



## Upper Feather River IRWM Proposition 84 Planning Grant Proposal **Attachment 4: Budget**

The tables included in this Attachment 4 present the estimated budget and funding match for preparation of the Upper Feather River (UFR) Region's Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan Update as described in Attachment 3: Work Plan and Attachment 5: Schedule.

This attachment includes six (6) budget tables as summarized below:

1. Table 1 – Project Budget summarizes the Total Project Budget and includes the costs presented in the five (5) other tables described below. Table 1 is formatted to be consistent with the format suggested in Table 4 of the IRWM Planning Proposition 84 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) – Round 2. The budget for each of the tasks and subtasks described in the Work Plan, as well as, the historical in-kind costs that occurred between October 2008 and March 9<sup>th</sup> 2012 are included in Table 1. The costs in Table 1 are broken out by Non-State Share (Funding Match) and Requested Grant Funding (DWR Grant Amount).
2. Table 2 – Consultant and Plumas County Estimate, is a summary of the total Requested Grant Funding included in Table 1. The IRWM planning effort is divided amongst the IRWM Plan Consultant, Meeting Facilitator, Meeting Coordinator, Ecosystem Resources Specialist, Tribal Outreach Consultant, and Plumas County staff. The UFR Region is requesting grant funding for the above entity's scope of works which are summarized in Table 2 and Section II of Attachment 3.
3. Tables 3 through 6 show how the funding match summarized in Table 1 was developed. Table 3 a-c – Projected In-Kind Cost Summary includes a summary of the projected in-kind contributions by members of the UFR IRWM RWMG, Steering Committee and Workgroups. Rate information was not available for the members of each of these groups, therefore a conservative rate of \$40/hour for the year 2012 with a 4% increase per year was assumed for each member of the RWMG, Steering Committee and Workgroups.
4. Table 4 – Accrued In-Kind Cost Summary, includes a summary of the costs associated with the RWMG member's planning efforts between October 2008 and March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012 which are presented as part of the Funding Match. This included two meetings in 2009 and one in 2008 to create the RAP document and develop the RWMG MOU (see Attachment 3: Work Plan, Appendix A). The agenda for the 2008 meeting did not contain attendance information; therefore, in-kind match for this meeting was not included. Additionally, the RWMG meeting held in preparation for the submittal of this grant application, held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of February 2012, is also included as an in-kind match within Table 4.
5. Table 5 – Plumas County's 1 October 2008 to 9 March 2012 UFR IRWM Program In-Kind Costs includes a summary of Plumas County's in-kind contribution associated with the preparation of this grant application as well as staff in-kind contributions associated with the Water,



## Upper Feather River IRWM Proposition 84 Planning Grant Proposal **Attachment 4: Budget**

Forestry/Agriculture and Conservation Elements of the General Plan.

6. Table 6 – Other Projects supporting the current IRWM Plan present additional Funding Match included in Table 1. These projects include the Water, Forest/Agriculture and Conservation Elements of the Plumas County General Plan Update, Lake Almanor Water Quality Monitoring and the Lake Almanor Watershed Management Plan. The linkage of these in-kind match contributions is discussed in Section III: Additional IRWM Plan Work of Attachment 3: Work Plan.

As can be seen in Table 1, the total Project Budget for updating the UFR Region's Proposition 84 IRWM Plan is estimated to be \$1,114,339 with a grant request amount of \$798,704 and a local funding match of \$315,635 which equates to a 28% Local Funding Match. Due to the high level of anticipated participation by the recently expanded RWMG, and the existing IRWM Plan work, the Region is able to meet the DWR required 25% match with solely in-kind funds.

As discussed above, the UFR Region's Requested Grant Funding is based on the costs for the IRWM Plan Consultant, the Meeting Facilitator, the Meeting Coordinator, the Ecosystem Resources Specialist, the Tribal Outreach Consultant, and Plumas County staff. Any costs associated with the RWMG's effort for the IRWM Plan will be paid for by the RWMG member agencies and submitted to DWR as an in-kind funding match. Therefore, all the Requested Grant Funding will be distributed from DWR through Plumas County to the consultants.

The overall scope of work for the Project Budget and assumptions made in development

of this Planning Grant Proposal are included in the Work Plan Section of Attachment 3 (Section II). Additional assumptions made in the development of the Project Budget are summarized below:

1. The IRWM Plan Consultant's labor rates shown in Table 2 are based on Kennedy/Jenks Consultants' projected 2011 Schedule of Charges, which is assumed to be a typical rate schedule for the consultants experienced in IRWM plan preparation.
2. The assumptions for the RWMG labor rates used in Table 3 for the RWMG's projected in-kind costs and in Table 4 for the RWMG's historical in-kind costs are summarized at the bottom of Table 4. An estimated labor rate of \$40/hour with a 4% increase per year was used in Table 3 to represent an average RWMG billing rate which consists of agencies, and NGOs that are both volunteer and paid.
3. Table 3(a) was developed assuming the RWMG Meetings will occur on a quarterly basis with an average of one member attending per RWMG member as summarized in Section II of Attachment 3: Work Plan.
4. Table 3(b) was developed assuming the RWMG Steering Committee will consist of eight (8) RWMG members, as dictated under the MOU. This Committee will meet twelve (12) times during the course of the plan update (6 times per year) and will be responsible for development of plan content and review of the major portions of the IRWM Plan prior to the quarterly RWMG meetings as summarized in Section II of Attachment 3: Work Plan.



## Upper Feather River IRWM Proposition 84 Planning Grant Proposal **Attachment 4: Budget**

5. Table 3(c) was developed assuming Workgroups will be established as set out in the MOU, with seven (7) separate Workgroups. Each Workgroup will be responsible for development of specific sections of the IRWM Plan prior to review by the Steering Committee. It was assumed that four (4) meetings will occur throughout the grant period with four (4) members per Workgroup. It was further assumed these meetings did not occur during the initial stages of the update occurring in 2012. These assumptions are also summarized in Section II of Attachment 3: Work Plan.
6. The IRWM Plan Consultant will be preparing the majority of the IRWM Plan writing; however, the Meeting Facilitator, the Meeting Coordinator, the Environmental Specialist, the Tribal Outreach Consultant and the Plumas County Staff will submit narratives of their efforts to the IRWM Plan Consultant for incorporation in the IRWM Plan. Plumas County will be working closely with the IRWM Plan consultants, intensely involved in both the writing and review of each portion of the IRWM Plan, provide meeting support and note taking, and will be responsible for project administration. Plumas County staff will also support designated DAC outreach efforts, including the groundwater vulnerability assessment described under Task 2.3 of Attachment 3: Work Plan. This is reflected in the budgetary numbers included in Table 2.
7. Table 3 was developed assuming that 15 projects will be accepted through the Call for Project process, and RWMG members will prepare the required

documentation and presentation of the Project for the Stakeholder Meetings, and inclusion in the IRWM Plan. It is assumed that many of the 15 presentations will represent multi-member IRWM Program projects combined as one proposed IRWM project/presentation.

The PSP-Round 2 states that applicants are encouraged to limit direct project administrative expenses to less than 5% of the total cost. Reviewing the costs associated with Task 7 – Grant Administration (\$57,730) to the Total Project Budget (\$1,114,339) as included in Table 1, shows that the UFR Region is requesting approximately 5.2% of the Total Project Cost for project administration. This request is only slightly above the requested amount.

The PSP requires submittal of labor categories, hourly rates, labor time estimates and consultant quotes. All of the required budget support information is included within the Attachment 4 tables that follow.

### Disadvantaged Community Costs

Disadvantaged Community outreach and project development are key aspects of the IRWM Plan update. While the entire UFR Region is considered a DAC, the costs of the proposed grant application directly associated with DAC outreach are summarized as follows, with a requested funding of \$49,142 and a total cost of \$69,142:

- i Subtask 1-4: DAC Outreach, with an estimated budget of \$22,142
- i Subtask 2-3: DAC Groundwater Vulnerability Needs Assessment with an estimated budget of \$27,000, with a \$20,000 match from the Plumas County Department of Environmental Health



## Upper Feather River IRWM Proposition 84 Planning Grant Proposal ***Attachment 4: Budget***

These subtasks are described in detail in Attachment 3: Work Plan, Section II.

### Bond Management System Entries for Federal Line Item

The Federal contribution is called out separately in the Bond Management System (BMS) and has been tracked separately for historical in-kind purposes on Table 4 (\$219), based on the

federal RWMG members who attended meetings. For future in-kind contribution estimates by Federal employees, it is anticipated that two (2) federal employees will be involved in the RWMG meetings (\$3,330). As shown in BMS, the total Federal Contribution is estimated to be \$3,549.

## Attachment 4: Table 1- Project Budget

Proposal Title: Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Update Grant Application

Project Title: Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

	Non-State Share* (Funding Match)	Requested Grant Funding (DWR Grant Amount)	Other State Funds Being Used	Total	% Local Funding Match
<b>Task 1. Stakeholder Involvement</b>					
Subtask 1-1: Develop Stakeholder Involvement Plan		\$19,977		\$19,977	0%
Subtask 1-2: Stakeholder Outreach		\$26,370		\$26,370	0%
Subtask 1-3: Stakeholder Meetings					
Subtask 1-3-1: Steering Committee Meetings	\$17,228	\$63,628		\$80,856	21%
Subtask 1-3-2: RWMG Meetings	\$44,949	\$79,882		\$124,830	36%
Subtask 1-3-3: Workgroup Meetings	\$19,010	\$36,633		\$55,643	34%
Subtask 1-3-4: Public Information Meetings		\$14,245		\$14,245	0%
Subtask 1-3-5: DWR and Interregional Meeting Participation		\$22,045		\$22,045	0%
Subtask 1-4: DAC Outreach		\$22,142		\$22,142	0%
Subtask 1-5: Tribal Outreach		\$25,201		\$25,201	0%
Subtask 1-6: Interregional Outreach		\$16,544		\$16,544	0%
<b>Task 1 - Subtotal</b>		<b>\$326,666</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$407,852</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Task 2. Baseline Technical Study - Existing and Future Conditions</b>					
Subtask 2-1: Collect and Evaluate Post 2005 Data		\$9,200		\$9,200	0%
Subtask 2-2: Update IRWM Assumptions and Technical Analyses		\$20,620		\$20,620	0%
Subtask 2-3: DAC Groundwater Vulnerability Needs Assessment	\$20,000	\$27,000		\$47,000	43%
Subtask 2-4: Prepare Baseline Technical Study		\$12,520		\$12,520	0%
<b>Task 2 - Subtotal</b>		<b>\$69,340</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$89,340</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Task 3. Data Management Strategy, System Development and Implementation</b>					
Subtask 3-1: Develop a Phase 1 Data Management Strategy		\$19,220		\$19,220	0%
Subtask 3-2: Implement Phase 1 Data Management System		\$39,880		\$39,880	0%
Subtask 3-3: As-needed Support		\$19,140		\$19,140	0%
<b>Task 3 - Subtotal</b>		<b>\$78,240</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$78,240</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Task 4. Climate Change Technical Study</b>					
Subtask 4-1: Describe Legislative and Policy Context		\$1,850		\$1,850	0%
Subtask 4-2: Identify Vulnerability to Climate Change		\$12,432		\$12,432	0%
Subtask 4-3: Discuss Adaptation to Climate Change		\$11,432		\$11,432	0%
Subtask 4-4: Recommend Data Collection Improvements and GHG Calculation Tools for Future IRWMP Updates		\$4,320		\$4,320	0%
Subtask 4-5: Identification of Next Steps for Future IRWMP Updates		\$8,320		\$8,320	0%
Subtask 4-6: Prepare Technical Study		\$13,632		\$13,632	0%
<b>Task 4 - Subtotal</b>		<b>\$51,986</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$51,986</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Task 5. Project Development Process</b>					
Subtask 5-1: Develop Project Selection Criteria		\$12,640		\$12,640	0%
Subtask 5-2: Evaluate Status of Projects from Existing IRWMP		\$5,456		\$5,456	0%
Subtask 5-3: Call for New Projects, Project Integration, and Project		\$18,620		\$18,620	0%
Subtask 5-4: Project Evaluation and Technical Analysis		\$10,712		\$10,712	0%
<b>Task 5 - Subtotal</b>		<b>\$47,428</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$47,428</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Task 6. IRWM Plan Update</b>					
Subtask 6-1: Address New Plan Standards and Update Existing Plan		\$93,246		\$93,246	0%
Subtask 6-2: Integrate Technical Studies into Plan		\$9,530		\$9,530	0%
Subtask 6-3: Prepare Draft and Final Plan		\$64,528		\$64,528	0%
<b>Task 6 - Subtotal</b>		<b>\$167,304</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$167,304</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Task 7. Grant Administration</b>					
Subtask 7-1: Manage Grant Administration		\$30,960		\$30,960	0%
Subtask 7-2: Track In-Kind Contributions		\$2,900		\$2,900	0%
Subtask 7-3: Prepare DWR Invoices		\$12,960		\$12,960	0%
Subtask 7-4: Prepare Quarterly Progress Reports		\$4,960		\$4,960	0%
Subtask 7-5: Prepare Final DWR Report		\$5,960		\$5,960	0%
<b>Task 7 - Subtotal</b>		<b>\$57,740</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$57,740</b>	<b>0%</b>
Historical In-kind RWMG Costs	\$ 12,365	\$0		\$12,365	100%
Historical Projects In-Kind Match	\$ 202,084	\$0		\$202,084	100%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 214,449</b>	<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$214,449</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 315,635</b>	<b>\$798,704</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,114,339</b>	<b>28%</b>

Sources of Funding:

Non-State Share\* (Funding Match) = Local Contribution (\$0)+Federal Contribution (In-Kind)+In-Kind Contribution (RWMG historical and plan preparation in-kind)







**Attachment 4: Table 3a - Projected In-Kind Cost Summary - RWMG Meetings**

Agency	IRWM Budget Type	Participant Type	Labor Rates*			Total Travel Time	RWMG Meeting Hours								2012 Cost	2013 Cost	2014 Cost	Total Meeting Cost		
			2012 Labor Rates	2013 Labor Rates	2014 Labor Rates		Pre-Grant		Grant Period											
							Mtg. 1	Mtg. 2	Mtg. 1	Mtg. 2	Mtg. 3	Mtg. 4	Mtg. 5	Mtg. 6					Mtg. 7	Mtg. 8
City of Portola	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Feather River Coordinated Resource Management	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Feather River Land Trust	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Feather River Resource Management District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Gold Mountain Community Services District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Greenhorn Creek Community Services District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Greenville Rancheria	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District/Grizzly Ranch Community Services District/Plumas Eureka CSD	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Indian Valley Community Services District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Maidu Summit Consortium	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Mountain Meadows Conservancy	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Plumas Corporation	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Plumas County Community Development Commission	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Plumas County Fire Safe Council	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Quincy Community Services District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Sierra County Board of Supervisors	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Sierra County Fire Safe and Watershed Council	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Sierra Institute for Community and Environment	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Sierra Valley Mutual Water Company	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Trout Unlimited - Feather River Chapter	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
University of California Cooperative Extension	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Upper Feather River Watershed Group	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
USDA Forest Service - Plumas National Forest	In-Kind	Federal	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service	In-Kind	Federal	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
Walker Ranch Community Services District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 480.00	\$ 665.60	\$ 519.17	\$ 1,664.77
*Rate Assumptions:						2012	2013	2014	Fed Projected In-Kind Costs								\$ 960	\$ 1,331	\$ 1,038	\$ 3,330
For agencies that did not provide their billing rate structure we used the following rate schedule:						\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	Total Non State Projected In-Kind Costs								\$ 12,000	\$ 16,640	\$ 12,979	\$ 41,619
For paid NGOs that did not provide their billing structure we used the following rate schedule:						\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	State Projected In-Kind Costs								\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
For volunteers, unpaid NGOs and interested ratepayers we used the following rate schedule:						\$ 26	\$ 27	\$ 28	<b>Total Projected RWMG In-Kind Costs</b>								<b>\$ 12,960</b>	<b>\$ 17,971</b>	<b>\$ 14,018</b>	<b>\$ 44,949</b>
An average of a 4% increase in salary/year was assumed						Total Projected Steering In-Kind Costs											\$ 17,228			
						Total Projected Workgroup In-Kind Costs											\$ 19,010			
						<b>Total Projected Combined Meeting Costs</b>											<b>\$ 81,186</b>			

Attachment 4: Table 3b - Projected In-Kind Cost Summary - Steering Committee

Name	Appointed by	IRWM Budget Type	Participant Type	Steering Committee Meeting Hours																	2012 Cost	2013 Cost	2014 Cost	Total Meeting Cost				
				Labor Rates*				Travel Time 2012	Travel Time 2013	Travel Time 2014	Total Travel Time	Grant																
				2012 Labor Rates	2013 Labor Rates	2014 Labor Rates	Mtg. 1					Mtg. 2	Mtg. 3	Mtg. 4	Mtg. 5	Mtg. 6	Mtg. 7	Mtg. 8	Mtg. 8	Mtg. 9					Mtg. 10	Mtg. 11	Mtg. 12	
Member 1	County members (representing local government and DACs)	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
Member 2	County members (representing local government and DACs)	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
Member 3	Resource Conservation District	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
Member 4	Municipal Water and Wastewater members	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
Member 5	Maidu Summit Consortium	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
Member 6	Upper Feather River Watershed Group, Plumas-Sierra Cattlemens Association and Plumas-Sierra County Farm Bureau	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
Member 7	Feather River Coordinated Resource Management group	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
Member 8	Non-agency Parties to the MOU not otherwise Represented	In-Kind		\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43	1	6	5	12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	\$ 160	\$ 998	\$ 995	\$ 2,153
				<b>Total Projected In-Kind Costs</b>																					<b>\$ 1,280</b>	<b>\$ 7,987</b>	<b>\$ 7,961</b>	<b>\$ 17,228</b>

\*Rate Assumptions:  
 For agencies that did not provide their billing rate structure we used the following rate schedule  
 For paid NGOs that did not provide their billing structure we used the following rate schedule  
 For volunteers, unpaid NGOs and interested ratepayers we used the following rate schedule:  
 An average of a 4% increase in salary/year was assumed

	2012	2013	2014
For agencies that did not provide their billing rate structure we used the following rate schedule	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43
For paid NGOs that did not provide their billing structure we used the following rate schedule	\$ 40	\$ 42	\$ 43
For volunteers, unpaid NGOs and interested ratepayers we used the following rate schedule:	\$ 26	\$ 27	\$ 28

**Attachment 4: Table 3c - Projected In-Kind Cost Summary - Workgroups**

Name	Appointed by	IRWM Budget Type	Participant Type	2013 Labor Rates	2014 Labor Rates	Total Travel Time	Workgroup Meeting Hours				2013 Cost	2014 Cost	Total Meeting Cost
							Mtg. 1	Mtg. 2	Mtg. 3	Mtg. 4			
Workgroup 1 - Member 1	Community Watershed Education and Outreach	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 1 - Member 2	Community Watershed Education and Outreach	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 1 - Member 3	Community Watershed Education and Outreach	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 1 - Member 4	Community Watershed Education and Outreach	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 2 - Member 1	Floodplain and Meadow Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 2 - Member 2	Floodplain and Meadow Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 2 - Member 3	Floodplain and Meadow Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 2 - Member 4	Floodplain and Meadow Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 3 - Member 1	Irrigated Lands	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 3 - Member 2	Irrigated Lands	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 3 - Member 3	Irrigated Lands	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 3 - Member 4	Irrigated Lands	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 4 - Member 1	Municipal Services	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 4 - Member 2	Municipal Services	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 4 - Member 3	Municipal Services	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 4 - Member 4	Municipal Services	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 5 - Member 1	Project Prioritization	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 5 - Member 2	Project Prioritization	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 5 - Member 3	Project Prioritization	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 5 - Member 4	Project Prioritization	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 6 - Member 1	Science and Monitoring	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 6 - Member 2	Science and Monitoring	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 6 - Member 3	Science and Monitoring	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 6 - Member 4	Science and Monitoring	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 7 - Member 1	Uplands and Forest Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 7 - Member 2	Uplands and Forest Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 7 - Member 3	Uplands and Forest Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
Workgroup 7 - Member 4	Uplands and Forest Management	In-Kind		\$ 42	\$ 43	4	3	3	3	3	\$ 333	\$ 346	\$ 679
*Rate Assumptions:				2012	2013	2014	Total Future In-Kind Costs				\$ 9,318	\$ 9,691	\$ 19,010

For agencies that did not provide their billing rate structure we used the following rate schedule: \$ 40 \$ 42 \$ 43  
 For paid NGOs that did not provide their billing structure we used the following rate schedule: \$ 40 \$ 42 \$ 43  
 For volunteers, unpaid NGOs and interested ratepayers we used the following rate schedule: \$ 26 \$ 27 \$ 28  
 An average of a 4% increase in salary/year was assumed

**Attachment 4: Table 4 - Accrued In-Kind Cost Summary**

Name	Agency	IRWM Budget Type	Participant Type	Labor Rates*		RWMG Meeting Hours								Historical In-Kind Costs				
				2009 labor rate	2012 labor rate	10/28/2008	4/23/2009	12/3/2009	2/23/2012							2009 Cost	2012 Cost	Total Meeting Cost
Jeff Pudlicki	Feather River Coordinated Resource Management	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5	1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
Jim Wilcox, Jr.	Feather River Coordinated Resource Management	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5	1.5	1.75							\$ 108.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 178.00
Gia Martynn	Feather River Coordinated Resource Management	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5	1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
Jason Moghaddas	Feather River Land Trust	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Terri Rust	Feather River Resource Conservation District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Phil Noia	Feather River Resource Management District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00				1.75							\$ -	\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00
Roy Carter	Greenhorn Creek Community Services District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Brian Hermo	Greenville Rancheria	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Frank Motzkus	Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District/Plumas Eureka CSD	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Mark Dotta	Last Chance Creek Water District/Plumas County Planning Commission	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Nils Landes	Mountain Meadows Conservancy	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00				1.75								\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00
Steve Robinson	Mountain Meadows Conservancy	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5		1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
Ian Kanair	Mountain Meadows Conservancy	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
John Sheehan	Plumas Corporation	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
David Keller	Plumas County community Development Commission	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5		1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
Mike Kroencke	Plumas County Engineering Department	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Randy Wilson	Plumas County Flood Control & Water Conservation district	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5		1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
Leah Wills	Plumas County Flood Control & Water Conservation district	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00				1.75								\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00
John Olofson	Plumas County Planning Commission	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00				1.75								\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00
Burkhard Bohm	Plumas Geo-Hydrology	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Pamela Payen	Plumas-Sierra Cattlemen's Association	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Tim Beals	Sierra County	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Andrew Winberry	Sierra County	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5	1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
David Goicochea	Sierra County Board of Supervisors	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Regine Miller	Sierra County Fire Safe and Watershed Council	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00				1.75								\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00
Cindy Noble	Sierra County Fire Safe and Watershed Council	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5	1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
Jonathan Kusel	Sierra Institute for Community and Environment	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Kelly Weintraub	Sierra Institute for Community and Environment	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Emily Creely	Sierra Institute for Community and Environment	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5	1.75							\$ 54.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 124.00
Carl Genasci	Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Bill Copren	Sierra Valley Mutual Water Company	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Mike Filippini	Sierra Valley Mutual Water Company	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Gary Romano	Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
John Hafen	Trout Unlimited - Feather River Chapter	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Holly George	University of California Cooperative Extension	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Carol Dobbas	Upper Feather River Watershed Group	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Russell Reid	Upper Feather River Watershed Group	In-Kind	NGO Paid	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5	1.5								\$ 108.00	\$ -	\$ 108.00
Angela Dillingham	USDA Forest Service - Plumas National Forest	In-Kind	Federal	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Joe Hoffman	USDA Forest Service - Plumas National Forest	In-Kind	Federal	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5	1.5								\$ 108.00	\$ -	\$ 108.00
Dan Martynn	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service	In-Kind	Federal	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00			1.5								\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
Bob Perreault	Walker Ranch Community Services District	In-Kind	Agency	\$ 36.00	\$ 40.00		1.5									\$ 54.00	\$ -	\$ 54.00
*Rate Assumptions:				2009	2012									Fed Historical In-Kind Costs	\$ 216	\$ -	\$ 216	
For agencies that did not provide their billing rate structure we used the following rate schedule:				\$ 36	\$ 40									Total Non State Historical In-Kind Costs	\$ 1,890	\$ 980	\$ 2,870	
For paid NGOS that did not provide their billing structure we used the following rate schedule:				\$ 36	\$ 40									State Historical In-Kind Costs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
For volunteers, unpaid NGOs and interested ratepayers we used the following rate schedule:				\$ 23	\$ 26									<b>Total Historical In-Kind Costs</b>	<b>\$ 2,106</b>	<b>\$ 980</b>	<b>\$ 3,086</b>	
An average of a 4% increase in salary/year was assumed																		

Attachment 4: Table 5 - Plumas County's 1 October 2008 to 9 March 2012 UFR IRWM Program In-Kind Costs

Activity	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total Cost
<b>RWMP Meetings and Direct Support for IRWMP Grant Application</b>			
Plumas County Planning Director	97	\$ 60	\$ 5,828
Plumas County Clerical	29	\$ 29	\$ 835
<b>Subtotal</b>	126		\$ 6,663
<b>County of Plumas General Plan Update - Water/Forest/Agriculture Elements</b>			
Plumas County Planning Director	11.5	\$ 60	\$ 688
Plumas County GIS Staff	11.5	\$ 33	\$ 380
<b>Subtotal</b>			\$ 1,069
<b>County of Plumas General Plan Update - Conservation Element</b>			
Plumas County Planning Director	16.6	\$ 60	\$ 997
Plumas County GIS Staff	16.6	\$ 33	\$ 551
<b>Subtotal</b>			\$ 1,547
<b>Total Costs</b>			<b>\$ 9,279</b>

Attachment 4: Table 6 - Local In-Kind Projects 1 October 2008 to 9 March 2012 UFR IRWM Program In-Kind Costs

Activity	Agency	Project Cost	Funding Type
County of Plumas General Plan Update - Water, Agriculture and Forestry Elements	Plumas County	\$ 39,136	Local
County of Plumas General Plan Update - Conservation Element	Plumas County	\$ 49,298	Local
Lake Almanor Water Quality Monitoring	Sierra Institute for Community and Environment	\$ 40,851	Local
Lake Almanor Watershed Plan	Sierra Institute for Community and Environment	\$ 72,799	Federal
<b>Total Costs</b>		<b>\$ 202,084</b>	