

**From:** [Amy Talbot](#)  
**To:** [Peters.Laura@DWR](mailto:Peters.Laura@DWR)  
**Cc:** [Rob Swartz](#)  
**Subject:** Water Energy Grant Feedback  
**Date:** Friday, May 16, 2014 2:25:15 PM

---

Hi Laura,

Hope you are doing well. I wanted to thank DWR for hosting these workshops and for giving us an opportunity to help shape the grant. I summarized my comments below from the workshop and also added a few more comments after conferring with my colleague, Rob Swartz.

- We would like to see a menu of options for eligible water energy projects including direct installation, rebates, landscape irrigation retrofits, cash for grass, commercial/institutional programs and leak detection. Water conservation and efficiency needs vary throughout the state and we would like to see that reflected in the grant format. We also request that DWR make the grant format flexible enough to allow for additional creative solutions that might come forward.
- We would like to see this grant issued in a similar competitive format as the past Proposition 50 Drought Grant, overseen by the DWR Office of Water Use Efficiency.
- We are in support of including disadvantaged communities as part of the criteria of the grant. This criteria could be applied to all eligible funds or could be applied to a dedicated portion of the funding to directly assist disadvantaged communities and their needs.
- We understand that DWR will be calculating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for all projects submitted and would like to have access to the methodology prior to grant application submission date.
- We support the inclusion and preference of regional projects as we have seen the wide ranging benefits of previous regional projects and believe they should continue to be prioritized.
- We believe the cost effectiveness component should reflect the degree to which a project is not locally cost effective. As an incentive program, the grant would be acting as the extra funding needed to push a potential project “over the edge” from not locally cost effective to cost effective and ready for implementation.
- We strongly believe that submitted projects should be evaluated by their combined ability to save water, save energy and reduce GHG emissions. We would like to see a project perform relatively well in all of these areas to show the need for this type of funding program now and in the future.
- We believe project proponents should demonstrate coordination with local energy utilities.
- We would like to see DWR have a goal of distributing this funding throughout the state.
- We would like to see projects provide consideration for coordinating with regional IRWMPs.
- We would like to see DWR ensure that the grant program doesn’t penalize those agencies who are actively interested in saving energy and reducing GHGs but have a relatively low energy intensity because their water is locally sourced.

Overall we are very excited about this grant opportunity and see it as a huge step towards funding

joint energy and water savings projects. Our hope is that this process and results are so successful that this type of joint funding will continue beyond the drought and will become a permanent opportunity for water and energy utilities.

We (mostly Rob) have a lot of experience with the past Prop 50 grant funding and would be happy to meet with you and your team as we are just down the street!

Please let me know if you have any questions or if you would like to discuss these comments in greater detail.

Thank you,

Amy

**Amy Marie Talbot**  
Water Efficiency Program Manager  
Regional Water Authority  
5620 Birdcage Street, Suite 180  
Citrus Heights, CA 95610  
916-967-7692  
[rwah2o.org](http://rwah2o.org)  
[bewatersmart.info](http://bewatersmart.info)