

**Local Groundwater Assistance Grant  
Program**

FOLLOW UP TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL (TAP)  
MEETING  
APRIL 25, 2013  
SACRAMENTO

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Meeting Schedule**

- TAP Meeting 10:00
  - Presentation
  - TAP Discussion
- Public Comment Period
- TAP Recommendations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Agenda**

- TAP Reminders
- Review of February TAP meeting
- Review Public Comments Received
- TAP Funding Recommendations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Desired Outcomes

- Solicit public comments
- TAP develop grant funding recommendations for DWR Director's consideration

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## TAP Reminders

*Water Code Section 10795.16.*

(a) If a member of the Technical Advisory Panel, or a member of his or her immediate family, is **employed by a grant applicant**, the employer of a grant applicant, or a **consultant** or independent contractor employed by a grant applicant, the panel member shall make that **disclosure to the other members of the panel and shall not participate in the review of the grant application of that applicant.**

(b) The Technical Advisory Panel shall operate on principles of **collaboration**. Panelists shall be appointed who are committed to working together with other interests for the **long-term benefit of California groundwater resources and the people** who rely on those resources.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Review of February TAP Meeting

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 2012 Solicitation Schedule

- May 4, 2012 Release Final Guidelines & PSP
- June 5-11, 2012 Applicant Workshops (4)
- July 13, 2012 Applications Due
- February 15, 2013 Scores & Reviews Released
- February 27, 2013 TAP/Public Meeting
- March 6, 2013 Comments Due
- April 25, 2013 Follow Up TAP Meeting
- July 2013 Awards\*
- September 2013 Execute Grant Agreements

\* Pending passage of FY 13-14 Budget

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Grant Submittals

- 98 Complete Grant Applications
- Total Funds Available – Approx. \$4.7 million
- Total Funds Requested – \$23.6 million
- Total Project Costs - \$32.3 million

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Applications Received



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Summary of Scores

- Scores ranged from 40 to 7 (out of 40)
- Geographic points have not been assigned
- Individual Proposal Summaries provided
- Many high quality proposals
- Highly competitive

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Comparison of Scenarios

#	Score	Option 1		Option 2			Option 3				
				2a	2b	2c					
5	40	100%	\$250,000	100%	\$250,000	95%	\$237,500	90%	\$225,000	79%	\$197,807
7	39	100%	\$250,000	80%	\$200,000	85%	\$212,500	80%	\$200,000	79%	\$197,807
12	38	58%	\$145,000	70%	\$174,161	69%	\$172,500	74%	\$184,869	79%	\$197,807

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Summary of TAP Discussion

- Preferred Option 2 over Options 1 & 3
  - Debated which of the sub-option was preferred
  - No decision
- Discussed Geographic Balance points
  - No decision
- Decided need results of reevaluations/public comments 1<sup>st</sup>

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Summary of Public Comments

- Support for specific projects
- 15 requests for re-evaluation
- Other comments
  - Higher scores should receive more funding
  - Distribute funds evenly
  - Project is scalable
  - Do not use Geographic Balance points

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Results of Reevaluations

- Net Result – 2 proposals added to funding range
- Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (39 to 40)
  - Budget score rose from 4 to 5
  - No overall impact to scoring picture
- Zone 7 Water Agency (37 to 39)
  - Work plan score adjusted from 8 to 10
- Castaic Lake Water Agency (35 to 38)
  - Adoption of GWMP – revised score to be consistent with similar applications
- Other reevaluations
  - Undertaken, but did not result in scores being raised to 38+

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Funding Considerations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Available Funding

- Total Funding Available = \$4.7 million
  - \$4,682,489 to be precise
    - × Identified up to \$75,000 in possible additional funds
      - Returned funds from prior grants
      - Not shown in scenarios; no significant impact to scenarios
  - Source – Proposition 84 IRWM – Interregional Funds
- Maximum Grant Amount - \$250,000
- No additional sources of funding
  - No secured funding for future solicitations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Funding Considerations

- Rank high to low
- No “bright line” scoring break
- No Geographic Balance Points Used
- “Checkbook” analysis
  - Funding runs out in 38 pts block of applications
  - 38 pts = 95% of total possible points (“A-”)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Net Results from Rescore

Comparison of Prior Results				
# Apps Original	# Apps Revised	Score	Total Request Original	Total Request Revised
5	6	40	\$1,249,424	\$1,499,424
7	7	39	\$1,748,654	\$1,748,654
12	13	38	\$2,919,914	\$3,169,914

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Comparison of Scenarios

#	Score	Option 1		Option 2			Option 3				
		2a	2b	2c	2a	2b	2c				
6	40	100%	\$250,000	100%	\$250,000	95%	\$237,500	90%	\$225,000	79%	\$197,807
7	39	100%	\$250,000	80%	\$200,000	85%	\$212,500	80%	\$200,000	79%	\$197,807
12	38	58%	\$145,000	70%	\$174,161	69%	\$172,500	74%	\$184,869	79%	\$197,807
13	38	45%	\$112,500	56%	\$140,000	56%	\$140,500	63%	\$157,500	73%	\$182,397

73% = 72.9588%

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

## Applications scored 38+




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Scores of 38+

- 1 - Alameda County Water District
- 9 - **Castaic Lake Water Agency**
- 10 - Consolidated Irrigation District
- 11 - Crescenta Valley Water District
- 19 - Folsom, City of
- 21 - **Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District**
- 31 - Kings Co. Water District
- 33 - Lassen, County of
- 39 - Modesto, City of
- 44 - Napa, County of
- 45 - Newhall County Water District
- 49 - Orange County Water District
- 55 - Rancho California Water District
- 58 - Roseville, City of
- 59 - Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority
- 60 - Sacramento Groundwater Authority
- 61 - Sacramento Suburban Water District
- 62 - San Bruno, City of
- 73 - Sonoma County Water Agency
- 74 - Soquel Creek Water District
- 78 - Squaw Valley Public Service District
- 80 - Three Valleys Municipal Water District
- 81 - Tranquillity Irrigation District
- 83 - Turlock, City of
- 95 - Yuba County Water Agency
- 98 - **Zone 7 Water Agency**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

## Slide 19

---

**JY1** This 73% would be throughout all ranks in option #3 correct? Just from looking at the slide it suggests 40's and 39's at 79%. Not sure if we should that to the note at the bottom or just remember to verbally explain.  
Joe Yun, 4/23/2013




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Comparison of Scenarios

Score/# apps	Option 1		Option 3	
40/6	100%	\$250,000	73%	\$182,397
39/7	100%	\$250,000	73%	\$182,397
38/13	45%	\$112,500	73%	\$182,397

Score/# apps	Option 2					
	2a	2b	2c			
40/6	100%	\$250,000	95%	\$237,500	90%	\$225,000
39/7	80%	\$200,000	85%	\$212,500	80%	\$200,000
38/13	56%	\$140,000	56%	\$140,500	63%	\$157,500

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Q&A – Public Comment Period Comments due by April 26, 2013

**SUBMIT TO:**  
 Email to: [DWR\\_IRWM@water.ca.gov](mailto:DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov)  
 Preferred  
 Word Compatible

**Mail to:**  
 Department of Water Resources  
 Division of Integrated Regional Water Management  
 Attn: Tom Lutterman  
 P. O. Box 942836  
 Sacramento CA 94236-0001

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## TAP Recommendations

- **FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**
- **GEOGRAPHIC BALANCE POINTS**
- **OTHER ISSUES**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---