

# 2015 IRWM Implementation Grant Solicitation

APPLICANT WORKSHOP  
JUNE 22, 2015 – SACRAMENTO  
JUNE 23, 2015 – ALHAMBRA

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Agenda

- ▶ Welcome/Introductions
- ▶ PSP & GL Overview
  - ▶ Changes From Draft to Final
  - ▶ Funding
  - ▶ Eligibility Requirements
  - ▶ Proposal Evaluation
  - ▶ Schedule and Submittal
- ▶ Question and Answer

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

## PSP Overview



Refer to both during preparation of application

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Changes From Draft PSP to Final

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Changes

Topic	Draft PSP	Final PSP
<b>Projects Not Required to Contain Construction Activities</b>	Project area comprised of a DAC	Project area <u>entirely</u> comprised of a DAC (i.e., 100% DAC)
<b>Reimbursement Date</b>	Costs incurred after January 1, 2015	Costs incurred after January 17, 2014
<b>DAC threshold To receive credit for Question 12, Table 10</b>	Undefined	At least 25% of the project area (by population or geography) must be a DAC
<b>Project types considered to effectively address long-term drought preparedness</b>	N/A	Added "Solutions that yield a new water supply such as seawater desalination"
<b>SRF Funds</b>	Considered State Funds and not eligible as Funding Match	Not considered State Funds and eligible as Funding Match

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Funding

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Available Funding for 2015 Solicitation

- ▶ Total Available – \$231.6M
  - ▶ DWR's intent to award not less than 10% (~\$23M) to projects that provide direct water-related benefits to a DAC
  - ▶ Funding Match – 25% of total proposal cost
- ▶ Maximum grant award dependent on IRWM Funding Area (FA) and competition
  - ▶ See Table 1 (page 7) in PSP for anticipated FA allocations
  - ▶ Maximum grant award to an applicant is of FA's Remaining Balance

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Proposition 84 IRWM Remaining Balances

Funding Area	Funding Area Remaining Balances (Maximum Grant Award 2015 Solicitation)
North Coast	\$11,047,939
San Francisco Bay	\$41,305,435
Central Coast	\$4,937,016
Los Angeles – Ventura	\$40,039,355
Santa Ana	\$64,267,686
San Diego	\$38,834,904
Sacramento River	\$10,129,278
San Joaquin River	\$6,674,438
Tulare/Kern	\$4,054,299
Lahontan	\$6,116,807
Colorado River	\$4,175,000
Total	\$231,582,158

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Grant Reimbursement

- ▶ Reimbursement: Costs incurred after Governor's drought declaration – January 17, 2014
- ▶ Funding Match: Costs incurred after January 1, 2011

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Eligibility Requirements

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Application Eligibility

- ▶ Eligible Applicants
  - ▶ Local public agency
  - ▶ Non-profit organization – 501(c)(3)
- ▶ One proposal per IRWM Region
- ▶ Adopted IRWM Plan
  - ▶ Applicants must have an adopted plan that has gone through DWR’s Plan Review process (PRP) by application due date – August 7, 2015
- ▶ Additional eligibility criteria in the Guidelines

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Eligible Project Types

- ▶ Projects must yield multiple benefits and include one of the 11 IRWM project elements listed in Section III.C. of the Guidelines (page 16) and Table 4 of PSP
  - ▶ Section II.C. of the PSP (page 6) provides additional detail
- ▶ Projects must be part of an adopted IRWM Plan
- ▶ All Project Proponents must adopt IRWM Plan
- ▶ Proposed projects that intend to provide direct water-related benefits to a project area entirely comprised of a DAC(s) are not required to include construction activities to be eligible.
  - ▶ Therefore, can be comprised of project development activities including, but not limited to: project scoping, planning, feasibility studies, and preliminary design

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

[ ]

Application Attachments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

[ ]

### Attachment 1 Eligibility Requirements

- ▶ Criterion consolidated & updated
  - ▶ Authorizing Documentation
  - ▶ Eligible Applicant Documentation
  - ▶ Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption
  - ▶ Project Consistency with an adopted IRWM Plan
  - ▶ Urban Water Management Compliance
  - ▶ Agricultural Water Management Compliance
  - ▶ Surface Water Diverter Compliance
  - ▶ Groundwater Management Compliance
  - ▶ CASGEM Compliance

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

[ ]

### Attachment 1 – Cont. Eligibility Requirements

**Authorizing Documentation**

- ▶ Applicant must provide a resolution (PSP page 13)
- ▶ If unable to supply at time of application, then include expected submittal date

**Eligible Applicant Documentation**

- ▶ Local agencies or non-profit organizations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 1 – Cont.

### Eligibility Requirements

#### **Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption**

- ▶ IRWM Plans must be submitted to DWR for review no later than application due date
- ▶ If an IRWM region has yet to have its plan approved by DWR through PRP, it must submit proof of formal adoption by all RWMG entities
- ▶ All Project Proponents must submit proof of adoption
  - ▶ Unless submitted with 2014 Grant solicitation, then just indicate as such

#### **Project Consistency with an adopted IRWM Plan**

- ▶ Provide Proof
  - ▶ Project(s) part of Adopted Plan Project List or
  - ▶ Projects vetted through the RWMG
- ▶ Limit: 1 page/Project, min. 10-point font

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 1 – Cont.

### Eligibility Requirements

#### **Urban Water Management Compliance**

- ▶ Proponents that are urban water supplier must submit AB 1420 and Water Meter Compliance Self Certification Forms:
  - ▶ [http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources\\_forms.cfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_forms.cfm)
  - ▶ <http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/finance/>
- ▶ Urban water suppliers must also provide DWR documentation that verifies complete 2010 UWMP

#### **Agricultural Water Management Compliance**

- ▶ Proponents that are agricultural water suppliers must provide DWR verification documentation for AWMP
- ▶ If submitted any of the above (both Urban and Ag) in 2014 Solicitation, indicate as such and do not resubmit

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 1 – Cont.

### Eligibility Requirements

#### **Surface Water Diverter Compliance**

- ▶ Proponents that are surface water diverters must verify SWRCB reporting

#### **Groundwater Management Compliance**

- ▶ Proponents with projects that affect groundwater levels or quality must submit GWMP Self Certification Form:  
[http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources\\_forms.cfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_forms.cfm)
- ▶ Projects that affect groundwater levels or quality in a CASGEM High or Medium priority groundwater basin, without an adopted GWMP in compliance of CWC §10753 before January 1, 2015 will not be eligible (CWC §10750.1.(a))

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 1 – Cont.

### Eligibility Requirements

#### CASGEM Compliance

- ▶ DWR has prioritized the groundwater basins:  
<http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/casgem/>
- ▶ Projects located in high and medium priority must demonstrate a eligible CASGEM monitoring entity per CWC §10927 has been designated for the basin
- ▶ Grant applicant and project proponents must by CASGEM compliant by application due date.
- ▶ Ineligible applicant under CASGEM = entire application ineligible
- ▶ Ineligible project proponent under CASGEM = no funding for that project and grant award will be proportionately reduced

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 1 – Cont.

### Eligibility Requirements

#### CASGEM Compliance – Cont.

- ▶ If the entire service area of grant applicant or project proponent's service area is demonstrated to be a DAC, the project will be considered eligible for grant funding notwithstanding CASGEM compliance.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 2

### Project Justification

- ▶ Project Summary Table
- ▶ Project Description
- ▶ Regional Map and Project Map
- ▶ Project Physical benefits
- ▶ Technical Analysis of Physical Benefits Claimed
- ▶ Direct Water-Related Benefit to a DAC
- ▶ Project Performance Monitoring Plan
- ▶ Cost Effectiveness Analysis

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## Attachment 2 – Cont.

### Project Justification

#### Project Physical Benefits – cont.

► Benefit types and units from page 19:

Benefit Type	Unit
water supply produced, saved, or recycled	acre-feet per year (AFY)
water quality	constituent concentration reduced in mg/L
flood damage reduction	inundated acres reduced in acres
habitat improved, restored or protected	acres
fishery benefits	increased fishery flow rate in cubic feet per second (cfs)
species protection	number of species benefited

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 2 – Cont.

### Project Justification

**Table 5 – Annual Project Physical Benefits**

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of Benefit Claimed: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Units of Benefit Claimed: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Anticipated Useful Life of Project (years): \_\_\_\_\_

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Year	Physical Benefits		Change Resulting from Project (c) - (b)
	Without Project	With Project	
2015			
2016			
2017			
Etc.			
Last Year of Project Life			
Comments:			

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 2 – Cont.

### Project Justification

#### Technical Analysis of Physical Benefits Claimed

- For each project provide a description of the primary and secondary physical benefits; must address the following:
1. Explanation of need for project, including recent and historical conditions that provide background for benefits to be claimed.
  2. Estimates of without-project conditions (i.e., levels of the physical benefits in the future, without the project, but with other projects that might be planned).
  3. Description of methods used to estimate physical benefits
  4. Identification of all new facilities, policies, and actions required to obtain the physical benefits
  5. Description of any potential adverse physical effects and what is being done to mitigate those impacts
  6. Description of whether the proposed project effectively addresses long-term drought preparedness (see Statewide Priority in Table 1 of 2015 Guidelines).
- DAC non-construction projects: only required to complete #1.  
 ► Limit: 10 pages/Project, min. 10-point font

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 2 – Cont.

### Project Justification

#### Direct Water-Related Benefit to a DAC

- ▶ Describe whether the proposed project area encompasses a DAC
  - ▶ Must use Attachment 7 to demonstrate the community meets the definition of a DAC
- ▶ Describe water-related need of the DAC and explain how the proposed project will address the need
- ▶ Must demonstrate at least 25% of project service area (by population or geography) will benefit a water-related need of a DAC to receive credit for Question 12 in Table 10
- ▶ Limit: 1 page/Project, min. 10-point font

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 2 – Cont.

### Project Justification

#### Project Performance Monitoring Plan

- ▶ Must be completed for each project and should include the following, and may be presented in tabular form like Table 6
  - ▶ Proposed Physical Benefits
  - ▶ Targets – measurable measurable targets that are feasible to meet during the life of the project(s)
  - ▶ Measurement tools and methods – to effectively track performance
- ▶ DAC non-construction projects: not required to complete this section.

Table 6 – Project Performance Monitoring Plan

Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Physical Benefits	Targets	Measurement tools and methods

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 2 – Cont.

### Project Justification

#### Cost Effectiveness Analysis

- ▶ No economic analysis
- ▶ Applicants must conduct a Cost Effectiveness analysis of each project
- ▶ Evaluates whether the physical benefits provided by the project are provided at the least possible cost
- ▶ Use Table 7 for each project
- ▶ DAC non-construction projects: not required to complete this section.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 2 – Cont.

### Project Justification

Table 6 – Cost Effective Analysis	
Project Name:	_____
Question 1	Types of benefits provided as shown in Table 5
Question 2	Have alternative methods been considered to achieve the same types and amounts of physical benefits as the proposed project been identified?
	If no, why?
	If yes, list the methods (including the proposed project) and estimated costs.
Question 3	If the proposed project is not the least cost alternative, why is it the preferred alternative? Provide an explanation of any accomplishments of the proposed project that are different from the alternative project or methods.
Comments:	_____

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 3

### Work Plan

- ▶ Must contain descriptions of the anticipated tasks necessary to complete each project, including:
  - ▶ Deliverables
  - ▶ Current project status (i.e.: permitting activities, etc.)
- ▶ Tasks should be organized by the four budget categories, as applicable
- ▶ Limit: 5 pages/project, min. 10-point font
- ▶ Maps and figures count against page limit, as they should be presented in Attachment 2

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 4

### Budget

- ▶ Project and Proposal Budgets required
  - ▶ Consistent with how tasks presented in Work Plan
    - ▶ e.g., if the Work Plan describes projects at the subtask level, the budget must also present costs at the subtask level
  - ▶ Support anticipated costs with documentation
- ▶ Refer to Exhibit B in PSP for guidance on how to prepare Attachment 4.
- ▶ See 2015 Guidelines (page 26) for guidance on eligible costs
- ▶ Limit: 2 pages/project, min. 10-point font

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 5

### Schedule

#### Project Schedule

- ▶ Realistic timelines for all tasks with start and end dates for each task in Work Plan
- ▶ Description of how project schedule is realistic, reasonable, and accomplishable
- ▶ Be consistent with Work Plan and Budget
- ▶ Limit: 2 pages/project, Min. 10-point font

#### Proposal Schedule

- ▶ Schedule which summarizes Proposal's overall schedule

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 6

### Program Preferences

- ▶ Document breadth and magnitude of how proposal assists in meeting Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities (2015 Guidelines Page 11-13)
- ▶ Claimed program preferences clearly result of implementing project
- ▶ Describe any issues related to Human Right to Water and region's effort to address the goal of the policy
- ▶ Examples of critical water supply/quality DAC projects provided in Table 9 of 2015 Guidelines
  - ▶ Not a requirement to receive DAC funding match waiver
- ▶ Limit: 1 page/project, Min. 10-pt font

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Attachment 7

### Disadvantaged Community Assistance

- ▶ Only required if proposal includes a project which addresses a direct water-related need of a DAC
- ▶ Consult 2015 IRWM Guidelines, Appendix G and DAC Tool, to determine if the project area includes a DAC using the most recent MHI data available:  
[http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources\\_dac.cfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_dac.cfm)
  - ▶ Link also contains GIS data files for download
  - ▶ Qualifies as DAC at Census Place, Tract, or Block Group
- ▶ For regional construction projects that include a DAC within a larger project area, describe the proportion of project benefits to the DAC (based on either population or geography).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Proposal Evaluation

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Review and Scoring Process

**Eligibility and Completeness Review**

- ▶ Application must pass this step to move on to scoring phase

**Application Scoring**

- ▶ Scoring methodology similar to 2014 Drought Solicitation
- ▶ Series of Y/N questions (Table 10)
  - ▶ No = 0 pts
  - ▶ Yes & N/A = Points
- ▶ Table 10 also provides detailed explanation on how to receive a full score (i.e., a score of "yes")

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Review and Scoring Process

**Application Scoring – Cont.**

- ▶ Proposal level questions
  - ▶ Four Y/N questions, plus
  - ▶ Points for addressing Human Right to Water
- ▶ Project level questions
  - ▶ Each project will have a score
  - ▶ Average of all project scores used in Total Proposal Score
- ▶ In event of a tie, Program Preferences will be scored as "tie-breaker"
- ▶ Total Proposal Score = Proposal Criteria Score + Average of Project Criteria Score

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

☐

## Solicitation Schedule and Application Submittal

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

☐

## Solicitation Schedule

- ▶ May 13, 2015 – Final Guidelines and PSP released
- ▶ June 22 and 23 – Applicant Workshops
- ▶ August 7, 2015 – 5:00 p.m. – Applications Due
- ▶ November 2015 (tentative) – Draft funding recommendations/public meeting
- ▶ December 2015 (tentative) – Final Conditional Awards announced
- ▶ Early 2016 – Agreements executed and work commences

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

☐

## Contacts

- ▶ Keith Wallace: (916) 651-9624
- ▶ Email questions to: [DWR\\_IRWM@water.ca.gov](mailto:DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov)
- ▶ Prop 84 Implementation Grant Program Website:  
<http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/p84implementation.cfm>

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Questions & Answers

- Entire application submitted electronically via DWR's GRanTS: <http://www.water.ca.gov/grants/>
- Applications must be received by DWR by 5:00 p.m., August 7, 2015

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---