contributions) by the funding recipient (and potentially other parties involved) directly related to the execution of the scope of work (*examples*: volunteer services, equipment use, and facilities). The cost of in-kind service can be counted as funding match in-lieu of actual funds provided by the funding recipient. Other funding match and in-kind service eligibility conditions may apply. Provided below is guidance for documenting funding match with and without in-kind services.

1. Although tracked separately, in-kind services shall be documented and, to the extent feasible, supported by the same methods used by the funding recipient for its own employees. Such documentation should include the following:
 - a. Detailed description of the contributed item(s) or service(s).
 - b. Purpose for which the contribution was made (tied to project work plan).
 - c. Name of contributing organization and date of contribution.
 - d. Real or approximate value of contribution. Who valued the contribution and how was the value determined? (e.g., actual, appraisal, fair market value, etc.). Justification of rate. (See item #4, below).
 - e. Person's name and the function of the contributing person.
 - f. Number of hours contributed.
 - g. If multiple sources exist, these should be summarized on a table with summed charges.
 - h. Source of contribution if it was provided by, obtained with, or supported by government funds.
2. Rates for volunteer or in-kind services shall be consistent with those paid for similar work in the borrower/grantee's organization. For example, volunteer service of clearing vegetation performed by an attorney shall be valued at a fair market value for this service, not the rate for professional legal services. In instances in which the required skills are not found in the recipient's organization, rates shall be consistent with those paid for similar work in the labor market. Paid fringe benefits that are reasonable, allowable, and allocable may be included in the valuation.

3. Funding-match contribution (including in-kind services) shall be for costs and services directly attributed to activities included in the funding agreement work plan. These services, furnished by professional and technical personnel, consultants, and other skilled and unskilled labor, may be counted as in-kind if the activities are an integral and necessary part of the project funded by the Loan/Grant Agreement.
4. Cash contributions made to a project shall be documented as revenue, not as an expenditure, as would be an in-kind service. These costs should be tracked separately in the borrower/grantee accounting system.