

ATTACHMENT 4 - Budgets

Supporting Documentation General to All Projects

Budgets have been produced for each project by Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group in accordance with engineering standard cost estimating procedures. For each of the projects, a manhour estimate was created for each task/sub-task for agency staff time, legal counsel, CEQA/engineering/survey consulting staff, and electrical/geotechnical sub-consultants; these manhour spreadsheets have not been included in the application due to page restrictions and can be provided upon request as supporting documentation. Salaries for consulting staff are based upon their current fee schedule and represent a median value for each staff type (e.g. Principal Engineer, Associate Engineer, etc). Salaries for the agency staff (BVWSD, GHCSO, and LOWMWC) are based upon their pro-rated salary and benefits costs. Mileage, per diem and travel costs are not included since they are not eligible for reimbursement. Costs are not included for post-construction monitoring and maintenance since they will take place after the project, and can be performed by existing staff under their current operations budgets. All surveying and contracted construction costs are based on local prevailing wage rates.

Engineering Opinions of Probable Construction Costs (EOPCCs) were also prepared for each project and are included in this Attachment. To estimate these construction costs, cost data were obtained from similar project bid canvasses, product vendors, contractors, RS Means (an online construction cost database), as well as Provost & Pritchard's past project experience.

DWR budget tables (PSP Tables 8 and 9) are included at the end of this Attachment.

4.1 Project 1: Grant Administration

Category (a) – Direct Project Administration (Tasks 1-3)

PSP Table 8 for Project 1 provides a summary of the overall grant administration costs that are expected to be expended over the course of implementing all of the projects within this Proposal (from Grant Award to June 2017). The manhours developed for these costs are approximated based on manhours expended on prior IRWM Round 2 Implementation Grants and 2014 Drought Grants managed by Provost & Pritchard. Over this time period, five quarterly reports will be prepared. Reimbursement requests will also be prepared quarterly with the exception of the LOWMWC, which will prepare monthly requests for reimbursement (including a monthly progress report). This exception is needed as LOW, being a disadvantaged community, has limited operating reserves to receive quarterly payments, especially during construction.

The overall grant administration costs under the three tasks have been allocated to each of the project proponents based on the estimated work for administering the grant on behalf of their projects. This depends upon the timeline for each project and the additional invoicing in the case of LOW. The costs have been distributed in this manner to provide proper accounting for each project proponent. Additionally, the LOWMWC service area is within a disadvantaged community place and has requested a funding match waiver; its share of these costs has been accounted for in the LOWMWC funding match waiver. The funding match for BVWSD and GHCSO is the same as the overall % Funding Match in Projects 2 & 3, respectively.

The combined Direct Project Administration (Category (a) of Projects 1 through 4) is less than 5% of the overall Proposal costs (\$209,000 or 4.3%).

4.2 Project 2: BVWSD The Palms Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project

Category (a) – Direct Project Administration (Tasks 1-3)

Costs for the tasks associated with Direct Project Administration specific to this Project, including grant administration, invoicing and preparation of required progress reports and the project completion report, were estimated as 2% of Categories (b), (c), and (d). Under the 2014 Drought Solicitation Implementation Grant, BVWSD has prepared a Labor Compliance Plan (LCP) and is awaiting approval of the plan; no costs have been included under this grant for this Task since the District should be able to use the existing LCP. These percentages are consistent with recent experience from similar DWR grant funded projects in the past.

Category (b) – Land Purchase/Easement (Task 4)

No easements or land need to be obtained for the Project.

Category (c) – Planning / Design / Engineering / Environmental Documentation (Tasks 5-9)

Based on similar groundwater recharge basin construction and well rehabilitation projects, Final Design costs are typically 5% of the projected cost of construction, which was confirmed with a detailed person-hour estimate using BVWSD and consultant staff. Costs for project assessment and evaluation are \$27,000 and has been completed as part of the grant application process. Project final design and engineering costs were estimated to be \$71,400, including \$7,100 for survey and utility investigation, \$17,900 for well equipping design, and \$46,400 for recharge basin and recovery pipeline design. District staff will perform the survey/utility investigation and the final design, using consultants to supplement District staff in final design tasks. \$15,000 was budgeted to contract a geotechnical consulting firm to perform a geotechnical report for the Project area (included in the recharge basin and recovery pipeline design budget). The recently completed final design for the Kern Water Bank Recharge and Recovery Project corroborates this geotechnical consultant fee amount. The District has completed a Programmatic EIR for the BVWSD Water Management Program, which includes the recharge basin and recovery pipeline portion of this project in addition to three other proposed projects; costs from this work are not included. The District's environmental consultant (GEI) is currently in the process of preparing an IS/MND specific to The Palms GRRP, and costs are estimated to be \$90,000. The District will need to file a Notice of Exemption (NOE) for the well equipping project. Based on prior experience of similar projects, the NOE was estimated at \$3,000. Permitting includes SWPPP and DCP/ISR application preparation costs estimated by Provost & Pritchard (\$10,000) and applicable fees (\$23,000). Based previous experience on well design projects, \$4,500 has been allocated to prepare and submit 3 PG&E service applications to obtain electrical service at the Project wells. The development and approval of the DWR License Agreement is estimated to be \$25,000. \$5,000 has been budgeted for the development of the Project Performance Monitoring Plan, which is consistent with the project complexity and costs from prior IRWM grants.

Category (d) – Construction / Implementation (Tasks 10-13)

Construction costs were estimated using the preliminary design that has been completed during the initial assessment and evaluation for the Project, the cost of construction information from similar projects recently completed, and budgetary estimates received from contractors and suppliers including:

- Consolidated ID, South & Highland Basin Project (\$1.3M, 2013)
- Visalia Water Conservation Plant, Recycled Water Pipeline (\$10.1M, 2013)
- Root Creek WD, In-Lieu Groundwater Recharge Project (\$5M, 2013)
- Kern Water Bank Authority, Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project (\$2.5M, 2015 –final design complete)

Construction was estimated to be \$1.1M from the sources noted above (as itemized in **Table 4.2-1**). A 15% construction contingency cost was included for the Project based upon the preliminary design and the simple nature of the project (relative to other projects). \$12,000 has been budgeted for consultant costs related to construction contracting.

BVWSD will perform Task 13-Construction Administration with some consultant assistance (typical of ag water districts); costs were estimated to be \$56,400 (5% of construction costs) for this task including contract administration and construction review (average of 20 hrs/wk for 10 months). \$10,000 has been budgeted for environmental compliance (e.g. SWPPP Practitioner work) and mitigation measures to be identified in the Project CEQA documents (if applicable). The Task 13 budget also includes \$21,600 in costs for implementing a Labor Compliance Program based on a recent quote from a Labor Compliance Consultant (\$2,200 per month of construction). These costs are all based on experience with similar projects in the area.

In summary, the budget is considered reasonable for the following reasons: 1) Provost & Pritchard has experience with multiple similar projects recently completed or currently in final design (listed above), 2) District staff will perform some of the design and most of the construction administration tasks supplemented by specialized consultants, 3) the estimate includes a contingency (15%) considered appropriate for the current level of project development and simple nature of the project, and 4) unit costs for construction line items shown in **Table 4.2-1** are relatively standardized.

Project Cost

The total Project cost is estimated to be \$1,517,100 and BVWSD would contribute a 28% cost match that will come from BVWSD's capital improvement funds.

Table 4.2-1. EOPCC for The Palms Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project

BVWSD The Palms Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost						
Construction Cost Estimate:						
ITEM NO.	ESTIMATED QUANTITY		ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT PRICE	SUBTOTAL	
	Qty.	Unit				
<i>General</i>						
1	1	LS	Mobilization/Demobilization	\$ 35,000	\$	35,000
2	1	LS	Worker and Public Protection	\$ 10,000	\$	10,000
3	1	LS	Miscellaneous Facilities and Operations	\$ 10,000	\$	10,000
					<i>Subtotal</i>	55,000
<i>Construct Recharge Basins</i>						
4	29,319	CY	Scarify and Recompaction	\$ 1.00	\$	29,319
5	110,500	CY	Embankment Earthwork	\$ 2.50	\$	276,250
6	1	EA	F&I Recharge Basin Turnout Structure	\$ 10,000	\$	10,000
					<i>Subtotal</i>	315,569
<i>Well Equipping</i>						
7	3	EA	Well Video Log	\$ 1,500	\$	4,500
8	3	EA	F&I Development Pump and 12 hrs Development Pumping	\$ 9,750	\$	29,250
9	3	EA	F&I Well Pump, Motor, and Pump Controls and Electrical	\$ 82,500	\$	247,500
10	3	EA	Well discharge, fittings, and appurtenances	\$ 10,000	\$	30,000
					<i>Subtotal</i>	311,250
<i>Construct 24" Well Recovery Pipeline</i>						
11	2,729	LF	F&I 24" 80 PSI PIP PVC Pipeline	\$ 40	\$	109,160
12	1	EA	F&I 24"x21" 80 PSI PIP PVC Reducer	\$ 790	\$	790
13	2	EA	F&I 24"x24"x12" 80 PSI PIP PVC Tee	\$ 1,080	\$	2,160
14	2	EA	F&I 2" Pipeline Air Vent	\$ 3,000	\$	6,000
					<i>Subtotal</i>	118,110
<i>Construct 27" Well Recovery Pipeline</i>						
14	3,250	LF	F&I 27" 80 PSI PIP PVC Pipeline	\$ 51	\$	165,750
15	1	EA	F&I 27" Connection to 72" CMLC Pipeline	\$ 7,500	\$	7,500
16	1	EA	F&I 27"x24" 80 PSI PIP PVC Reducer	\$ 800	\$	800
17	1	EA	F&I 27"x27"x12" 80 PSI PIP PVC Tee	\$ 1,200	\$	1,200
18	2	EA	F&I 2" Pipeline Air Vent	\$ 3,000	\$	6,000
					<i>Subtotal</i>	181,250
					Construction Cost Subtotal	\$ 981,200
					Contingency (15%)	147,180
					Construction Total	1,128,380

4.3 GHCS D - Antelope Conjunctive Use Project – Steuber Phase

Category (a) – Direct Project Administration (Tasks 1-3)

Project administration will include project specific grant administration by District staff and the District's Consultant and is based on similar manhours expended on previous IRWM Implementation Grants. This cost is approximately 1% each for Task 1-Administration, and Task 3-Reporting. The Task 2 costs are based on a Labor Compliance specialist preparing the LCP.

Category (b) – Land Purchase/Easement (Task 4)

No land purchase is needed for the project. Remaining work includes salary costs to finalize a Joint Agencies Agreement and Easement Agreement. No fee will be required for the easement. Limited legal services will be needed for this task.

Category (c) – Planning / Design / Engineering / Environmental Documentation (Tasks 5-9)

The Assessment and Evaluation, CEQA Initial Study, and Well Design are 100% complete. The costs incurred to date for these items are included and qualify for funding match. The GHCS D and their engineering consultant have experience designing similar projects and are familiar with typical engineering fees required. Permit fees are included for the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Dust Control Plan, Indirect Source Review, Well Permit, and Road Encroachment Permit (regulatory fees total \$2,750). All surveying costs are based on prevailing wages. The well design is already completed. Fees are also included for the pipeline design, electrical design and coordination with local electric utility.

Category (d) – Construction / Implementation (Tasks 10-13)

Construction costs were prepared using construction cost estimates and bid summaries from recent similar projects and other sources including:

- Golden Hills CSD, Abajo Avenue Transmission Pipeline Project (2013, \$397,000)
- City of Ceres, Wells 41 and 42 Project (2014, \$649,000)
- Blaker/Richland Water Transmission Main Project (2015, \$1,690,000)
- Well contractors

All construction costs are based on local prevailing wages. The pipeline alignment is relatively flat and free of obstructions so no unusual or difficult conditions are expected. The well costs are based on current rates for wells and discussions with Bakersfield Well and Pump Industries, a local well drilling contractor.

Construction Contracting, Administration, and Environmental Compliance costs were estimated using a detailed manhour breakdown and are about 9% of the Construction Costs (typical for this type of municipal water project). The budget also includes costs for implementing a Labor Compliance Program based on a direct quote from a Labor Compliance Subconsultant as mentioned under Project 2. The construction cost estimate includes a 15% contingency. This contingency is considered appropriate for the combined level of design (100% for well and 10% for pipeline). A detailed construction cost estimate is provided as **Table 4.3-1**.

GHCS D has adequate funds to cover their portion of the project cost share using their Capacity Fee Account, which has \$802,566 as of June 30, 2015. The City of Tehachapi will pay for 28% of the project, which is based on 50% of the design, construction and contingency costs related to the pipeline (detailed documentation can be provided to DWR upon request). They can cover their cost share with existing funds.

In summary, the budget is considered reasonable for the following reasons: 1) The CEQA Initial Study is 100% complete, reducing uncertainty in costs for environmental documentation and compliance; 2) The budgets are based on experience constructing similar projects (listed above); 3) The estimate includes a contingency (15%) considered appropriate for the current level of project development.

Project Cost

The total Project cost is estimated to be \$1,347,433; GHCS D and the City of Tehachapi, who is a project partner, will contribute a cost share of \$372,367.

Table 4.3-1: EOPCC for Antelope Conjunctive Use Project - Steuber Phase

Antelope Conjunctive Use Project - Steuber Phase					
Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Costs					
Item	Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Price	Total
Pipeline					
1	Mobilization/Demobilization, Bonds, Insurance, Worker Protection, Miscellaneous Facilities, Water Line Pressure and Disinfection Testing	LS	1	\$50,000	\$50,000
2	18" C905 PVC Water Pipe & Appurtenances	LF	4,100	\$85	\$348,500
3	8" C900 PVC Water Pipe & Appurtenances	LF	400	\$35	\$14,000
	Air Release Valves and Blowoff	EA	1	\$10,000	\$10,000
4	Jack & Bore 30-inch Casing	LF	50	\$500	<u>\$25,000</u>
				Subtotal	\$447,500
Well					
5	Mobilization/Demobilization, Bonds, Insurance, Permits, Miscellaneous Facilities, Operations and Worker Protection	LS	1	\$39,000	\$39,000
6	F&I 30-inch Diameter Conductor Casing	LF	50	\$500	\$25,000
7	Drill Pilot Hole (to 600 feet total depth)	LF	550	\$75	\$41,250
8	Perform Electric and Deviation Logs	LS	1	\$3,500	\$3,500
9	Open Hole to 26-inch Diameter (to 600 feet total depth)	LF	550	\$75	\$41,250
10	F&I 14-inch Diameter Blank Casing	LF	201	\$60	\$12,060
11	F&I 14-inch Diameter Perforated Casing	LF	390	\$80	\$31,200
12	F&I 2-inch Diameter Sounding Tube	LF	400	\$10	\$4,000
13	F&I Gravel Pack	LF	480	\$50	\$24,000
14	F&I Annular Seal	LF	120	\$50	\$6,000
15	Preliminary Development	HR	36	\$350	\$12,600
16	Water Quality Testing	EA	1	\$3,000	<u>\$3,000</u>
				Subtotal	\$242,860
Pumps, Power & Controls					
17	Mobilization/Demobilization Development Pump and Pump up to 40 hours	LS	1	\$20,000	\$20,000
18	Additional Pump Development and Test Pumping	HR	20	\$350	\$7,000
19	Perform Video Log	LS	1	\$1,500	\$1,500
18	Construct Pump Foundation	LS	1	\$5,000	\$5,000
19	F&I Pump Bowls	LS	1	\$10,000	\$10,000
20	F&I Column Pipe and Shaft	LF	380	\$95	\$36,100
19	F&I Discharge Head	LS	1	\$5,000	\$5,000
20	F&I Electric Motor	LS	1	\$30,000	\$30,000
21	Building	LS	1	\$25,000	\$25,000
20	Disinfection Equipment	LS	1	\$5,000	\$5,000
21	Bring Electric Service To Site	LS	1	\$20,000	\$20,000
22	F&I Controls	LS	1	\$50,000	<u>\$50,000</u>
				Subtotal	\$214,600
Construction Cost Subtotal					\$904,960
Contingencies and Incidentals (15%)					\$135,800
Total Project Construction Cost					\$1,040,800

Subtask 11.1 = 50% of Items 1, 5, 17 (plus contingency)
 Subtask 11.2 = Sum of Items 6-15, 18-22 (plus contingency)
 Subtask 11.3 = Sum of Items 2-4 (plus contingency)
 Subtask 11.4 = Item 16 + 50% of Items 1, 5, 17 (plus contingency)

4.4 LOWMWC Water Main Replacement & Meter Installation Project

Category (a) – Direct Project Administration (Tasks 1-3)

Project administration will include project specific grant administration by LOWMC staff and the Water Company's Consultant and is based on similar manhours expended on previous IRWM Implementation Grants. This cost is approximately 1.5% for Task 1-Administration and 1% for Task 3-Reporting. Relative to GHCSO, for example, the manhours are higher as monthly invoicing (and associated monthly progress reports) are required for the finances of the Water Company. For Task 2, the Water Company will use its existing LCP that was approved in September 2014; \$2,000 in expenses from CS & Associates for developing the LCP are included for reimbursement (occurred after 1/17/2014 requirement).

Category (b) – Land Purchase/Easement (Task 4)

No easements or land needs to be obtained for the project.

Category (c) – Planning / Design / Engineering / Environmental Documentation (Tasks 5-9)

Provost & Pritchard prepared a labor estimate for Category (c) tasks. The Feasibility Study subtask work has been estimated based on similar experience with Buttonwillow County Water District and their similar water main and meter replacement project. The Rate Study, Outreach, and Rate Implementation subtask is budgeted based on similar rate studies for small districts conducted by Provost and Pritchard including a rate study for the neighboring Lebec County Water District. Estimates for survey and design manhours are based on Provost & Pritchard's experience on two recent water main replacement projects in the Central Valley. A Categorical Exemption is required for water main replacements, and a draft of the Notice of Exemption has been prepared by Self Help Enterprises; \$1,000 has been budgeted to complete this task. Permitting includes SWPPP, DCP, and Kern County Road Encroachment Permit application preparation costs estimated by Provost & Pritchard (\$16,000) and applicable fees (\$1,750).

Category (d) – Construction / Implementation (Tasks 10-13)

Provost & Pritchard estimated construction quantities and constructability based on record drawings and review of streets where the water mains will be installed. All construction costs are based on local prevailing wage rates. Construction costs were prepared using construction cost estimates and bid summaries from recent similar projects and other sources including:

- Pratt Mutual Water Company – Water System Improvements (\$3.8M, 2013)
- Riverdale Public Utility District – Meter Project (\$1M, 2015)
- Buttonwillow County Water District – Water Main Replacement and Meter Installation Project (\$4M, 2015- in final design)
- Vendors: Diamond Plastics PVC Pipe and Badger Meter

The water mains will be installed within existing roadways with some elevation gain and curvature. Based on local knowledge, pipeline trenching can be accomplished with typical trenching equipment. Currently, 70% of water mains are under pavement, and therefore, the cost for trench patching was also factored into the estimate. Meter procurement and installation costs are factored into the costs based on manufacturer costs and bid canvasses (equipment for reading meters and software included in estimate). Construction costs are estimated to be \$1.3M (as itemized in **Table 4.4-1**). A 15% construction contingency is included and is deemed appropriate based upon the lower complexity of the project.

Construction Environmental compliance consists of SWPPP/DCP monitoring and reporting. As the Water Company does not have full-time staff, consultants will provide most of the construction administration and site reviews for the project. Construction administration costs are based on a manhour estimate, and actual fees incurred for similar water main replacement and meter installation projects to observe construction and administer the construction contract. It is assumed that the project consulting engineers will perform the construction observation activities. This percent cost of construction for these tasks is 14% and is typical for small water systems with limited staffing for administration tasks. The budget also includes costs for implementing a Labor Compliance Program based on a direct quote from a Labor Compliance Subconsultant as mentioned under Project 2.

In summary, the budget is considered reasonable for the following reasons: 1) Provost & Pritchard has experience with multiple similar projects recently completed or currently in final design 2) Unit costs for construction line items shown in **Table 4.4-1** are relatively standardized 3) The estimate includes a contingency (15%) considered appropriate for the simple nature of the project.

The total project cost is estimated to be \$1.9M. LOWMWC is requesting a DAC funding match waiver for the cost share as documented in **Attachment 7**.

Table 4.4-1: EOPCC for LOWMWC Water Main Replacement & Meter Installation Project

LOWMWC Water Main Replacement & Meter Installation Project						
Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost						
ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL	
Qty.						
Water Main Replacement						
1	Mobilization, Demobilization, Bonds, Insurance, Waterline Disinfection and Pressure testing	LS	1	\$ 59,000 / \$	\$ 59,000	
2	SWPPP Implementation	LS	1	\$ 14,000 / \$	\$ 14,000	
3	Traffic Control	LS	1	\$ 15,000 / \$	\$ 15,000	
4	Worker Protection	LS	1	\$ 20,000 / \$	\$ 20,000	
5	Clearing & Grubbing	LS	1	\$ 15,000 / \$	\$ 15,000	
6	Abandon Existing Water System In Place	LS	1	\$ 35,000 / \$	\$ 35,000	
7	Tie In To Existing Water Main	EA	10	\$ 4,000 / \$	\$ 40,000	
8	F&I 2" Blow-Off Assembly	EA	4	\$ 2,500 / \$	\$ 10,000	
9	F&I 1" Air Release Valve	EA	5	\$ 4,000 / \$	\$ 20,000	
10	F&I 6" PVC C-900 Water Main	LF	7,288	\$ 40 / \$	\$ 291,520	
11	F&I 6" Gate Valve	EA	47	\$ 1,440 / \$	\$ 67,680	
12	F&I Fire Hydrant Assembly	EA	9	\$ 3,000 / \$	\$ 27,000	
13	Permanent Trench Resurfacing	LF	4,976	\$ 25 / \$	\$ 124,390	
14	Bore & Jack 2-18" Casings Across Frazier Park Rd	LF	180	\$ 550 / \$	\$ 99,000	
15	Potholing Existing Utilities	LS	1	\$ 4,800 / \$	\$ 4,800	
					\$ 842,390	
Meter Installation						
16	F&I 3/4" Water Meter Assembly	EA	348	\$ 900 / \$	\$ 313,200	
17	F&I 3/4" Water Meter Assembly w/ Service Line	EA	58	\$ 1,350 / \$	\$ 78,300	
18	Radio Read AMR Unit	EA	1	\$ 14,500 / \$	\$ 14,500	
19	Purchase, Install Billing Software	EA	1	\$ 6,000 / \$	\$ 6,000	
					\$ 412,000	
Construction Cost Subtotal					\$ 1,254,390	
Contingency (15%)					\$ 188,159	
Construction Cost Total					\$ 1,442,549	

Notes: Subtask 11.1 = Item 15 + 50% of Item 1 (plus contingency)
 Subtask 11.2 = Sum of Items 2-14 (plus contingency)
 Subtask 11.3 = Sum of Items 16-19 (plus contingency)
 Subtask 11.4 = 50% of Item 1 (plus contingency)

4.5 Proposal Budget

A Proposal Budget Summary (DWR Table 9) is included at the end of this Attachment. With the DAC Funding Match Waiver for LOWMWC, the percent funding match of the two other projects is an average of 26.7%.

As an additional note, each of the projects can be scaled back in size to reduce project costs in the event a partial award. The following are general ways in which each project will be scaled back or cost share increased.

- BVWSD & GHCSO Projects – BVWSD and GHCSO are able to increase its cost share in order to complete the Project
- LOWMWC Project – The water main replacements can be scaled back to specific areas where the mains are the smallest and leakage is most prevalent. If funding is reduced significantly the water meter installation component may need to be removed (hopefully funded through other grant programs).

Table 8 – Project Budget

Proposal Title: Kern IRWM 2015 Grant Proposal

Project Title: Project 1 - Grant Administration

Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes (GHCSO and LOWMWC)

Funding Match Waiver request?: Yes (Partial Funding Match Waiver requested for LOWMWC Project for \$45,480 - items shown in green)

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	\$91,197	\$17,283	\$0	\$108,480
	Task 1 - Agreement Administration	\$18,365	\$4,115	\$0	\$22,480
	<i>Subtask 1.1 - BVWSD</i>	<i>\$5,425</i>	<i>\$2,075</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$7,500</i>
	<i>Subtask 1.2 - GHCSO</i>	<i>\$5,460</i>	<i>\$2,040</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$7,500</i>
	<i>Subtask 1.3 - LOWMWC</i>	<i>\$7,480</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$7,480</i>
	Task 2 - Invoicing	\$45,319	\$7,681	\$0	\$53,000
	<i>Subtask 2.1 - BVWSD</i>	<i>\$10,126</i>	<i>\$3,874</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$14,000</i>
	<i>Subtask 2.2 - GHCSO</i>	<i>\$10,193</i>	<i>\$3,807</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$14,000</i>
	<i>Subtask 2.3 - LOWMWC</i>	<i>\$25,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$25,000</i>
	Task 3 - Progress Reports and Project Completion Reports	\$27,513	\$5,487	\$0	\$33,000
	<i>Subtask 3.1 - BVWSD</i>	<i>\$7,233</i>	<i>\$2,767</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$10,000</i>
	<i>Subtask 3.2 - GHCSO</i>	<i>\$7,281</i>	<i>\$2,719</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$10,000</i>
	<i>Subtask 3.3 - LOWMWC</i>	<i>\$13,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$13,000</i>

Table 8 – Project Budget				
Proposal Title: Kern IRWM 2015 IRWM Grant Proposal Project Title: BVWSD The Palms Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project Project serves a need of a DAC?: NO Funding Match Waiver request?: NO				
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	\$29,800	\$0		\$29,800
Task 1: Grant Administration	\$14,900	\$0		\$14,900
Task 2: Labor Compliance Program	\$0	\$0		\$0
Task 3: Grant Reporting	\$14,900	\$0		\$14,900
(b) Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0		\$0
Task 4: Landowner Easements	\$0	\$0		\$0
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$258,900	\$0		\$258,900
Task 5: Assessment and Evaluation	\$27,000	\$0		\$27,000
Task 6: Final Design	\$71,400	\$0		\$71,400
<i>Subtask 6.1: Survey and Utility Investigation</i>	<i>\$7,100</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$7,100</i>
<i>Subtask 6.2: Well Equipping Design</i>	<i>\$17,900</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$17,900</i>
<i>Subtask 6.3: Recharge Basin and Recovery Pipeline Design</i>	<i>\$46,400</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$46,400</i>
Task 7: Environmental Documentation	\$93,000	\$0		\$93,000
<i>Subtask 7.1: Well Equipping CEQA</i>	<i>\$3,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$3,000</i>
<i>Subtask 7.2: Recharge Basin and Recovery Pipeline CEQA</i>	<i>\$90,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$90,000</i>
Task 8: Permitting	\$62,500	\$0		\$62,500
<i>Subtask 8.1: Existing PG&E Service Applications</i>	<i>\$4,500</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$4,500</i>
<i>Subtask 8.2: SWPPP</i>	<i>\$8,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$8,000</i>
<i>Subtask 8.3: DCP/ISR</i>	<i>\$20,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$25,000</i>
<i>Subtask 8.4: DWR License Agreement</i>	<i>\$25,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$25,000</i>
Task 9: Project Performance Monitoring Plan	\$5,000	\$0		\$5,000
(d) Construction/Implementation	\$798,517	\$429,883		\$1,228,400
Task 10: Construction Contracting	\$12,000	\$0		\$12,000
Task 11: Construction	\$698,517	\$429,883		\$1,128,400
<i>Subtask 11.1: Well Equipping Construction</i>	<i>\$221,575</i>	<i>\$136,362</i>		<i>\$357,938</i>
<i>Subtask 11.2: Recharge Basin and Recovery Pipeline Construction</i>	<i>\$476,942</i>	<i>\$293,521</i>		<i>\$770,463</i>
Task 12: Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement	\$10,000	\$0		\$10,000
Task 13: Construction Administration	\$78,000	\$0		\$78,000
(e) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$1,087,217	\$429,883		\$1,517,100

Table 8 – Project Budget					
Proposal Title: Kern IRWM 2015 IRWM Grant Application Project Title: Antelope Conjunctive Use Project - Steuber Phase Project serves a need of a DAC?: YES Funding Match Waiver request?: NO					
	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	\$25,988	\$0		\$25,988
	Task 1: Administration	\$10,728	\$0		\$10,728
	Task 2: Labor Compliance Program	\$4,610	\$0		\$4,610
	Task 3: Reporting	\$10,650	\$0		\$10,650
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$4,840	\$0		\$4,840
	Task 4: Land Purchase/Easement	\$4,840	\$0		\$4,840
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$95,937	\$69,899		\$165,836
	Task 5: Assessment and Evaluation (Completed)	\$0	\$25,042		\$25,042
	Task 6: Final Design	\$64,852	\$12,785		\$77,637
	<i>Sub Task 6.1: Survey and Utility Investigation</i>	<i>\$10,440</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$10,440</i>
	<i>Sub Task 6.2: Well Design (Completed)</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$12,785</i>		<i>\$12,785</i>
	<i>Sub Task 6.3: Electrical Design & SCE Coordination</i>	<i>\$17,736</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$17,736</i>
	<i>Sub Task 6.4: Project Design</i>	<i>\$36,676</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$36,676</i>
	Task 7: Environmental Documentation (completed)	\$0	\$32,072		\$32,072
	Task 8: Permitting	\$27,107	\$0		\$27,107
	<i>Sub Task 8.1 - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</i>	<i>\$8,739</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$8,739</i>
	<i>Sub Task 8.2 - Dust Control Plan & Indirect Source Review</i>	<i>\$7,559</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$7,559</i>
	<i>Sub Task 8.3 - Well Permit & Domestic Water Supply Permit Amendment</i>	<i>\$6,209</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$6,209</i>
	<i>Sub Task 8.4 - Encroachment Permit - Road Crossing</i>	<i>\$4,600</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$4,600</i>
	Task 9: Project Performance Monitoring Plan	\$3,978	\$0		\$3,978
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$848,301	\$302,468		\$1,150,769
	Task 10: Construction Contracting	\$10,114	\$0		\$10,114
	Task 11: Construction	\$737,832	\$302,468		\$1,040,300
	<i>Sub Task 11.1 - Mobilization and Site Preparation</i>	<i>\$44,470</i>	<i>\$18,230</i>		<i>\$62,700</i>
	<i>Sub Task 11.2 - Well Construction</i>	<i>\$322,567</i>	<i>\$132,233</i>		<i>\$454,800</i>
	<i>Sub Task 11.3 - Pipeline Construction</i>	<i>\$324,198</i>	<i>\$132,902</i>		<i>\$457,100</i>
	<i>Sub Task 11.4 - Performance Testing & Demobilization</i>	<i>\$46,598</i>	<i>\$19,102</i>		<i>\$65,700</i>
	Task 12: Env. Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement	\$14,252	\$0		\$14,252
	Task 13: Construction Administration	\$86,103	\$0		\$86,103
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$975,066	\$372,367		\$1,347,433

Note: Construction Costs in Task 11 include 15% contingency

Table 8 – Project Budget					
Proposal Title: Kern IRWM 2015 Grant Proposal Project Title: LOWMWC Water Main Replacement & Meter Installation Project Project serves a need of a DAC?: YES Funding Match Waiver request?: YES					
	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	\$44,332	\$0		\$44,332
	Task 1: Administration	\$26,823	\$0		\$26,823
	Task 2: Labor Compliance Program	\$2,000	\$0		\$2,000
	Task 3: Reporting	\$15,509	\$0		\$15,509
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0		\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$189,446	\$0		\$189,446
	Task 5: Assessment and Evaluation	\$40,364	\$0		\$40,364
	<i>Subtask 5.1: Feasibility Study / Basis of Design / Schematic</i>	<i>\$23,896</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$23,896</i>
	<i>Subtask 5.2: Rate Study</i>	<i>\$16,468</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$16,468</i>
	Task 6: Final Design	\$124,216	\$0		\$124,216
	<i>Subtask 6.1: Survey and Utility Research</i>	<i>\$22,274</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$22,274</i>
	<i>Subtask 6.2: Geotechnical Investigation</i>	<i>\$27,452</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$27,452</i>
	<i>Subtask 6.3 Project Design</i>	<i>\$74,490</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$74,490</i>
	Task 7: Environmental Documentation	\$1,030	\$0		\$1,030
	Task 8: Permitting	\$17,753	\$0		\$17,753
	<i>Subtask 8.1 - SWPPP</i>	<i>\$8,084</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$8,084</i>
	<i>Subtask 8.2 - DCP</i>	<i>\$5,894</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$5,894</i>
	<i>Subtask 8.3 - Encroachment Permits</i>	<i>\$3,775</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$3,775</i>
	Task 9: Project Monitoring Plan	\$6,083	\$0		\$6,083
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$1,660,742	\$0		\$1,660,742
	Task 10: Construction Contracting	\$13,049	\$0		\$13,049
	Task 11: Construction	\$1,442,549	\$0		\$1,442,549
	<i>Subtask 11.1: Mobilization & Site Prep.</i>	<i>\$39,445</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$39,445</i>
	<i>Subtask 11.2: Water Main Construction</i>	<i>\$895,379</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$895,379</i>
	<i>Subtask 11.3: Water Meter Installation</i>	<i>\$473,800</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$473,800</i>
	<i>Subtask 11.4: Performance Testing & Demobilization</i>	<i>\$33,925</i>	<i>\$0</i>		<i>\$33,925</i>
	Task 12: Env. Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement	\$10,970	\$0		\$10,970
	Task 13: Construction Administration	\$194,175	\$0		\$194,175
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$1,894,520	\$0		\$1,894,520

Table 9 – Proposal Budget						
Proposal Title: Kern IRWM 2015 IRWM Grant Proposal						
Individual Project Title		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Funding Sources	Total Cost	% Funding Match (Col b/Col d)
(a)	Project 1: Grant Administration	\$91,197	\$17,283	\$0	\$108,480	15.9%
(b)	Project 2: BVWSD The Palms Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project	\$1,087,217	\$429,883	\$0	\$1,517,100	28.3%
(c)	Project 3: GHCSA Antelope Conjunctive Use Project - Steuber Phase	\$975,066	\$372,367	\$0	\$1,347,433	27.6%
(d)	Project 4: LOWMWC Water Main Replacement & Meter Installation Project	\$1,894,520	\$0	\$0	\$1,894,520	0.0%
(e)	Proposal Total <i>Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column</i>	\$4,048,000	\$819,533	\$0	\$4,867,533	
(f)	DAC Funding Match Waiver Total ** <i>Sum column (d) only for projects seeking DAC funding match waiver in rows (a) through (d)</i>	-	-	-	\$1,940,000	
(g)	Grand Total <i>Subtract row (f) from row (e) for column (d) and recalculate column (e)</i>	-	-	-	\$2,927,533	28.0%

** DAC Funding Match Waiver Total is the total of the cost for Project 4 (\$1,894,520) and the LOWMWC's share of the Project 1 Grant Administration (\$45,480)