

**From:** Sylvir Consulting, Inc.  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 03, 2014 2:52 PM  
**Subject:** Water-Energy Grant draft guidelines comments

Hi Laura,

I have the following comments from clients:

Provide points for projects which applicants are able to provide a cost share. Supporting a cost share advantage provides multiple benefits: ensures the applicant has a vested interest in the project and stretches the State dollars to allow for more projects. DACs could also be provided bonus points for providing even a small cost share.

1. When determining DAC according to the CalEnvironScreen tool, multiple values are given for percentages based on census tracts. Please clarify whether only those tracts served by a specific project would be included, or if the applicant needs to base the DAC designation on an average of all of the census tracts for the system service area(s).
2. Projects required for regulatory compliance (i.e. installation of water meters) should require at least a 50% match, as many agencies long ago complied with this requirement and these agencies feel their rate payers are being slighted.
3. IF maximizing water and energy savings are the primary goals for the program, then ranking DAC's that have lower savings than non-DACs is counter to the primary goals of the program. The ranking should be changed to prioritize those projects with highest savings, with DAC status as a lesser priority. (i.e. switch priority ranks 3 and 4, and 6 and 5).
4. Please clarify what costs are eligible for reimbursement since July 1, 2014; only non-construction costs? Also, it states on page 28, that the "costs for preparing and filing a grant application belonging to another solicitation is not eligible." Does that mean that the costs for developing grant applications for this solicitation are eligible for reimbursement? Please clarify.
5. The priority ranking of high medium and low are pretty subjective, plus with the addition of 7 priority classifications it is difficult to assess project competitiveness when considering project proposals for submission. Can the State provide some clarity on this issue; for instance, how will it be determined that a project ranks high vs medium and how will the cut-offs be determined between the two? Also, will project cost also be a factor in this ranking assessment?
6. Based on the current review criteria, it would seem the proposals will be ranked and funded based on estimated savings and DAC status only, while the rest of the application components are simply a pass/fail situation. Is this accurate....there are no scoring criteria?

Sheri L. Lasick  
Sylvir Consulting, Inc.  
5235 Fawn Crossing Way  
Antelope, Ca 95843