

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

Performance Based vs. Competitive Program

Definition –

Performance Based means a grant program that is focused on the content and quality of a grant application. DWR would work with applicants on a scope of work to develop or improve an IRWM plan. When the scope meets a pre-established standard an applicant could pursue a planning grant. Similarly, when an applicant’s IRWM plan meets pre-established requirements, the applicant could pursue implementation funding. The program would not be deadline driven.

Competitive means a grant program similar to what has been run in previous rounds, where all applications are due on a specific date; application contents are evaluated against an established set of scoring criteria; applications are ranked; and funding decisions are based on application ranking and available funding.

Observations from Previous Efforts –

- Applicants generally could have benefited from more state involvement in the development of IRWM Plans.
- Applicants could have benefited from a more interactive/iterative grant program versus submitting everything in an application package and being critiqued only on the single submission.
- Not all applicants are at the same stage in plan development making it difficult for some to compete.
- Deadlines, rather than long-term goals have driven past planning efforts

DWR Concept for IRWM Grant Program –

DWR is considering modifying the program to be more performance based. DWR would have more contact with applicants to monitor and assist performance, and deadlines would not drive the process.

Input Questions –

From your regions perspective, what are the advantages/disadvantages of a Competitive Grant Program?

ADV: - In theory, our region should compete very well in a truly “competitive” grant program because of the quality of the IRWMP, local consensus agreement on the local priorities, the potential growing water demands of the area, and the critical state of our regional water supply; however; note the perceived realities of the disadvantages below.

DIS: - We feel that a competitive program opens up more political influences in the decision-making. Our area is at a significant disadvantage without strong bi-partisan or democratic representation.

- Cannot afford high priced consultants to produce glamorous applications
- Cannot compete with coastal and other statewide priorities

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

Performance Based or Competitive Program Input

From your regions perspective, what are the advantages/disadvantages of a Performance Based Grant Program?

ADV: - A performance based grant program seems more consistent with the goals outlined in the California Water Plan. From our perspective, a strong IRWMP built with specific objectives and extensive stakeholder involvement has produced quality projects that have the complete support of the local community. The analysis of the projects was so rigorous and the community support is so strong that millions of dollars of local dollars will have to be spent as a match of the State grants funds. Having a strong plan built on strong local involvement and support ensures the State that the projects proposed to be built are indeed high quality projects that will address the regional needs. The California water plan clearly indicates that the State's needs will be met by collectively addressing the needs of the region. The needs of the regions CANNOT be met by the State determining what is or is not a "good" project. Therefore, having high standards for developing good IRWMPs that produce real priorities of the region will produce the greatest benefit for the State implementation

DIS: - None

Which type of program would your region prefer and why?

Performance Based Grant Program: This type of program would make local agencies responsible for accounting to not only local stakeholders but the state. The proof would have to be made easily understandable and justifiable before any funds for a plan were made available.

Are there other ideas or suggestions you have concerning performance based versus a competitive grant program?

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

IRWM Plan Standards

Observations from Previous Efforts –

Minimum standards for IRWM plans included in the guidelines may not be sufficient to ensure high quality. Governance of an IRWM plan was not always easily addressed. Project development and selection was not always tied to measurable plan objectives. Stakeholder involvement was inadequate in some plans.

Other Observations –

Proposition 84 contains language that will necessitate changes in the guidelines and standards. Eleven funding areas will limit competition as a means to ensure quality if plans.

DWR Concept for IRWM Grant Program –

- DWR is considering emphasis on planning prior to funding implementation projects.
- DWR is considering holding IRWM Plans to pre-established standards.
- Standards would be added or modified (such as project prioritization and governance) in the guidelines.
- Applicants would not be eligible to pursue implementation grants until the IRWM Plan meets a pre-established standards.
- Planning grants would be predicated on a scope of work that produces an IRWM plan that will meet the pre-established standards.

Input Questions –

Based on your experience with the current standards which ones were difficult to address? Please discuss what made them difficult.

- 1) Statewide priorities – in order to meet these, a region must have an existing situation that lends to solving these specific statewide priorities, which may or may not be the priority of any particular regional priority as part of and adopted IRWMP and this creates a conflict.
- 2) Environmental Justice – moving target different objectives than those required by an IRWMP pre CWC

Continued on back

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

IRWM Plan Input

Which standards, if any, were not helpful in your IRWM Plan?

Fish restoration
Beach restoration
Desalination

Because of our geographic location, it is impossible for us to address these.

What elements would be helpful for DWR to include or explain in a governance standard?

For our region, a successful governance structure includes: 1) a clear structure and process that allows for continuous inclusive public/stakeholder involvement; 2) a body that has clear decision-making authority that 3) represents the entire region which is 4) openly accountable to the public for actions taken.

What elements would NOT be helpful for DWR to include in a governance standard (what would make a governance standard too restrictive)?

A specific format. Let the regions determine the structure which fits the region's needs but provide performance measures for the structure to meet.

In what areas was it important for your plan to exceed the minimum standards?

We voluntarily exceeded the standards in several ways. First, we put our plan through a EIR process to ensure it was able to withstand legal scrutiny and so that we meet the legal standard for public input. Secondly, we incorporated the requirement for the Urban Water Management Plan and the Groundwater Management Plans into the IRWMP. We did this so as to have a truly comprehensive document that addresses all forms of current resource management standards.

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

Disadvantaged Communities

Comment Summary from Previous Efforts –

Incentives to reduce cost share for DAC did not address hardships DACs face engaging the IRWM process.

DWR Concept for IRWM Grant Program –

Through Prop 84 DWR does have the means to provide some technical assistance and financial assistance to help DAC engage in their regional IRWM processes. DWR is considering implementing this assistance early in the process so DAC's can engage more fully in IRWM planning and/or application preparation processes. DWR is also considering allocating funding to projects that meet critical needs of DACs.

Input Questions –

What types of technical assistance would be helpful to augment your region's efforts to engage DACs in the IRWM process?

Clear guidelines on what type of project could be funded. Clear simple samples (ie completed example applications for real projects) of how DAC's could get funds to improve water issues derived from the IRWMP.

Are there specific functions that DWR personnel can provide in the IRWM process that would help engage DACs?

Coordinate with DHS for using some of the \$180,000,000 for projects

In addition to technical assistance, is there also need for financial assistance and how do you envision those funds being used?

No

Continued on back.

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

Disadvantaged Community Support Input

Is addressing water quality and supply issues that directly impact DACs a priority in your region?

Yes

Can the IRWM Process address direct water supply and quality problems in DACs? If so how? How was this addressed in your IRWM Plan

Of course, water supply, water quality and contamination reduction were all elements of the IRWMP.

Are there other ideas or suggestions you have concerning engaging disadvantaged communities in the IRWM process? Are there items that DWR should emulate, retain or drop from other grant programs regarding DACs?

Have joint meetings with RECD, HUD, Community Re-Development, etc, - find out and let local DAC's know how they can leverage funding with State/County/Federal agencies.

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

Regional Definition

Comment Summary from Previous Efforts –

Provide a better definition of what a region is. Provide direction on appropriate regions.

DWR Concept for IRWM Grant Program –

Work with regional efforts upfront to establish functional regional/sub-regional efforts. The timing of Funding for implementation efforts will reflect the readiness of the various funding areas. DWR will work with regions to “pre-screen” regional efforts for readiness.

Input Questions –

Based on you experience with the existing IRWM Grant Program, how can the definition of a “region” be improved?

The Guidelines did a good job in generally describing what makes up a region, possible provide real demographic info on existing and planned regions in map form. This would show that traditional boundaries may or may not apply. It might also be helpful to include some example for possible criteria that could be used to determine a successful region (i.e. watershed boundaries, geo-political (county), areas with access to common supplemental water supply...)

What factors other than water management objectives and hydrologic, watershed, and political boundaries should be considered in establishing IRWM Plan Region Boundaries?

All

For Prop 84 funding areas with multiple IRWM Planning Regions, identify possible mechanism for equitable distribution of limited funding.

1. Other sources of Prop 84 designated certain parts of a funding area should be taking into consideration when allocating funds within a funding area. For example, one part of a funding area may be getting funds earmarked in Prop 84 for non-IRWMP purposes. Note that about 80 percent of Prop 84 was for non-IRWMP earmark projects (about \$4B out of the \$5B) Since environmentally related projects are also many times part of a successful IRWMP, those area not receiving earmark funds should not be inequitably disadvantaged by having sole access to funds limited to the smaller pool of funds available through the IRWMP portion of the bond. In other words, total funds received from 84 should be taken into account when determining equity within a funding area.

2. The original theme of prorating the \$1B of available bond funds should not be completely forgotten when allocating funds with a funding area. The concept was to allocate funds based on need through population. One could take this rational one step further and state that investment needs should not only be based on population but on population growth. In fact Prop 50 contains clear preferences towards areas which had high population growth rates. In summary, DWR should stay clear of breaking from the original population formula and NOT consider some sort of geographic balance within a funding area. To stay with the original legislative intent, DWR SHOULD consider some form of the original prorating formula (based on population) with a preference given to those areas with the highest growth potential (areas with the high needs for investment).

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder Involvement				
For your region, please describe briefly who are the stakeholders and rate their level of involvement.				
	STAKEHOLDER INTERESTS	HIGH	MED	LOW
	Water Districts	X		
	Sanitary Districts	X		
	Flood Control Districts		X	
	City Government	X		
	County Government	X		
	Municipalities	X		
	Associations of Government Agencies		X	
	Tribes			X
	Watershed Groups		X	
	Environmental Groups	X		
	Community Based Groups	X		
	Environmental Justice Organizations			X
	Representatives Disadvantaged Communities			X
	Private Landowners		X	
	General Public	X		
	Universities		X	
	Industry/Trade Organizations		X	
	Other – List State Agencies		X	
<p>Please discuss if there are other stakeholders who should be involved in your regional efforts, but have not been.</p> <p>Regulatory Agencies such as the Regional Water Quality control Board, California Department of Fish and Game State elected officials</p> <p>Please discuss efforts that your region has made to ensure that IRWM Planning efforts are inclusive of diverse stakeholder interests.</p> <p>Once every two months Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Community-wide invitations are regularly made to solicit interest in participating in the TAC Public Hearings, written correspondence, public outreach programs</p>				

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program
Scoping Meetings – Stakeholder Input

OPTIONAL – Please provide brief information about the person(s) completing this form	
Region:	Lahathon and Colorado
Name	Mojave Water Agency
Address	22450 Headquarters Apple Valley, CA. 92308
If you are not already on the DWR IRWM Mailing/Distribution List. Please add the above listed person(s) to the IRWM distribution list. <input type="checkbox"/>	

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY