

From: Serena Johns  
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 1:30 PM  
To: Peters, Laura@DWR  
Subject: Public Comments

Dear Ms. Peters:

This provides public comments and recommendations from Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District in regards to the following issues presented at the recent Water Energy Grant Program presentation on 8/19/14 and 8/25/14:

1) Preference/Priority for DACs. Slide #14 from the Water Energy PowerPoint Presentation identifies the DAC ranking system and indicates DACs with high/medium water/energy savings will take priority as #2 and #3 over Non-DAC projects that have high savings in both water and energy (currently ranked as #4). While we understand the requirement of the grant to provide at least 50% of funding to DAC projects, we strongly recommend that NON-DAC projects that have high savings in both water and energy be prioritized as #2 behind DAC projects with high savings in both water and energy. A Non-DAC project could potentially benefit a much larger population than a DAC community, and therefore, provide much greater value to the State as a whole.

2) Project Cost Effectiveness. Slide #12 from the Water Energy PowerPoint Presentation identifies cost effectiveness determined by Water Saved divided by Project Cost, and Energy Saved divided by Project Cost. You indicated that the District must include all costs for the project, including any match that the District might have added to complete the project. We believe this criteria should strictly be a measure of the cost effectiveness of State Funding, therefore, we recommend that only funding provided by the State be used for evaluation of this criteria, not the entire cost of the project. State funding added to local funding would allow for a project that might not otherwise be feasible, benefitting a significant population base and creating an effective/efficient use of State funding. If a City/District were to use the total project cost criteria (local match and State), it would make the project look less cost effective than other projects that only used State funding.

3) Eligible and Competitive Projects. Slide #8 identifies eligible projects for funding. Certain projects lend themselves to much greater water savings than others (AMI/AMR projects, canal lining, landscape irrigation, etc.), while others (installation of low-flow sink aerators, shower heads, toilets) garner much smaller savings as a whole. Will you be apportioning awards by project category to ensure that a variety of projects are eligible and competitive for the grant? For example, a direct install program for low-flow aerators, showerheads and toilets will not be able to compete against an agricultural canal-lining project in terms of water and energy saved.

Thank you very much for your consideration of these comments and suggestions. If you should have any questions, or want further clarification of our comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at 951-674-3146 X8319.

Serena L. Johns  
Management Analyst  
WESA // EVMWD  
31315 Chaney St.  
Lake Elsinore, CA 92534