

Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Castaic Lake Water Agency
City of Santa Clarita
Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District
Newhall County Water District
Valencia Water Company
Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Clarita Water Division
San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy

June 9, 2011

Mr. Trevor Joseph
California Department of Water Resources
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management
Financial Assistance Branch
Post Office Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236

RE: Upper Santa Clara River Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan
Regional Water Management Group Comments on the Proposition 84 Draft
Implementation Grant Funding Recommendations

Dear Mr. Joseph:

On behalf of the Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP RWMG, I am writing in support of the Proposition 84 Implementation Grant draft funding recommendations and to express our appreciation for the effort that went into the evaluation and scoring of the submittals. The Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP RWMG is especially pleased that our application was one of the highest scored applications in the state.

We noted in the evaluation that there were several areas where Department of Water Resources (DWR) staff was unable to find information or felt it was lacking. For those areas where we thought that we had included the information, we would like to respectfully request that DWR consider the following comments regarding our implementation grant application:

1. Work Plan. 12/15 points received.

DWR notes that Project 2, NCWD-3 Sewer Trunk Line Relocation Project "...will not be operational until the next two phases are complete", as the project is Phase 1 of a multi-phase project and Phase I provides for the planning, design and engineering involved with the Project. DWR also correctly notes that "...funding for the remaining phases will be incorporated into the District's Capital Improvement Plan", however DWR also states that it is not clear what the timeframe involved is for implementation of the remaining phases and therefore firm assurances that remaining phases will be completed are not provided. Phase 2 involves the removal and relocation of the current gravity feed portion of the sewer trunk line, while Phase 3 consists of the construction of a sewer lift station, forced sewer main, and the remaining gravity feed portion of the sewer trunk line. We would like to refer DWR

staff to Attachment 7, pg. 16 where the schedule shows that Phase 3 is scheduled for completion in June 2016.

DWR notes that "...although it is assumed that the proposed projects are consistent with the Basin Plan, no mention of Basin Plan consistency is found in the application." In Section 6 of the application, Performance Measures for each project in the application, there is an evaluation of Basin Plan consistency. This is provided for each project on the following pages:

Attachment 6_IG1_Measures_1of1:

- CLWA-4 on page 2
- NCWD-3 on page 7
- VWC-1 on page 10
- CLWA-2 on page 13
- SC-1/USFS-1 on page 16

2. Budget. 3/5 points received.

DWR's evaluation states that no supporting documentation was provided for the project budgets. There are differing levels of support for each project, depending on the design stage of the project. DWR states that for Projects 1 (CLWA-4), 3 (VWC-1) and 4 (CLWA-2), estimates for consultant costs, preliminary design, reports and final designs are neither discussed, broken down, nor supported with any documentation. This information has been provided and can be found in (1) the Work Plans for each of these projects, (2) the description of the budget in the Work Plans and (3) the numeric information provided in the Budget Attachment. For example, for Project 1 (CLWA-4), detailed consultant information can be found in Tasks d.1) Consultant Costs and Task d.1.1) Programs Implementation. For Project 2 (VWC-1) in the Work Plan on page 32, (1) Task c.1) Evaluation and Assessment, (2) Task c.1.1.3) Preliminary Design Report and (3) Task c.2) Final Design provide detailed information on the preliminary reports and designs that are discussed in that projects budgeted items.

DWR also notes that for grant administration (Table 4-7), an amount of \$304,583 is listed in the overall budget; however, the cost breakdown provided shows an amount of \$102,200. We checked the project breakdown for grant administration on page 9 and page 19 and in both places we have consistently used a figure of \$304,583.

We do not know if this information would result in a change in the scoring of our application for either the Work Plan or Budget. We would just like to confirm with DWR that we made every attempt to be complete and consistent with the requirements of the PSP.

We look forward to being included on DWR's final recommended funding list for this round of implementation grants so that we can work with our stakeholders to enhance regional water management.

Please call Jeff Ford, Principal Water Resources Planner, at (661) 513-1281, if your team has any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dan Masnada". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "D" and a long, sweeping underline.

Dan Masnada
General Manager
Castaic Lake Water Agency

Cc: Upper SCR IRWM RWMG
Tanya Meeth, DWR