Frequently Asked Questions
Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Program (Round 1)

#	Question Type	Question	Answer	Date Posted
1	Clarification	If multiple IRWM regions in a funding area had a binding agreement between them regarding timing and amount of grant applications, and one IRWM did not abide by that agreement would DWR refrain from awarding that specific IRWM grant pending any legal action taken by the remaining IRWMs bound by the agreement?	DWR would evaluate the applications per our guidelines and PSP. DWR releases "draft funding recommendations" and receives public comment. IRWM regions that are considering legal action may comment on the "draft funding recommendations". At that point DWR may consider public comment before the Director makes the final awards.	12/3/2010
2	Clarification	If an applicant cannot be awarded its full funding request, due to funding limitations, will it be expected to increase its funding match or will it be allowed to reduce the scope of the work plan?	If a grantee is awarded partial funding, the grantee is allowed to determine how their proposal would be modified. The choice to reduce scope or assume the additional funding match is up to the grantee. Scope changes will be reviewed by DWR prior to acceptance.	12/3/2010
3	Clarification	Please clarify requirement for tribes to be notified by CEQA lead agency prior to adoption of CEQA itself?	Please refer to Appendix D of the Guidelines.	12/3/2010
4	Clarification	What is the date that funding match can be claimed after? What is the date when a grantee can begin to get reimbursed with grant funds?	Costs incurred after September 30, 2008 are eligible as funding match. Reimbursable costs begin at the award date of the grant, anticipated to occur around June 1, 2011.	12/3/2010
5	Clarification	As DWR is often the responsible agency for CEQA, will DWR be providing any guidance on criteria for CEQA compliance on topics such as climate change? If so, where will that information be available at and when might it be available?	DWR has and will continue to post additional guidance documents relating to climate change. Climate change clearing house documentation can be found here: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_resourceslinks.cfm	12/3/2010
6	Clarification	What action will DWR take if a grantee, who obtains funding through this grant, fails to update their IRWM Plan within the required two years?	As described in the Consent Form provided as Exhibit H of PSP, failure to update the IRWM Plan within two years of the execution date of the agreement may result in termination of the grant agreement by DWR and that DWR may demand the immediate repayment of funds disbursed prior to such termination.	12/3/2010
7	Clarification	Can volunteer time be counted toward local match cost?	Yes. The donated (volunteer or in-kind) service must be specific, reasonably valued as determined by DWR, otherwise reimbursable, and related to the proposed work in the grant application. For example, a member of the public actively serving on a committee of the IRWM or writing a portion of the IRWM plan is performing a specific service to the IRWM and can be counted as in-kind service.	12/3/2010
8	Clarification	How secure is funding and what steps is DWR taking?	DWR has funding to proceed with the grant program. DWR does not have all the bond sale allocations to cover the entire amount of the grants. Bond sale allocations are based upon a six-month "immediate" need. Therefore, DWR will continue to work to request bond sale allotments over the life of this program.	12/3/2010
9	Clarification	Is there a deadline for the completion of a project?	As stated in the PSP on page 20, under Schedule, an assumed end date of the grant agreement will not be established by DWR, instead applicants must include a reasonable estimate of the end date, based on their Proposal including time for any final reports and invoicing.	12/3/2010
10	Clarification	Can a project proponent not identified in the 2009 Region Acceptance Process apply?	Yes.	12/3/2010
11	Climate Change	When is EPA handbook on Climate Change going to be ready?	DWR anticipates a tentative release of the document in Spring 2011.	12/3/2010
12	Disadvantaged Communities	Are projects put forth for Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) communities required to be ready for construction?	No. Eligible projects in direct support of DACs include feasibility studies that may lead to a construction project to address DAC needs; engineering designs and specification; or needs assessments where a critical water supply or quality issue is perceived but specific needs have not been determined (see Guidelines, page 17).	12/3/2010

Frequently Asked Questions
Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Program (Round 1)

#	Question Type	Question	Answer	Date Posted
13	Disadvantaged Community Funding Match Waiver	If a proposal contains one or more DAC projects, is the minimum 25% funding match required on the Total Proposal Cost?	No. For proposals that contain DAC projects and are requesting DAC waivers, for the purposes of budget and funding match in the application, applicants can assume the waiver is granted and show a funding match of less than 25%. For example, if a proposal contains 4 projects (1 DAC and 3 non-DAC), each requesting $1M of grant funding, a minimum of only $750K of cost share would need to be provided. In addition, the budget should show how that reduced funding match is manifested on the project level (i.e. which projects contain what portion of funding match). Based on DAC information included in the application, DWR will determine if the DAC waiver is actually granted.	10/7/2010
14	Documentation	Should applicant submit all documents referenced in the Proposal work plan(s)?	Exhibit A - Work Plan provides guidance for presenting the Work Plan for the Proposal. Submittal of plans and specifications consistent with the design tasks included in the Work Plan (if applicable) is required. They should be uploaded to BMS as part of Attachment 3. Specific documents (scientific/technical/feasibility reports, etc.) that are discussed in Exhibit A and that support the feasibility of the Proposal are not required; however, applicant should include reference citations, as well as references to the page locations of the studies or reports that support the work plan, as appropriate.	12/3/2010
15	Economic Analysis	Is the economic analysis required by the Prop 50 proposal solicitation package (PSP) similar to that required by the Prop 84 PSP?	In general, yes, but there are differences. Notably, a) flood damage reduction methods described in Exhibit E are more detailed; b) the scoring criteria are different (in part to reflect differences in bond language); and c) Prop 50 limited the discussion of project benefits to 50 years, while Prop 84 PSP simply directs applicants to use the project life, whatever it is.	12/3/2010
16	Economic Analysis	If a project is not well into at least the design phase is it possible to provide a good (quantified), cost/benefit analysis?	Regardless of the current phase of a project, an estimate or description of costs and benefits is required. At a minimum, a good narrative description of the project's costs and benefits should be provided.	12/3/2010
17	Economic Analysis	For a project that will be completed in separate phases (such as a recycled water project), that will request grant funding for one phase, how should the economic analysis be structured in the PSP?	The workshop presentation dealt with this issue in general terms. All costs needed to achieve the benefits claimed must be included. If the project is in a second or later phase, then sunk costs and opportunity costs are relevant. Sunk costs, costs that have already been spent and cannot be recovered or salvaged, need not be included. Examples of sunk costs could be money spent on CEQA compliance, or concrete work if it would have no salvage value. Opportunity costs, items already purchased that have value (e.g. land, machinery that could be re-sold or used elsewhere), should be shown as a cost at its current value. If there will be future phases, and the application is claiming benefits from those future phases, the costs of the future phases must be included in the cost table. It is possible and understood that the cost of a future phase will not be as detailed as the cost for the current phase. Also, note that a commitment to provide the full level of benefits may be required.	12/3/2010
18	Economic Analysis	If a proposal seeks funding for a single phase of a larger project, should the application include costs and benefits for just this phase or for the entire project?	If the proposal is successful, a commitment to provide the benefits may be a term of the grant agreement. Therefore, if the funding needed to provide the larger benefit is assured, only costs and benefits of this phase need to be shown.	12/3/2010
19	Economic Analysis	How should a project that lacks a project alternative (ex. a septic system conversion, required by mandate) be analyzed for benefits?	Explain what would happen if the project cannot be built. If the project is built, aren't there some water quality problems that are remedied? At a minimum, explain these improvements in physical terms. If there truly is no project alternative other than the proposed project, be sure to explain why.	12/3/2010
20	Economic Analysis	In benefit analysis, what is meant by "Measure of Benefit (Units)", for example, on Table 12?	Table 12 is for displaying benefits that are estimated on a per-unit basis, for example per unit of water purchased. "Measure of benefit" in column (c) is simply the units used for measuring the benefit - for example, acre-feet, or tons of salt, or salinity in parts per thousand. Do not put the actual numerical estimates into column (c) - those go into the next columns.	12/3/2010

Frequently Asked Questions
Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Program (Round 1)

#	Question Type	Question	Answer	Date Posted
21	Economic Analysis	If a proposed project involving bridge repairs, to reduce scouring, will also include ecosystem restoration (ER) activities, how should the economic benefits for the ER activities be derived?	The benefits may be difficult to quantify. Minimally, include a detailed narrative description of the project's physical ER benefits such as acreage and species. If reasonable, an estimate of the cost of obtaining the same benefits in some other way may be used as the measure of benefit. Also, an available resource is to review successful Proposition 50 applications, to see if there are examples of economic analysis for similar projects. Access is through the State Water Board's FAAST tool at: https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/PublicProposalsSearch.asp	12/3/2010
22	Economic Analysis	Is there a standardized method to apply dollars to habitat restoration?	There is no standard method. In some cases the restored habitat itself can be valued using the avoided cost of an alternative. In some cases, prices paid for the same habitat elsewhere can indicate value (but be careful that the habitat lands are similar in the kind and location of habitat). Existing economic studies of similar restoration can be used if available, but use and document carefully. Finally, it is not necessary to quantify in dollars if there simply is no way to quantify the physical habitat change or if there are no comparable economic studies or alternative cost approaches- just describe the changes.	12/3/2010
23	Economic Analysis	The Implementation Workshop presentation referred to Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP). What is it?	This procedure is a standardized approach to habitat evaluation. Please reference the HEP at U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (see Habitat Evaluation Procedures Manual 870 FW 1) http://www.fws.gov/policy/870fw1.html	12/3/2010
24	Economic Analysis	Is it possible for one project to have both qualitative AND quantitative benefits?	Yes. Where quantitative analysis is not available (or possible), provide a detailed narrative description of the projects benefits.	12/3/2010
25	Economic Analysis	Should costs for CEQA compliance be included in the cost table for economic analysis?	Yes, if the costs for CEQA have not yet been incurred. If they have already been incurred, they would generally be considered a sunk cost, and need not be included in the cost table for economic analysis.	12/3/2010
26	Economic Analysis	Why should costs and benefits many decades into the future be included? Doesn't discounting make them inconsequential?	A reasonable project life should be selected and all costs and benefits during that life should be shown. In general, discounting at the 6% rate does make many of those future costs or benefits inconsequential, but there can be cases where they are not - for example if the real value of a benefit is trending upward due to population growth (be sure to document the source for real trends).	12/3/2010
27	Economic Analysis	Table 11 requires annual cost of project for the project life. Is that the total cost of the project?	In Table 11 or 17, display how the initial cost will be incurred over the years, and provide Operation, Maintenance, and Replacement (OM&R) costs in the spaces provided, then total for each year and discount. The total of Table 11 or 17 initial costs should match Table 7 except: 1) some costs reported in Table 7 may be sunk now, and 2) the market value of costs associated with budget components in Table 7 may now differ from what was paid. Please explain any differences.	12/3/2010
28	Economic Analysis	The cost and benefits tables start at 2009. What data should be entered in the years 2009 to 2010?	Do not enter any cost or benefits data for these years. Most costs paid in 2009 and 2010 are likely sunk costs now. If any costs could be recovered now, enter that amount in the cost row for 2011.	12/3/2010
29	Economic Analysis	In Table 11 (or 17), if a project replaces an inefficient system with an efficient one thereby reducing the current operation and maintenance cost, does the incremental cost get reported as a zero or negative value?	No. Report the capital cost of the project in Tables 7 and 11 (or 17), and claim the cost savings as a benefit in Table 12 or 14.	12/3/2010
30	Economic Analysis	Can a project elect not to use a unit value for salinity in determining water quality benefit?	Yes, an avoided project approach and a format similar to Table 13 may be used. In Southern California, the Lower Colorado River Basin Water Quality Model (LCRBWQM) can provide benefits of salinity reduction for 15 different regions. Other sources or methods may also be used.	12/3/2010
31	Economic Analysis	If a proposal does not contain any flood control projects could it lose possible points?	If there are no flood control benefits, flood control points cannot be obtained. However, it is still possible for a proposal to score well overall if well-documented benefits in the other categories exceed costs.	12/3/2010
32	Economic Analysis	If a proposal does not include a flood control project, will Tables 17-19 need to be completed?	No.	12/3/2010

Frequently Asked Questions
Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Program (Round 1)

#	Question Type	Question	Answer	Date Posted
33	Economic Analysis	If a proposed project is scheduled to start in April of a future year, can benefits from that year be claimed?	Partial year benefits in the first operational year of the project may be claimed.	12/3/2010
34	Economic Analysis	For a proposed project with substantial urban water shortages in the without project condition that will be reduced somewhat in the with project condition, how should the benefits of the reduced shortage be quantified?	If available, use information about how the shortage would be accommodated without project. This might include, for example, specific conservation practices and specific reduced or lost uses such as non-irrigation of parks and landscapes. If these are not enough to accommodate the without-project shortage, the cost of the next most expensive water supplies may be used. These could be desalination, recycling, and/or trucking water. If these are not feasible or insufficient, an estimate of the avoided cost of additional customer shortage using existing studies or demand elasticity estimates may be used. Be sure to justify and document.	12/3/2010
35	Economic Analysis	If an applicant's proposal includes components of a larger project and another applicant's proposal includes the remaining components, can both applicants claim the same water as a benefit?	Do not allow the same water supply to be claimed as a benefit in more than one proposal. The share of water to attribute to and claim in each proposal should be estimated based on share of total cost, this total cost being the sum of costs from the two proposals. The double-counting of water must be avoided. Also, note that a commitment to provide the full level of benefits may be required.	12/3/2010
36	Economic Analysis	How should the supply benefits from multiple water supply projects be presented when the projects are interdependent?	If supply from two or more projects are interdependent, it is not appropriate to present benefits from the individual projects alone because the benefits cannot be obtained without the other project(s) and double-counting is likely. Either present the total supply and benefit of the combined projects as a stand-alone project, or allocate the total benefit of the combined projects among the projects based on the share of cost in each project as in Economic FAQ immediately above.	12/3/2010
37	Economic Analysis	How should project proponents who are customers of Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) use MWD's nominal water price projections for the economic analysis of their proposed projects?	The nominal water price projections show what MWD expects to charge for years into the future. All costs and benefits in the economic analysis should be in 2009 dollars and should be net of inflation. Therefore, inflation needs to be removed from the MWD prices. Ask MWD what their assumption was for future general price inflation. If, for example, the inflation assumption was 3 percent, and MWD projected a nominal price increase of 7 percent annually, the real rate of increase is 4 percent.	12/3/2010
38	Economic Analysis	Regarding MWD's price projections (above), what values should project proponents use for years beyond MWD's projections?	Extrapolate into the future based on the rate at the end of MWD's price projection period.	12/3/2010
39	Economic Analysis	The Implementation Workshop Economic Analysis presentation included the sentence "do not confuse a hydrologic sequence with a planning horizon." What is meant by that?	The hydrologic sequence shows the effects of variability in hydrology. Any observed value in the hydrologic sequence could occur in any year of the planning horizon. Each year of the planning horizon should be an expected value under the planned conditions in that future year, not a specific year from the hydrologic sequence.	12/3/2010
40	Economic Analysis	What is considered to be an adequate B/C ratio for a proposed project?	The proposals will not be judged based on individual project B/C ratios. Rather, the total benefits in each scoring category (supply, quality/other, flood damage reduction) will be judged.	12/3/2010
41	Economic Analysis	For a proposed project that will provide flood control, wetlands, and habitat restoration benefits of unknown quantities, how should benefits be presented?	At a minimum, provide a good description of project benefits.	12/3/2010
42	Economic Analysis	Who should be contacted for questions regarding the Economic Analysis?	Farhad Farnam, DWR, 916-653-9415, farhad@water.ca.gov	12/3/2010
43	Economic Analysis	In reference to Table 10 of the PSP, if a project is using cost estimates prior to 2002, what Update Factor should be applied?	As an update to Table 10, the following Update Factors should be applied: 1997 1.34 1998 1.32 1999 1.29 2000 1.25 2001 1.21	12/3/2010

Frequently Asked Questions
Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Program (Round 1)

#	Question Type	Question	Answer	Date Posted
44	FA Balance Points	How will Funding Area Balance Points be awarded?	If used, points may be awarded by a selection panel after technical reviews are complete. The panel will evaluate each of the applicants within a funding area and award points according to the applicants IRWM Plan development and grant status. Preference may be given to those region's who have yet to receive IRWM grant funds.	12/3/2010
45	Funding	In an earlier workshop, it was said that 10% of the Prop 84 funding is available to DWR to cover admin costs. Is that 10% coming out of the grant amounts shown in Table 2, basically the $200,000,000, or is it above and beyond the amounts shown in the table?	To clarify, only 5% of the Prop 84 allocation is available to DWR for administrative costs. An additional 3.5% is used by the State Treasurer's Office for bond issuance related administration for a total of 8.5%. This 8.5% will be assessed to each of the Funding Area allocations over the life of the grant program, but it will not reduce the $200,000,000 available for award during this first round of Implementation.	12/3/2010
46	Funding	If multiple applicants within a funding area request the maximum grant amount, with equally scored applications, will DWR consider fully funding each proposal rather than partially funding?	If IRWM regions from other Funding Areas have submitted applications that do not adequately address DWR's scoring criteria, DWR will consider awarding the maximum grant amount to more than one applicant within a Funding Area.	12/3/2010
47	Funding	Can a Funding Area receive funding above the amount in Column D in Table 2 of the Implementation PSP?	It is possible for a Funding Area to be awarded more than the amount in Column D (as referenced in the answer above), but individual IRWM regions will not be awarded more than the amount in Column D.	12/3/2010
48	Funding Area Allocation	Can an applicant's project be funded by a Funding Area (FA) other than its own?	Yes, if the Regional Water Management Group(s) for the other FA(s) supports the use of the funds for the project(s). As described on page 18 of the Guidelines: This is allowable, but the applicant must include in their proposal: - Clear explanation of how the project contributes directly to the objectives of their IRWM Plan - Description of the IRWM regions' efforts to cooperate on planning and implementation - Description of the level of support for the project from both IRWM regions.	10/7/2010
49	Funding Area Allocation	If an IRWM that is shown as being in two funding areas, Mojave for example, is awarded an implementation grant, how will that grant amount be divided between the total available for each funding area?	As described in the Guidelines, starting on pg. 17, section III.C.3 - Funding Projects in Adjacent Funding Areas.	12/3/2010
50	Funding Match	Is a funding match of 25% required for the individual projects or the overall proposal?	A funding match of 25% is required for the overall proposal. If a DAC is included, the 25% funding match requirement for that project may be waived (see DAC FAQ above).	12/3/2010
51	Invoicing	Does the grantee need to provide proof that a contractor's invoice has been paid to be reimbursed or is the invoice sufficient?	As long as the Grantee can prove that the work in question has been performed by documenting, hours, rates and all other necessary backup information and has approved the incurred costs, DWR will not require that the Grantee's subcontractors and/or subconsultants have been paid prior to reimbursement to the Grantee.	12/3/2010

Frequently Asked Questions
Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Program (Round 1)

#	Question Type	Question	Answer	Date Posted
52	IRWM Plan Adoption	Must all project proponents (defined on Page 9 of Guidelines) included in the Round 1 Implementation Grant Application adopt the IRWM Plan prior to January 7, 2011?	As stated on page 6 of the Implementation, Round 1 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP), per CWC Section §83002.(b)(3)(B), project proponents must be included in an IRWM Plan that: (1) complies with CWC §10530, Part 2.2 of Division 6 (IRWM Plan Standards found in the Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E Guidelines) or (2) was adopted before September 30, 2008, with an agreement to update within two years of the execution date of the grant agreement. Per PSP, page 8, those applicants complying with conditions 1 or 2 are allowed to add implementation projects post adoption date, as long as it is demonstrated the project is fully vetted through the IRWM. This may mean addition of project proponents post adoption date. Therefore: • Proponents of projects included in an IRWM Plan meeting condition (1) must adopt the Plan prior to the submittal of the Round 1 Implementation Grant Application as such a plan should be adopted recently and contain all the associated project proponents and implementation projects. • Proponents of projects that were added post adoption per the PSP allowances for IRWM plans meeting complying with condition (2) will not be required to adopt the Plan prior to the submittal of the Implementation Grant Application, but will be required to adopt the Plan once it has been updated.	10/7/2010
53	Labor Compliance	If a project proponent, who is a public agency, will be completing their own construction (i.e. using their labor), are they subject to Labor Compliance (i.e. do they need to hire a third party labor compliance person)?	Proposition 84 language is as follows: 75075. *The body awarding any contract for a public works project financed in any part from funds made available pursuant to this division shall adopt and enforce, or contract with a third party to enforce, a labor compliance program pursuant to subdivision (b) of Labor Code Section 1771.5 for application to that public works project.* DWR will comply with the Proposition 84 code. DWR recommends that a project proponent seek the advice of their legal counsel to evaluate this requirement as it relates to self performed construction.	12/3/2010
54	Performance Measures	What is the difference between "Output indicators" and "Outcome Indicators" referenced on page 21 of the Implementation PSP references for Attachment 6 – Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures? Please provide examples.	As described on page 21 of the Implementation PSP, output indicators are measures to effectively track output, i.e., to quantify project delivery. Examples of output indicators may include: length of pipeline built; area of ecosystem enhanced, volume of additional water supply developed, etc. Therefore, the applicant must develop measures to track output indicators. Outcome indicators are described as measures to evaluate change that is a direct result of the work, i.e., to verify project performance. Examples of outcome indicators may include: improved habitat, increased water supply reliability, improved water quality, reduced TMDL, etc.	12/3/2010
55	SB 855/Addendum	SB 855 appropriated additional Proposition 84 funding that can be available in Round 1. In areas that receive water supplied by the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, does a proposed project or program that receives funds from SB 855 have to reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply?	No. The proposed project or program specifically does not have to reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The language in the November 5, 2010 Addendum says "eligible programs and projects shall be a component of an existing IRWM plan that will help reduce dependence on the delta for water supply". Therefore, the IRWM plan must help reduce dependence on the delta regardless of the specific projects being proposed.	12/3/2010
56	SB 855/Addendum	In the November 5, 2010 *Addendum to the IRWM Implementation Grant Round 1 PSP,* what does DWR mean by an "area?"	The "area" referred to is the area covered by the IRWM plan.	12/3/2010
57	SB 855/Addendum	SB 855 appropriated additional Proposition 84 funding that can be available in Round 1. Are these funds available statewide, or are they limited to only those IRWM regions that receive water supplied from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta?	SB 855 funds are available statewide. This means that IRWM regions that do not receive water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) are eligible for the additional SB 855 funds. IRWM regions that do receive water from the Delta are also eligible for the SB 855 funds, but only if they meet the Eligibility Criteria specified in the November 5, 2010 Addendum, and supply the necessary information requested in the Addendum.	12/3/2010

Frequently Asked Questions
Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Program (Round 1)

#	Question Type	Question	Answer	Date Posted
58	SB 855/Addendum	In order to be eligible for 855 funds, is there a certain percent reduction of dependence on the Delta that is targeted? And if so, is there a funding area or region target?	No, there is no reduction target for either funding areas or regions.	12/3/2010
59	SB 855/Addendum	SBX7 8 allocated $250 million from Proposition 84 for IRWM grants, then SB 855 simply added that $100 million be earmarked for programs that reduce dependence on the Sacrament-San Joaquin Delta? There isn't actually additional funding, it is just allocated differently?	SB 855 reverted the SBx7-8 appropriation and then appropriated the same amount with slightly different clarifying language. Of the $250M dollars appropriated by SB855, DWR has moved $100M into Round 1 so that Round 1 now contains a total of $200M available.	12/3/2010
60	SB 855/Addendum	As it relates to the SB 855 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta requirement, how does DWR define the Delta?	DWR defines the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as the "The Legal Delta". http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/DeltaAtlas/02-General.pdf.	12/3/2010
61	Scoring Criteria	How should an applicant handle tasks completed on a project that is requesting grant funds that started prior to September 30, 2008?	In order to demonstrate completeness, the applicant should include those tasks completed prior to September 30, 2008 in the budget, schedule, and work plan, but no funding match can be claimed for those tasks.	12/3/2010
62	Travel Costs	Are travel costs eligible for match or reimbursement?	As stated on page 28 of the Guidelines, travel costs incurred on IRWM Implementation and SWFM Grants are not eligible as funding match or for reimbursement.	12/3/2010
63	UWMP/AB 1420	If a project proponent previously submitted AB 1420 compliance documentation as part of another IRWM grant program, will the proponent need to resubmit for Implementation?	It depends. If that documentation was submitted to and approved by DWR within the past 6 months and there are no changes, then no. However, where updates or changes are needed, an urban water supplier who has previously submitted this documentation (specifically Tables 1 and 2, referenced in PSP Attachment 13), will need to re-submit updated tables and must include any changes in the implementation schedule, financing, budget, and level of coverage.	12/3/2010
64	UWMP/AB 1420	If the tentative award date for Implementation Grants is June 2011 and 2010 Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) are not due to the Office of Water Use Efficiency (OWUE) until July 1, 2011, how can UWMPs be reviewed for adequacy as a condition of a grant agreement?	The execution of an implementation grant agreement typically takes 3 to 6 months. If the final grant award date is tenatatively scheduled for June 2011, it is unlikely that a grant agreement would be executed before September 2011. OWUE intends to give priority review of UWMPs to urban water suppliers that have pending grant awards to help expedite the grant agreement process. Therefore, it is unlikely that the UWMP review schedule will impact the execution of a grant agreement. However, project proponents may consider submitting their UWMPs to OWUE well in advance of July 1, 2011 to help avoid any potential delay.	12/3/2010
65	UWMP/AB 1420	Will DWR require a review of the 2005 UWMP, or the 2010 UWMP?	Page 16 of the Guidelines states "Applicants and project proponents that are urban water suppliers and have projects that would receive funding through the IRWM grant program must have a 2010 UWMP (due by July 1, 2011) that has been verified as complete by DWR before a grant agreement can be executed."	12/3/2010

Last Updated: December 3, 2010

This table will be periodically updated; however, DWR will not circulate an email each time an update occurs. Please compare the "last updated" date with any previous versions you may have printed to ensure you have the latest information.