

Attachment 5 - Budget Summary

Introduction

Attachment 5 contains the project budget summaries, descriptions, and overall proposal budget summary. The project budget summaries are consistent with the tasks discussed in the Attachment 4 Work Summary, and demonstrate that the majority of the projects will be ready for construction and implementation by April 1, 2015. The budget descriptions show how each project's budget is reasonable, based on the most current available information. Additional cost estimate backup can be found in "Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf"

This attachment is organized into the following sub-sections:

- Project Budget Summaries
- Proposal Budget Summary

Project Budget Summaries

Project 1: Lower American River Pipeline

Implementing Agency: Carmichael Water District (CWD)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. Land purchase and easement cost estimate is based on staff labor associated with the easement procurement as well as the cost of obtaining the easements. This project will require a temporary construction easement of one property, and a temporary and permanent easement of a second property on the north side of the American River. This project will also require procurement of a lease agreement or easement from Sacramento County for construction of the pipeline within the American River Parkway. Planning cost estimate is based on feasibility investigations completed in 2012. Design and engineering cost estimate is based on a current consultant contract for 30% to 90% design, and planned 100% design and bid-ready plans, specifications, and opinion of probable construction cost. Environmental compliance cost estimate is based on preparation of CEQA initial study and mitigated negative declaration. This project is nearing 60% design completion, and the associated construction/implementation cost estimate has been developed with a 15% contingency consistent with the ACE Standards to reflect unknowns associated with a non-final design package. See attachment "Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf" for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$25,000	\$8,333	\$0	\$33,333
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$200,000
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$1,125,000	\$0	\$1,125,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$750,000	\$3,035,000	\$0	\$3,785,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$775,000	\$4,368,333	\$0	\$5,143,333

***List sources of funding:** Sources of funding include Aerojet/Rocketdyne Corporation via a funding agreement with Carmichael Water District and Golden State Water company.

Project 2: Hazel/50 Intertie Improvements

Implementing Agency: City of Folsom (Folsom)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. Planning cost estimate is based on water availability analyses currently underway. Environmental compliance cost estimate is based on preparation of CEQA initial study and mitigated negative declaration. The cost estimate for construction and implementation are used as planning level costs and discussions with the consultant that developed the estimates considered the scope and size of this project as one that would have similar planning level cost estimates as what is included in attachment “Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf”.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$16,000	\$5,333	\$0	\$21,333
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$85,000	\$0	\$85,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$530,000	\$93,500	\$0	\$623,500
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$546,000	\$183,833	\$0	\$729,833
*List sources of funding: (b) City of Folsom funds.					

Project 3: Well #2 Reactivation

Implementing Agency: City of Lincoln (Lincoln)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The planning, design, engineering and environmental documentation, and construction and implementation cost estimates for this project are based off of a recent bid for work to be performed on the well with adjustments to account for differences in what Lincoln is now proposing. The proposed budget was prepared Lincoln engineering staff with adjustments from the initial bids to account for the minor project modifications.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$9,125	\$3,042	\$0	\$12,167
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$35,000	\$0	\$35,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$187,500	\$27,500	\$0	\$215,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$196,625	\$65,542	\$0	\$262,167
<p>*List sources of funding: <i>The City of Lincoln (Lincoln) expects to pay for the project out of Lincoln’s Water Capital Replacement Fund and Lincoln’s Water Non-Operations Fund as account and project constraints allow. It is Lincoln’s desire to receive financial assistance to replenish the Water Capital Replacement Fund and Water Non-Operations Fund so Lincoln can continue to operate long-term infrastructure and repair projects not crucial to the current drought situation.</i></p>					

Project 4: Nelson Well Improvements

Implementing Agency: City of Lincoln (Lincoln)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The planning, design, engineering and environmental documentation, and construction and implementation cost estimates for this project are based off of bid and invoices for the project the Lincoln received. Current cost estimates to complete the project are in line with the proposed budget set in the winning bid. The proposed budget was prepared by Lincoln engineering staff and the actual cost will depend on any issues that may emerge in the construction phase.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$9,125	\$3,042	\$0	\$12,167
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$210,000	\$40,000	\$0	\$250,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$219,125	\$73,042	\$0	\$292,167
<p>*List sources of funding: <i>The City of Lincoln (Lincoln) expects to pay for the project out of Lincoln’s Water Capitol Replacement Fund and Lincoln’s Water Non-Operations Fund as account and project constraints allow. It is Lincoln’s desire to receive bond reimbursement to replenish the Water Capitol Replacement Fund and Water Non-Operations Fund so Lincoln can continue to operate long-term infrastructure and repair projects not crucial to the current drought situation.</i></p>					

Project 5: PFE & Zone 4 Transfer Pump Stations

Implementing Agency: City of Roseville (Roseville)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The design, engineering, and construction management cost estimates are based on the current approved contract between Roseville and Bennett Engineering Services for the work related to the proposed project. The construction cost is a preliminary engineering estimate based on a similar pump station constructed in 2006. The budget is reasonable because it was prepared by a licensed and registered civil engineer and is based on a similar project already completed.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,500	\$5,833	\$0	\$23,333
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$200,000	\$135,000	\$0	\$335,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$925,000	\$975,000	\$0	\$1,900,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$1,142,500	\$1,115,833	\$0	\$2,258,333
<p>*List sources of funding: Project funding is from the City's capital improvement project (CIP) fund. While the proposed project was envisioned in the City's long term water supply reliability for drought and emergencies, the use of funding is appropriate. However, with the unexpected and unprecedented low rain fall, this project is moved forward and being implemented for summer/fall 2014. As such, funding from DWR from this grant is imperative.</p>					

Project 6: Phase 2B Well Rehabilitations

Implementing Agency: City of Sacramento (Sacramento)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. Cost estimates for planning, design, and environmental documentation are based on work already performed. The project design is already complete and contracting bids have been secured and approved by Sacramento’s governing board. The work is similar in scope to Sacramento’s other Phase 1 rehabilitation project. Given significant completion of the project elements under emergency measures, financial aspects that are often unknowns for projects in a conceptual stage are established in this project. See attachment “Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf” for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$12,084	\$4,028	\$0	\$16,112
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$108,000	\$0	\$0	\$108,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$447,000	\$988,000	\$0	\$1,435,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$597,084	\$992,028	\$0	\$1,589,112
*List sources of funding: Funding needs not met will be paid by the utility rate payers of the City of Sacramento					

Project 7: Sacramento River Pump Station Modifications

Implementing Agency: City of Sacramento (Sacramento)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. Cost estimates for planning, design, and environmental documentation are based on work already performed. Sacramento staff and professional engineering evaluation and design are being tracked and are nearing completion. Material needed for construction have been acquired, and Sacramento staff time for fabrication, which is nearing completion, is being tracked. Bids for addition of vibration monitoring equipment and installation of fabricated vortex breakers onto the intake vertical turbine pumps have already been received. Fabrication of the vortex breakers is substantially complete. See attachment "Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf" for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$6,833	\$2,278	\$0	\$9,111
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$110,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$160,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$156,833	\$52,278	\$0	\$209,111

***List sources of funding:** *Funding unable to be met by grant funds will be paid for by the utility rate payers of the City of Sacramento*

Project 8: Lower American River Pump Station Modifications

Implementing Agency: City of Sacramento (Sacramento)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The evaluation and implementation of similar improvements are sufficiently advanced at Sacramento's other surface water intake structure (see other project application at the Sacramento River Plant project), that a higher degree of confidence regarding budget is warranted. Sacramento staff and professional engineering evaluation/design costs are in progress and being tracked. Private contracting bids for addition of vibration monitoring equipment and installation of the fabricated vortex breakers onto the intake vertical turbine pumps have already been received. See attachment "Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf" for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$6,833	\$2,278	\$0	\$9,111
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$110,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$160,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$156,833	\$52,278	\$0	\$209,111
*List sources of funding: Funding unable to be met by grant funds will be paid for by the utility rate payers of the City of Sacramento.					

Project 9: Main Ditch Piping

Implementing Agency: El Dorado Irrigation District

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The budget for the project is based on standard construction costs and a budget estimate for land purchase and easement, planning, design and engineering, and construction and implementation from the Basis of Design Report prepared by Domenichelli and Associates, June 2014. See attachment "Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf" for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$21,250	\$7,083	\$0	\$28,333
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$73,000	\$292,640	\$0	\$365,640
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$81,100	\$324,220	\$0	\$405,320
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$845,900	\$3,337,140	\$0	\$4,183,040
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$1,021,250	\$3,961,083	\$0	\$4,982,333
*List sources of funding: (b) \$195,000 was provided in grant funding by the El Dorado County Water Agency (\$110,000 for land purchase/easement and \$85,000 for planning/design/engineering/environmental). Remaining funding will be provided by the EID Capital Improvement Program.					

Project 10: Madison Well Construction
Implementing Agency: Fair Oaks Water District

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. Cost estimate for land purchase and easements is based on the 2011 acquisition of the well site. Cost estimates for planning, design, and environmental documentation are based on work already performed in 2014. The project design is already complete and contracting bids have been secured, which is the basis for the construction and implementation cost estimate. The contract has been awarded and the project is under construction further ensuring our confidence in the budget estimate.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$19,375	\$6,458	\$0	\$25,833
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$150,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$600,000	\$400,000	\$0	\$1,000,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$719,375	\$556,458	\$0	\$1,275,833

***List sources of funding:** *Fair Oaks Water District Budget*

Project 11: American River Pump Station Improvements

Implementing Agency: Placer County Water Agency (PCWA)

Budget Description: PCWA has budgeted \$2.5M for this project. Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. PCWA has entered into a purchase agreement with a Weir Floway Inc. to expedite the procurement of the new 41 cfs pump and motor in an amount of \$628,500 due to the long lead time of 9 months. West Yost and Associates has been hired to complete the design of the project. They prepared the specifications for the pump and motor that was used to enter into a purchase agreement with Weir Floway Inc. They have recently completed 90% plans, specifications, and a cost estimate for the facility improvement contract that will install the pump and structural, mechanical, and electrical improvements to place the pump into operation. The construction costs at the 90% design level is \$1.6M (not including contingencies). See attachment "Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf" for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$10,625	\$3,542	\$0	\$14,167
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$155,250	\$51,750	\$0	\$207,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$694,750	\$1,584,083	\$0	\$2,278,833
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$860,625	\$1,639,375	\$0	\$2,500,000
<p>*List sources of funding: (b) Funding for the American River Supply System Improvements would be provided by Western Water System Revenues.</p>					

Project 12: Agricultural and Rural Residential Drought Response Incentives Program

Implementing Agency: Placer County Water Agency (PCWA)

Budget Description: The project budget is reasonable based on available information. Estimates for direct project administration are based on RWA's extensive experience in applying for and managing regional grants through Proposition 13, 50, and 84. No land purchase/easements are necessary because the program only provides incentives to customers for improvements at their properties. The incentives expand an existing successful program, so no additional planning is necessary. Since the project does not involve construction, no design, engineering, or environmental work are required.

It is assumed that this project will affect 1,875 acres of agricultural land across 233 landowners. Implementation of the scheduling support and system upgrades practices will involve expanding the USDA's Environmental Incentives Equipment Program (EQIP). Implementation of the plant material practice will involve expanding PCWA's current program. The exact grant amount per participant will vary depending on the practice implemented but will average \$1,287 for each of the 233 participants. To encourage a broad base of participants a cap of \$5,000/participant has been established. The budget is based on the current documentation of existing like programs that PCWA already implements for urban water use customers and the NRCS's EQIP program.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$6,875	\$4,292	\$0	\$11,167
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$300,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$400,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$306,875	\$104,292	\$0	\$411,167
*List sources of funding: PCWA water use efficiency program budget for non-commercial agricultural and rural residential customer incentives will provide the non-state fund source.					

Project 13: Regional Water Efficiency Drought Measures

Implementing Agency: Regional Water Authority

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The project will provide 1,400 landscape surveys and up to \$1,000 per property for irrigation incentive and/or upgrade with the average property estimated to receive \$800. The budget is based on the current project documentation of several existing programs with the additional consideration of including cash for grass programs into the incentive and upgrade package. Previous programs have not included cash for grass and solely focused on smart controllers averaged lower unit cost around \$500 per property. Cash for grass programs are typically more staff intensive and expensive to implement (but yield more permanent savings) with the incentive ranging from \$500-\$1,000 per household. In order to communicate to customers about these opportunities and about how to water efficiently outdoors, the budget includes \$200,000 for public outreach. This funding would be used to increase the amount of media and event outreach and advertising buys to effectively communicate a regional consistent message with the goal of reducing outdoor water use.

Program administration will be limited because RWA and its member agencies are already implementing similar projects at both the regional and local levels. This project would increase the capacity of those existing programs. The focus on this project is accelerating additional water savings from existing programs. A minimal amount of planning and design funding will be needed for an expanded outreach plan and the addition of cash for grass into the current incentive and upgrades project.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$19,030	\$6,343	\$0	\$25,373
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$10,970	\$4,030	\$0	\$15,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$983,750	\$342,500	\$0	\$1,326,250
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$1,013,750	\$352,873	\$0	\$1,366,623

***List sources of funding:** Match funding will be provided by RWA's Regional Water Efficiency Program and member agency conservation and public outreach budgets.

Project 14: Striker Well Upgrades

Implementing Agency: Sacramento County Water Agency

Budget Description: The budget is based on estimated tasks and purchases associated with the Striker well outfitting project. Only those costs associated with the project from January 2014 forward will be included as part of the grant request and budget description. Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The land purchase, planning, and environmental determination were prepared several years ago and are not included in the project cost estimate.

The engineering component of the Striker well project is mostly completed. The electrical portion of the draft plans are being prepared by Stantec beginning in early 2014 and are currently at 90%. There will also be additional in house final engineering for the: site layout, plumbing, conduits, panels, back-up power generator specifications, auto-transfer switching gear, chemical systems, paving, drainage, and other details. These will be completed after the well’s production levels are verified in July of 2014.

The construction/implementation component of the project includes a well water pump, electric pump motor, electrical systems, chemical systems, SCADA system, pavement, back-up power generator, automatic transfer switching gear, and associated plumbing are based on previous costs for similar projects.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,500	\$5,833	\$0	\$23,333
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$11,600	\$0	\$11,600
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$487,500	\$150,900	\$0	\$638,400
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$505,000	\$168,333	\$0	\$673,333
*List sources of funding: <i>Sacramento County Water Agency Capital Improvement Budget funds.</i>					

Project 15: Antelope Booster Pump Station Phase 2

Implementing Agency: Sacramento Suburban Water District/San Juan Water District

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The planning, design, engineering and environmental documentation, and construction and implementation cost estimates for this project are based off of pre-design, detailed cost estimate developed by Domenichelli & Associates (D&A) for the 10,000 gpm facility. This project was originally proposed as a smaller 4,200 gpm pump station, which was approved for DWR Proposition 84 Implementation Grant, awarded in June, 2011. This proposal includes a larger alternative to original project, which has not been constructed. Local cost share is currently being met for the original project. The budget is reasonable because it was prepared by a licensed and registered civil engineer, and is in line with costs for other similar facilities including a building, pumps, and SCADA as designed by D&A.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$18,125	\$6,042	\$0	\$24,167
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$700,000	\$1,426,000	\$264,000	\$2,390,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$718,125	\$1,832,042	\$264,000	\$2,814,167
<p>*List sources of funding:</p> <p>(b) Project funding is from SSWD & SJWD Reserves. Due to the drought and risk of not meeting water supply needs, this is an unanticipated and unplanned project for SSWD and SJWD that was not included in the past budget documents or master planning efforts. As such, funding from DWR from this grant is imperative.</p> <p>(c) SSWD has also received a DWR Proposition 84 Implementation Grant, awarded in June 2011, for a previous phase of the project in the amount of \$264,000. Per the Grant Agreement, the grant funds must be expended by June 1, 2016.</p>					

Project 16: Enterprise Intertie Improvements

Implementing Agency: Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD)

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. The project budget was prepared based on similar projects that utilized flow control valves and instrumentation and controls to provide water from one pressure zone to another within SSWD. Specifically, the Bainbridge Intertie/Pressure Reduction Project completed in 2006, and more recently The Arbors Pressure Reduction Project in 2013/2014. These projects utilized similar equipment and materials that would be used in the subject project. An existing intertie with the City of Sacramento (Sacramento) already exists at this location. However, this intertie was originally designed only for SSWD to take delivery of treated surface water from Sacramento. The intertie already includes a bi-directional flow meter. However, in order for SSWD to supply groundwater to Sacramento, new above-ground piping, isolation valves, a control valve, instrumentation and controls, and Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) integration and programming will be required. This will allow SSWD to remotely monitor and control the amount of water passing through the intertie as well as the pressure in both systems. See attachment "Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf" for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$10,625	\$3,542	\$0	\$14,167
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$100,000	\$45,000	\$0	\$145,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$110,625	\$52,542	\$0	\$163,167
*List sources of funding SSWD reserves will be used to fund the non-state fund share..					

Project 17: Barton Road Intertie

Implementing Agency: San Juan Water District

Budget Description: Direct project administration cost estimate is based on extensive prior experience by RWA for grant labor compliance, grant application development, and grant management for this scale of project. San Juan Water District has contracted with a professional licensed engineer (Engineer) to develop the design plans, specifications and probable cost for construction. A geotechnical evaluation of the alignment was completed and topographical survey performed in April, 2014; and 90% design completed in June, 2014. Based on this information and through the development of the design, the Engineer has estimated the project cost to be approximately \$1.2M; this includes a 10% contingency for unknown circumstances identified during construction. See attachment “Att5_DG_Budget_2of2.pdf” for additional detail.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$19,375	\$6,458	\$0	\$25,833
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$700,000	\$423,000	\$0	\$1,123,000
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$719,375	\$459,458	\$0	\$1,178,833
<p>*List sources of funding: <i>Project funding is from SJWD Reserves and a cost-share with PCWA. Cost share is currently under negotiation. Due to the drought and risk of not meeting water supply needs, this is an unanticipated and unplanned project for SJWD and PCWA that was not included in the past budget documents or master planning efforts. As such, funding from DWR from this grant is imperative.</i></p>					

Proposal Budget Summary

Table 8 – Summary Budget						
Proposal Title: American River Basin Drought Response Program						
Individual Project Title		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost	% Funding Match (Col b/Col d)
(a)	Project 1: Lower American River Pipeline	\$775,000	\$4,368,333	\$0	\$5,143,333	85%
(b)	Project 2: Hazel/50 Intertie Improvements	\$546,000	\$183,833	\$0	\$729,833	25%
(c)	Project 3: Well #2 Reactivation	\$196,625	\$65,542	\$0	\$262,167	25%
(d)	Project 4: Nelson Well Improvements	\$219,125	\$73,042	\$0	\$292,167	25%
(e)	Project 5: PFE and Zone 4 Transfer Pump Stations	\$1,142,500	\$1,115,833	\$0	\$2,258,333	49%
(f)	Project 6: Phase 2B Well Rehabilitations	\$597,084	\$992,028	\$0	\$1,589,112	62%
(g)	Project 7: Sacramento River Pump Station Modifications	\$156,833	\$52,278	\$0	\$209,111	25%
(h)	Project 8: Lower American River Pump Station Modifications	\$156,833	\$52,278	\$0	\$209,111	25%
(i)	Project 9: Main Ditch Piping	\$1,021,250	\$3,961,083	\$0	\$4,982,333	80%
(j)	Project 10: Madison Well Construction	\$719,375	\$556,458	\$0	\$1,275,833	44%

Table 8 – Summary Budget						
Proposal Title: American River Basin Drought Response Program						
Individual Project Title		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost	% Funding Match (Col b/Col d)
(k)	Project 11: American River Pump Station Improvements	\$860,625	\$1,639,375	\$0	\$2,500,000	66%
(l)	Project 12: Agricultural and Rural Residential Drought Response Incentives Program	\$306,875	\$104,292	\$0	\$411,167	25%
(m)	Project 13: Regional Water Efficiency Drought Measures	\$1,013,750	\$352,873	\$0	\$1,366,623	26%
(n)	Project 14: Striker Well Upgrades	\$505,000	\$168,333	\$0	\$673,333	25%
(o)	Project 15: Antelope Booster Pump Station Phase 2	\$710,625	\$1,839,542	\$264,000	\$2,814,167	65%
(p)	Project 16: Enterprise Intertie Improvements	\$118,125	\$45,042	\$0	\$163,167	28%
(q)	Project 17: Barton Road Intertie	\$719,375	\$459,458	\$0	\$1,178,833	39%

Table 8 – Summary Budget						
Proposal Title: American River Basin Drought Response Program						
Individual Project Title		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost	% Funding Match (Col b/Col d)
	Proposal Total					
(r)	Sum rows (a) through (q) for each column	\$9,765,000	\$16,029,623	\$264,000	\$26,058,623	62%
(s)	DAC Funding Match Waiver Total Sum column (d) only for projects seeking DAC funding match waiver in rows (a) through (q)	–	–	–	–	–
(t)	Grand Total Subtract row (s) from row (r) for column (d) and recalculate column (e)	\$9,765,000	\$16,029,623	\$264,000	\$26,058,623	62%