



MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER MANAGEMENT

5 HARRIS COURT, BLDG.
G POST OFFICE BOX 85
MONTEREY, CA 93942-0085 • (831) 658-5600
FAX (831) 644-9560 • <http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us>

February 16, 2007

Ms. Tracie Billington
California Department of Water Resources
Division of Planning and Local Assistance
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Ms. Shahla Farahnak
California State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Financial Assistance
1001 I Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: Comments on Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program

Dear Ms. **Billington** and Ms. Farahnak:

The staff of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) and stakeholders in the local Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) planning region would like to commend the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) staffs for providing local agencies the opportunity to comment on the IRWM Program.

Proposed Funding of Proposition 50 Implementation Grant Proposals. On January 23, 2007, DWR presented a proposal for disbursing the remainder of Prop. 50 funds. As you know, MPWMD was not invited to make a Step 2 IRWM Implementation Grant application, so this agency does not stand to benefit directly this proposal. While we are not opposed to the proposal, the February 20, 2007 deadline that DWR and SWRCB have set for deciding on awarding most of the remaining funds in Prop. 50 seems arbitrary and somewhat hurried. We would prefer a measured approach that resolves some of the issues that have surfaced since the January 23, 2007 proposal was made public.

As you are aware, agencies in the proposed Central Coast funding area have had some discussions through telephone conversations and e-mail about linking the award of Prop. 50 funds with an agreement on the future allocation of Prop. 84 funds within the Central Coast funding area. While

Ms. Tracie Billington and Ms. Shahla Faralmak
February 16, 2007
Page 2 of 2

there appears to be a logical link through the IRWM program, MPWMD staff is not in favor of making recommendations and decisions about Prop. 84 funds without having all eligible agencies in the Central Coast funding area participate and without having the opportunity for public discussion and concurrence of each managing Board or governing body.

Performance vs. Competitive Grant Program. The hurdles (costs) for participating in the competitivebased model of the IRWM grant program appear high. Each agency in the Step 1/Step 2 Prop. 50 grant application process spent considerable sums to develop required information. If added up for all the agencies around the State that have not been successful to date in obtaining an implementation grant, the total expenditure is likely to be fairly large. Funds used in making an application competitive could be put to better use in developing acceptable IRWM Plans and projects. MPWMD is in favor of a performance-based model for all future grant funds in the IRWM program.

Proposition 84 funds. Should DWR and SWRCB move forward with the January 23, 2007 proposal, we request that agencies that were not able to compete for Prop. 50 funds in a second round be given a preference in awarding Prop. 84 funds.

If you have **questions or comments about this letter**, please contact me at (831) 658-5650 or Larry Hampson at (831) 659-2543.

Sincerely,



David A. **Berger**
General Manager

pc: Assemblyman John Laird
Senator Abel Maldonado
Curtis Weeks, Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Bruce Laclergue, Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency
Paavo Ogren, San Luis Obispo County Public Works Department
Robert Almy, Santa Barbara County Water Agency
John Ricker, Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Services