



Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package

Including:
Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Program
Proposition 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Program
Department of Water Resources' Water Use Efficiency Program

January 4, 2002



**CONSOLIDATED WATER USE EFFICIENCY
2002 PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE
January 4, 2002**

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) invites you to submit a Proposal for funding of a Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grant, a Proposition 13 Agricultural Water Conservation Capital Outlay Feasibility Study Grant, and/or a DWR Water Use Efficiency Project.

PROPOSAL DUE DATE:

3:00 p.m., March 1, 2002
Must be received, not postmarked, by this time and date.

SUBMIT PROPOSAL TO:

Submit one original, eight photocopies, and one electronic copy for each Proposal, on 3.5 inch diskettes or CD-ROM (preferably in a PDF format, or in MS Word and/or Excel compatible format) to:

**California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236-0001
Attention: Marsha Prillwitz**

or overnight carrier or hand deliver to:

**California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
1416 Ninth Street, Room 338, Sacramento, CA 95814
Attention: Marsha Prillwitz**

The entire Proposal shall be in 12 point font or larger on 8 1/2 -11 inch paper. The Proposal, Parts One and Two combined, shall not exceed 20 single-spaced, consecutively numbered pages. Resumes and letters of support attached to the Proposal are not included in the 20-page limit. Proposals that exceed the 20-page limit will be excluded from consideration. (The page limit does not apply to the Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Proposals.)

QUESTIONS? NEED ASSISTANCE? CONTACT:

Marsha Prillwitz, (916) 651-9674 or
marshap@water.ca.gov

For an electronic copy of this Proposal Solicitation Package, please go to this website: www.water.ca.gov

**Notice of Public Workshops
for the
Consolidated Water Use Efficiency
2002 Proposal Solicitation Package**

Workshop Dates and Locations:

Tuesday January 22, 2002	Wednesday January 23, 2002	Thursday January 24, 2002	Friday January 25, 2002
10:00 am – 12:30 pm Modesto Irrigation District 1231 Eleventh Street Modesto, California	10:00 am – 12:30 pm Contra Costa Water District 1331 Concord Ave. Concord, California	10:00 am – 12:30 pm The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California 700 Alameda, Rm 2-145 Los Angeles, California	10:00 am – 12:30 pm Chico Municipal Center 421 Main Street Conference Room 1 Chico, California

Purpose of Workshops:

These public workshops will provide information about the Proposal Solicitation Package; describe the application, review and selection process; and provide an update on water use efficiency implementation.

Workshop Agenda:

(questions will be welcomed during each agenda item)

- Welcome and Introductions 10:00 am
- Water Use Efficiency Program: An Update 10:20 am
- WUE Proposal Solicitation Package:
How to submit a proposal 10:40 am
- Public Comments and Questions 11:30 am
- Adjourn 12:30 pm

For More Information:

Please direct specific questions related to the Proposal Solicitation Package to Marsha Prillwitz (916) 651- 9674, marshap@water.ca.gov, or general questions about CALFED to Tom Gohring at (916) 651-7089, gohring@water.ca.gov.

**CONSOLIDATED WATER USE EFFICIENCY
2002 PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE
January 4, 2002**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**SECTION A: PROPOSITION 13 URBAN WATER CONSERVATION GRANTS AND
PROPOSITION 13 AGRICULTURAL WATER CONSERVATION FEASIBILITY STUDY
GRANTS**

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 13 PROGRAMS IN THIS PACKAGE	5
A-I BACKGROUND, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	6
A-II. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS	7
A-III. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS	7
A-IV. INELIGIBLE PROJECTS.....	9
A-V. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE	10
A-VI. AVAILABLE FUNDS.....	10
A-VII. DURATION OF PROJECTS	10
A-VIII. AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS.....	11
A-IX. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY	11
A-X. PROPOSAL REVIEW, SELECTION, AND AWARD PROCESS.....	11
A-XI. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE	12
A-XII. SELECTION CRITERIA	12
A-XIII. PROPOSAL CONTENTS.....	13

SECTION B: DWR WATER USE EFFICIENCY PROJECTS

SUMMARY OF DWR WATER USE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM 24

B-I. BACKGROUND, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 25

B-II. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS 25

B-III. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS 25

B-IV. INELIGIBLE PROJECTS 26

B-V. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE 26

B-VI. AVAILABLE FUNDS 27

B-VII. DURATION OF PROJECTS 27

B-VIII. AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS 27

B-IX. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY 27

B-X. PROPOSAL REVIEW, SELECTION, AND AWARD PROCESS 27

B-XI. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE 27

B-XII. SELECTION CRITERIA 27

B-XIII. PROPOSAL CONTENTS 28

**SECTION A
SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 13 PROGRAMS IN THIS PACKAGE**

PROGRAM TITLE	Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grant	Agricultural Water Conservation Capital Outlay Feasibility Study Grant
DUE DATE:	3/1/02	3/1/02
ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS	Cities, counties, other political subdivisions of the State, incorporated mutual water companies, joint power authorities*	Cities, counties, other political subdivisions of the State, incorporated mutual water companies, joint power authorities*
ELIGIBLE PROJECTS	Cost effective urban capital outlay measures to improve water use efficiency	Agricultural capital outlay feasibility studies for measures to improve water use efficiency
GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE	Statewide	Statewide
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$30 million	\$1.75 million
FUNDS INCLUDED IN 2001-2002 BUDGET	\$9 million	\$1.5 million
PER PROJECT FUNDING LIMITATIONS	\$5 million	\$100,000
COST SHARING REQUIRED?	no	no

***Agencies subject to the Urban Water Management Planning Act must have adopted a plan that meets the requirements of the law and submitted it to DWR to be eligible for Proposition 13 funding (Senate Bill 610, Costa).**

A-I BACKGROUND, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Introduction

This Proposal Solicitation Package may be used to apply for funding of:

- (a) an Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay project (Proposition 13),
- (b) an Agricultural Feasibility Study Capital Outlay project (Proposition 13),
and/or
- (c) a DWR Water Use Efficiency project.

Section A will describe the two Proposition 13 Programs and Section B will describe the DWR Water Use Efficiency Program. Presently there is no specific authorization or funding for the DWR Water Use Efficiency Program

The universal goal of all three programs is to reduce irrecoverable water losses, improve water quality, and attain environmental benefits through water use efficiency measures and to document those benefits.

The CALFED Bay-Delta Program, a cooperative effort of over 20 State and Federal agencies with management or regulatory responsibilities for the Bay-Delta, is committed to identifying and funding the most promising water use efficiency projects that contribute toward the goals of the CALFED Program. This Proposal Solicitation Package is being released by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) as part of Stage One Implementation for the CALFED Water Use Efficiency Program. DWR is the CALFED State Agency designated to manage these grant programs. For more information about the CALFED Program, call (800) 900-3587 or (916) 657-2666, or visit the CALFED website at www.calfed.water.ca.gov.

URBAN WATER CONSERVATION CAPITAL OUTLAY GRANT (Prop 13 Urban Grant)

The Urban Water Conservation Program (Chapter 8, Article 6 under the Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection and Flood Protection Act (Proposition 13), Water Code Division 26) authorizes DWR to issue grants to public agencies and incorporated mutual water companies to finance feasible, cost effective water conservation capital outlay projects or programs to improve water use efficiency.

AGRICULTURAL WATER CONSERVATION CAPITAL OUTLAY FEASIBILITY STUDY GRANT (Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grant)

Proposition 13 also authorizes DWR to issue feasibility study grants to public agencies and incorporated mutual water companies to investigate the feasibility and cost effectiveness of potential agricultural water conservation capital outlay projects to improve water use efficiency. The goal of this program is to produce feasibility studies to identify potential agricultural water conservation capital outlay projects that may qualify for Proposition 13 Agricultural Water Conservation loans. This may be accomplished through capital outlay projects that implement established Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices. Agricultural water use efficiency capital outlay projects that

incorporate CALFED's Quantifiable Objectives are also eligible for **Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants**.

In addition, funds are available for Agricultural Water Conservation Loans through Proposition 13. **An applicant may not use this package to apply for a loan.** The loan application package is a separate document and will be found at www.water.ca.gov in early Spring, 2002. The State Water Resources Control Board also has funding available for water use efficiency projects. For more information, contact the State Board at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

A-II. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

- (a) cities
- (b) counties
- (c) cities and counties
- (d) joint power authorities
- (e) other political subdivisions of the State, (including public water districts, but not State Agencies)
- (f) incorporated mutual water companies

If the applicant is subject to the Urban Water Management Planning Act (California Water Code Division 6, Part 2.6), the applicant must have adopted a plan that meets the requirements of the law and submitted it to DWR in order to be eligible to receive funding under **Prop 13 Urban Grants** or **Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants** (per Senate Bill 610, Costa, Water Supply Planning (Stats. 2001, Chapter 643, effective January 1, 2002).

Neither private individuals nor private entities may apply for either of these programs. Applicants that wish to collaborate on a proposal may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship or a joint powers authority. Contracts will only be executed with one applicant. The proposal shall clearly indicate who will sign the contract and the nature of the agreement between the other participants.

A-III. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Prop 13 Urban Grants

This program will fund feasible, cost effective urban water conservation capital outlay projects that improve water use efficiency.

Capital outlay projects are those in which an agency builds or buys something of a permanent nature that contributes toward water use efficiency. Capital outlay expenditures shall be immediately and exclusively tied to the achievement of the project purposes. Construction, improvement, repair, and renovation projects, as well as projects involving the purchase and installation of project-specific equipment or other water saving devices may be eligible. Projects that involve the applicant's customer purchasing eligible equipment or devices for which the applicant provides a rebate after installation, may be eligible for funding.

Improvements to water distribution system controls, major improvements or replacement of leaking distribution system components, conveyance systems for recycled water, or capital outlay features of Best Management Practices, as identified by the California Urban Water Conservation Council, may be eligible. Other capital outlay water conservation projects, in addition to the Best Management Practices, may be considered for funding.

Eligibility of Urban Best Management Practices:	Eligible?
1. Water survey programs for residential customers	No
2. Residential plumbing retrofit	Yes
3. System water audits, leak detection and repair	Yes*
4. Metering with commodity rates and retrofits	Yes*
5. Large landscape (dedicated landscape meters)	Yes*
6. High-efficiency washing machines	Yes*
7. Public information programs	No
8. School education programs	No
9. Commercial, industrial, and institutional	Yes*
10. Wholesale agency assistance programs	No
11. Conservation pricing	No
12. Conservation coordinator	No
13. Water waste prohibition	No
14. Residential ultra low flush toilet replacement	Yes

Eligibility of Potential Best Management Practices:	Eligible?
1. Rate Structure and other Economic Incentives	No
2. Efficiency Standards- Appliances & Irrigation Devices	No
3. Replacement of Existing Water Using Appliances	Yes
4. Retrofit of Existing Car Washes	Yes
5. Graywater Use	Yes
6. Distribution System Pressure Regulation	Yes
7. Water Supplier Billing Records Broken Down	No
8. Swimming pool and spa covers	Yes
9. Restrictions Devices that use Evaporation	No
10. Point of Use Water Heaters	Yes
11. Efficiency Standards- Industrial & Commercial	No

* Priority will be given to system water audits, leak detection and repair; meters; dedicated large landscape meters; high-efficiency washing machines; and commercial, industrial and institutional projects. It is anticipated that these types of projects offer significant potential water savings. They must be capital outlay projects.

Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants

This program will fund studies to ascertain the feasibility and cost effectiveness of potential agricultural water conservation capital outlay projects that improve water use efficiency. The implementation of capital outlay projects associated with CALFED's Quantifiable Objectives may be eligible. Capital outlay features of Efficient Water Management Practices, (EWMPs) as identified by the Agricultural Water Management Council, may also be eligible.

Eligibility of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices: Eligible?

List A

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Prepare and adopt a Water Management Plan | No |
| 2. Designate a Water Conservation Coordinator | No |
| 3. Support water management services to water users | No |
| 4. Improve communications | No |
| 5. Evaluate institutional changes | No |
| 6. Evaluate and improve suppliers' pump efficiencies | No |

List B

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Facilitate alternative land use | No |
| 2. Facilitate the use of recycled water | Yes |
| 3. Facilitate the capital improvements for on-farm irrigation | Yes |
| 4. Facilitate voluntary water transfers | No |
| 5. Line or pipe ditches | Yes |
| 6. Increase flexibility in water ordering and delivery | Yes |
| 7. Construct water supplier spill and tailwater delivery systems | Yes |
| 8. Optimize conjunctive use | No |
| 9. Automate canal structures | Yes |

List C

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Water measurement | Yes |
| 2. Pricing and other incentives | No |

Other items not specifically listed as EWMPs that may be eligible projects are water meters, replacement of leaking distribution system pipelines and related appurtenances, conveyance systems for recycled water, re-regulating reservoirs to conserve already developed water, on-farm irrigation system improvements, repairing or rehabilitating leaking reservoirs, and covering or lining open reservoirs.

A-IV. INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Projects that generate benefits that would ordinarily be accrued as a result of carrying out an existing law, regulation, or contract within the same time frame as the project described in the Proposal are not eligible for funding. For example, if Federal law requires the installation of meters by an applicant, funding of that meter program would not be eligible. However, if funding would accelerate the meter installation project, that

portion of the project that would be facilitated by funding over and above the applicant's existing commitments would be eligible.

Projects funded through the **Prop 13 Urban Grant** program must be locally cost effective, that is, the benefits to the applicant must be equal to or greater than the costs.

Wellhead rehabilitation, new storage tanks providing expanded capacity, water supply, water treatment, wastewater treatment, flood control, conjunctive use, or groundwater banking projects are not eligible for funding through this Proposal Solicitation Package. No funds will be available to replace existing funding sources for on-going projects, for political advocacy, for the purchase of water, for the establishment of a reserve fund, or for an applicant's litigation costs.

Prop 13 Urban Grants and Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants

General-purpose equipment or equipment or materials used for routine operations and maintenance would not be considered eligible capital outlay costs, nor would water conservation services, public information programs, technical assistance programs, or other water conservation programs that do not involve construction, improvements, repairs, renovations, or project-specific purchases of equipment. General research projects not related to specific capital outlay projects are not eligible for funding.

A-V. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

Proposals from throughout the State of California will be considered for funding.

A-VI. AVAILABLE FUNDS

Prop 13 Urban Grants

Proposition 13 authorizes \$30 million for Urban Water Conservation projects. Nine million dollars is included in the 2001-2002 State budget. There is a \$5 million per-project funding limitation.

Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants

A total of \$1.5 million is available for projects during this funding cycle through Proposition 13. There is a \$100,000 per-project funding limitation.

A-VII. DURATION OF PROJECTS

Funds shall be expended within three years of the execution of the contract. If the project exceeds one year in duration, a budget with discrete 12-month periods shall be provided.

Projects may be multi-year efforts if necessary and appropriate, but proposal timelines and budgets that will be incorporated into the contract shall not exceed three years. In addition, since funding may be awarded for only a portion of each submitted project, the applicant should clearly show which tasks could be funded separately. When a portion of a project is funded, there is no guarantee that the remaining portions or future phases of that project will be funded. Future funding will depend on the progress of the project,

the nature and extent of competing proposals, priorities, program authorization and funding availability.

A-VIII. AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS

The recipient of a ***Prop 13 Urban Grant*** or ***Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grant*** must sign an agreement containing standard terms and conditions with DWR before the State can disburse funds. Funds will be delivered in accordance with the executed agreement. No work should be performed without a fully executed agreement.

A-IX. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY

All applicants and reviewers are subject to State conflict of interest laws. Failure to comply with these laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the proposal being rejected and/or any subsequent contract being declared void. An applicant may not permit any State or Federal employee to use his or her position for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being in conflict of interest, either by giving the applicant an unfair advantage or by a desire for private financial gain. Applicable California statutes include, but are not limited to, Government Code section 1090, Public Contract Code sections 10365.5, 10410 and 10411, and Government Code sections 87200 et seq.

All proposals will become public information once the solicitation has closed. After the initial recommendation for funding is made public, reviews from all levels of the review process will be public information. Proposals may be reviewed and discussed by members of the public under public disclosure requirements. When an applicant signs the signature page and submits the proposal for consideration, the applicant waives any rights to privacy and the confidentiality of the proposal.

A-X. PROPOSAL REVIEW, SELECTION, AND AWARD PROCESS

1. Proposals are received by DWR and initially reviewed by the CALFED Water Use Efficiency Agency Team: Department of Water Resources, United States Bureau of Reclamation, Natural Resources Conservation Service, State Water Resources Control Board, and CALFED.
2. Proposals are reviewed by the Science and Economics Technical Teams.
3. Proposals are provided to the Review Panel, (composed of CALFED Agencies, stakeholders, and subject matter experts) with reports from the Technical Teams.
4. The Review Panel members submit preliminary ratings, based on criteria established in Section XII.
5. The Review Panel convenes to discuss proposals, receive any additional clarification from the technical teams, and revise their scores, as desired.
6. The CALFED Agency Team receives final ratings and comments from the Review Panel and produces a preliminary list of projects recommendation for funding based on Review Panel ratings, geographic and categorical distribution, and availability of funds.
7. Public workshops are held and public comments received.

8. Recommendations are presented to the Water Use Efficiency Public Advisory Committee, if so assembled.
9. Final funding recommendations are presented to DWR and CALFED Policy Group, or their designee.
10. DWR makes the final funding decision.
11. A five-day appeal process begins.
12. Projects selected for funding will be posted on the DWR website at www.water.ca.gov.
13. Contract negotiations begin.
14. Final contracts are executed.
15. Projects begin.

At the applicant's discretion, proposals that do not receive funding during this cycle may be reconsidered during the next funding cycle without modification or may be revised to improve competitiveness.

A-XI. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE

The anticipated schedule for this process is as follows:

1/4/02	Proposal Solicitation Package released.
1/22/02-1/25/02	Public workshops held.
3/1/02	Proposals due.
4/1/02	Review process completed, recommendations presented to Advisory Committee, CALFED, and Department Management.
4/15/02	DWR makes final funding decision.
4/24/02	Five-day appeal process ends.
5/1/02	Contract negotiations begin.
10/1/02	Contracts executed, projects begin.

A-XII. SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed according to the following criteria:

- A. Relevance and Importance: 10 Points
- B. Technical/Scientific Merit, Feasibility, Monitoring and Assessment: 35 Points.
- C. Qualifications of the Applicants and Cooperators: 10 Points.
- D. Costs and Benefits: 35 Points.
- E. Outreach, Community Involvement and Acceptance: 10 points

No project with an average total score of less than 70 points shall be funded.

A-XIII. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

The Proposal, including one original, eight photocopies and one electronic copy on 3.5 inch diskettes or CD-ROM (preferably in a PDF format or in MS Word and/or Excel compatible format) must be received by 3:00 p.m, March 1, 2002 at:

**California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236-0001
Attention: Marsha Prillwitz, (916) 651-9674**

**or by overnight carrier or hand delivered to:
California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
1416 Ninth Street, Room 338, Sacramento, CA 95814
Attention: Marsha Prillwitz, (916) 651-9674**

The entire Proposal shall be in 12 point font or larger on 8 1/2 -11 inch paper with consecutively numbered pages. The Proposal will be appended to the contract, if the project is selected for funding.

A complete Proposal consists of the following:

Proposal Part One:

- A. Project Information Form
- B. Signature Page

Proposal Part Two:

Project Summary

- A. Scope of Work: Relevance and Importance
- B. Scope of Work: Technical/Scientific Merit, Feasibility, Monitoring and Assessment
- C. Qualifications of the Applicants and Cooperators
- D. Benefits and Costs
- E. Outreach, Community Involvement and Acceptance

Proposal Part Three:

(Items in Part Three are required only if the project is selected for funding.)

- A. Matching Funds Commitment Letter
- B. Resolution
- C. Environmental Documentation

**Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP
Proposal Part One:
A. Project Information Form**

1. Applying for (select one): (a) Prop 13 Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grant
 (b) Prop 13 Agricultural Water Conservation Capital Outlay Feasibility Study Grant
 (c) DWR Water Use Efficiency Project
2. Principal applicant (Organization or affiliation): Bear Valley Community Services District
3. Project Title: Water Conservation Specialist
4. Person authorized to sign and submit proposal:
- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name, title | <u>John C. Yeakley</u> |
| Mailing address | <u>28999 S. Lower Valley Road</u> |
| Telephone | <u>661.821.4428</u> |
| Fax. | <u>661.821.0180</u> |
| E-mail | <u>bvcsd@csurfers.net</u> |
5. Contact person (if different):
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name, title. | <u>John Martin</u> |
| Mailing address. | <u>28999 S. Lower Valley Road</u> |
| Telephone | <u>661.821.4428</u> |
| Fax. | <u>661.821.0180</u> |
| E-mail | <u>bvcsd@csurfers.net</u> |
6. Funds requested (dollar amount): 33473
7. Applicant funds pledged (dollar amount): 95270
8. Total project costs (dollar amount): 128743
9. Estimated total quantifiable project benefits (dollar amount): 97766
Percentage of benefit to be accrued by applicant: 74
Percentage of benefit to be accrued by CALFED or others: 26

**Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP
 Proposal Part One:
 A. Project Information Form (continued)**

10. Estimated annual amount of water to be saved (acre-feet): 25.42
- Estimated total amount of water to be saved (acre-feet): 76.26
- Over 3 years
- Estimated benefits to be realized in terms of water quality, instream flow, other: 0
11. Duration of project (month/year to month/year): 06/02 to 06/05
12. State Assembly District where the project is to be conducted: 34
13. State Senate District where the project is to be conducted: 17
14. Congressional district(s) where the project is to be conducted: 21
15. County where the project is to be conducted: Kern
16. Date most recent Urban Water Management Plan submitted to the Department of Water Resources: _____
17. Type of applicant (select one):
- (a) city
 - (b) county
 - (c) city and county
 - (d) joint power authority
 - (e) other political subdivision of the State, including public water district
 - (f) incorporated mutual water company
 - (g) investor-owned utility
 - (h) non-profit organization
 - (i) tribe
 - (j) university
 - (k) state agency
 - (l) federal agency
- DWR WUE Projects: the above entities (a) through (f) or:

18. Project focus: (a) agricultural
 (b) urban

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP

Proposal Part One:

A. Project Information Form (continued)

19. Project type (select one):
Prop 13 Urban Grant or Prop 13
Agricultural Feasibility Study Grant
capital outlay project related to:
- (a) implementation of Urban Best Management Practices
 (b) implementation of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices
 (c) implementation of Quantifiable Objectives (include QO number(s))
-
- (d) other (specify)
-

- DWR WUE Project related to:
- (e) implementation of Urban Best Management Practices
 (f) implementation of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices
 (g) implementation of Quantifiable Objectives (include QO number(s))
 (h) innovative projects (initial investigation of new technologies, methodologies, approaches, or institutional frameworks)
 (i) research or pilot projects
 (j) education or public information programs
 (k) other (specify)
-

20. Do the actions in this proposal involve physical changes in land use, or potential future changes in land use? (a) yes
 (b) no

If yes, the applicant must complete the CALFED PSP Land Use Checklist found at http://calfed.water.ca.gov/environmental_docs.html and submit it with the proposal.

**Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP
Proposal Part One
B. Signature Page**

By signing below, the official declares the following:

The truthfulness of all representations in the proposal;

The individual signing the form is authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the applicant; and

The individual signing the form read and understood the conflict of interest and confidentiality section and waives any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant.

Signature

Name and title

Date

PROPOSAL PART TWO

Project Summary

Provide a brief summary of the project (no more than 500 words) including location, nature, goals and objectives, methods, procedures, expected outcomes, costs and benefits, including the amount of water to be saved.

A. Scope of Work: Relevance and Importance

1. Nature, scope, and objectives of the project.
2. Statement of critical local, regional, Bay-Delta, State or federal water issues. Include an explanation of the need for the project. Describe how this project would be consistent with local or regional water management plans or other resource management plans.

B. Scope of Work: Technical/Scientific Merit, Feasibility, Monitoring and Assessment

1. Methods, procedures, and facilities. Provide enough information to permit evaluation of the technical adequacy of the approach to satisfy the objectives and the applicant's readiness to proceed.
2. Task List and Schedule. Provide a work schedule with tasks, deliverable items, due dates, and projected costs for each task, along with a quarterly expenditure projection. Identify start and completion dates of each task and identify which tasks are considered to be inseparable if only a portion of the project would be funded. This plan will form the basis of the required quarterly and annual project fiscal and programmatic reports. Tasks listed in the work schedule should match those in the budget.
3. Monitoring and assessment. Describe the monitoring and assessment procedures that will be used to document progress and determine the success of the project. Include a list of project-specific performance measures that will be used to assess project success in relation to its goals and objectives. For many types of projects, success is determined by measuring activities, outputs, or outcomes. Some other projects measure social and economic impact or environmental change, or use a combination of both measures. Include information about how the data and other information will be handled, stored, and made accessible. Provide a list of expected products/outcomes such as planned reports and other documentation, presentations, advances in technology, and information transfers via workshops, seminars, education programs, etc. (**Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grant** proposals are not required to submit a monitoring and assessment component.)

4. Preliminary Plans and Specifications and Certification Statements (for **Prop 13 Urban Grant** construction projects only). Submit Preliminary Plans and Specifications for the proposed project if final plans and specifications are not available.

The Preliminary Plans should indicate, at a minimum, types and quantities of materials, dimensions, and location. Certification Statements verify that the project is feasible. A California registered civil engineer must prepare the Preliminary Plans and Specifications and Certification Statements.

C Qualifications of the Applicants and Cooperators.

1. Include a resume(s) of the project manager(s). Resumes may be attached to the end of the Proposal and shall not exceed two pages.

2. Identify and describe the role of any external cooperators that will be used for this project.

D. Benefits and Costs.

1. Budget Breakdown and Justification.

Provide a detailed budget that includes the following line items and justification for each:

For capital outlay project proposals (**Prop 13 Urban Grants**):

- a. Land Purchase/Easement
- b. Planning/Design/Engineering
- c. Materials/Installation
- d. Structures
- e. Equipment Purchases/Rentals
- f. Environmental Mitigation/Enhancement
- g. Construction/Administration/Overhead
- h. Project/Legal/License Fees
- i. Contingency (up to 15%, amount must be fully justified by applicant)
- j. Other

For proposals other than capital outlay projects (**Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants**):

- a. Direct Labor Hours (hours for each individual).
- b. Salaries (rate of compensation for each individual).
- c. Benefits (overall rate for each category of employee).
- d. Travel (purpose and estimated cost for all non-local travel).
- e. Supplies and Expendables (list separately amounts for office, lab, computing, field supplies).
- f. Services or Consultants (identify specific tasks, time required, hourly or daily rate).
- g. Equipment (identify property having a useful life of more than one year and cost more than \$5,000 per unit).

- h. Other Direct Costs (including project management, planning, design, construction, maintenance, etc. Describe the specific costs associated with insuring accomplishment of the project, such as inspection of work in progress, validation of costs, report preparation, giving presentations, and necessary costs directly associated with specific project oversight).
- i. Total Direct Costs. Total items (a) through (g).
- j. Indirect Costs. (Explain what is encompassed in the overhead rate (indirect costs). Overhead should include costs associated with general office requirements such as rent, phones, furniture, general office staff, etc., generally distributed by a predetermined percentage of specific costs).
- k. Total Costs.

2. Cost-Sharing. If the applicant proposes any cost sharing (it is not required by Proposition 13), cost share funds shall be obligated during the period of performance. The applicant cost share shall be met during each 12-month budget period.

The proposal shall identify other funding commitments, the status of these commitments (tentative approval, contract, etc.), source, and any cost-sharing requirements. Successful proposals that commit cost sharing funds shall have the commitment of those funds within 30 days of notification of approval. If an applicant fails to secure the cost share funds identified in the proposal, and as a result has insufficient funds to complete the project, DWR has the option to amend or terminate the contract.

3. Benefit Summary and Breakdown. List expected project outcomes (the physical changes that will occur as a result of the project) and expected benefits (the value of those outcomes).

a. Quantify project outcomes and benefits. Quantify outcomes and benefits to the degree possible. For example, if the expected outcome of a project is to reduce dry-year demands in a particular region, the amount and value (benefit) of this reduction should be listed if known.

Indicate how each quantified outcome and benefit will be shared among the project's beneficiaries. For example, if an outcome will result in an avoided cost benefit for the applicant and/or the project partners, this should be identified as an applicant benefit. Identify and delineate quantified outcomes and benefits expected to directly or indirectly contribute to CALFED goals.

b. For project outcomes and benefits that are not quantifiable, provide a qualitative description of such project outcomes and benefits. List and describe in words all outcomes or benefits that cannot be quantified at present. One way to describe the significance of a project's non-quantified benefits is in terms of institutional, public, or scientific recognition. Indicate how each non-quantified outcome or benefit will be shared among the project beneficiaries. Identify and delineate non-quantified outcomes expected to directly or indirectly contribute to CALFED goals.

4. Assessment of Costs and Benefits. Include an assessment that summarizes the costs and benefits of the proposed project. The assessment shall adhere to the following general guidelines:

a. List and explain all major analysis assumptions and methodologies. Provide enough detail for a thorough review of the assessment.

b. Express all benefits and costs in year 2001 dollars. Do not adjust future dollar values for expected general inflation.

c. Convert all costs and benefits to their present value equivalents prior to aggregating them. Use a six percent discount rate.

d. Compile a table showing the present value of the quantified costs and benefits for the applicant, each project beneficiary, CALFED, and any other parties affected by the project. Compile a summary of the non-quantified costs and benefits to the applicant, each project beneficiary, CALFED, and any other parties affected by the project.

e. Demonstrate that the **Prop 13 Urban Grant** project is locally cost effective to the applicant. Projects funded through the **Prop 13 Urban Grant** program must be locally cost effective, that is, benefits to the applicant must be equal to or greater than the costs ($B/C \geq 1$).

For **Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants ONLY**, provide the following abbreviated Benefits and Costs information in place of Sections D3 and D4:

Potential Benefits to be Realized and Information to be Gained

Demonstrate the potential benefits and information to be gained that the project will explore in terms of water use efficiency: water supply, water quality improvements, and environmental enhancements.

Benefit Realized and Information Gained versus Costs

Compare the potential benefits and information that are anticipated to be gained to the anticipated costs.

E. Outreach, Community Involvement and Acceptance

Applicants are encouraged to coordinate prior to submitting a proposal with local governments, and other local entities such as community based organizations and watershed groups. Proposal shall describe a plan for public outreach to the groups or individuals that may be affected by the project. Identify which local groups or other interested organizations are aware of the project and their level of support or opposition. Identify any potential third party impacts. Estimate the number of people or organizations that are expected to receive training, employment, or other social or economic benefits from the project.

PROPOSAL PART THREE

The applicant will be required to provide the following items only if the proposal is selected for funding. These items are not required to be submitted with the proposal.

A. Matching Funds Commitment Letter. The applicant shall provide an institutional cost-sharing agreement (letter) signed by an official authorized to commit the applicant to all or part of the matching share or a letter authorizing third party, in-kind contribution signed by an official authorized to commit the third party.

B. Resolution. Prior to the execution of the contract, the applicant shall provide a resolution from their governing board accepting the funds and designating a representative authorized to execute the contract and sign requests for disbursement.

C. Environmental Documentation.

Prior to the disbursement of any funds, the applicant shall provide documentation that the project complies with environmental laws and regulations and that necessary permits have been obtained. For general information about environmental compliance, refer to this website: <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa>. For information about environmental regulatory compliance for CALFED projects, please refer to the "Guide to Regulatory Compliance for Implementing CALFED Actions" at http://calfed.water.ca.gov/environmental_docs.html or contact Chuck Vogelsang at chuckv@water.ca.gov, (916) 653-2536. For assistance in establishing environmental significance of project specific impacts to farmland, refer to this website: www.consv.ca.gov/dlrp/LESA/LESA.htm.

**SECTION B
SUMMARY OF DWR WATER USE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM**

PROGRAM TITLE	DWR Water Use Efficiency Program**
DUE DATE:	3/1/02
ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS	Agencies eligible for Proposition 13 grants plus investor owned utilities, non-profits, tribes, universities, state or federal agencies
ELIGIBLE PROJECTS	Agricultural and urban water use efficiency projects that contribute to CALFED objectives
GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE	Projects from any areas that contribute to CALFED objectives
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE	**
CURRENT YEAR FUNDS AVAILABLE	**
PER PROJECT FUNDING LIMITATIONS	No per project limits
COST SHARING REQUIRED?	yes

**** There is presently no specific authorization or funding for this program.**

B-I. BACKGROUND, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Presently, there is no specific authorization or funding for this program. The **DWR WUE** component of this PSP is modeled after the 2001 Water Use Efficiency Proposal Solicitation Package authorized by Senate Bill 23 that funded 53 projects totaling almost \$12 million last year. Any projects tentatively recommended for funding under this program will be subject to the provisions of authorizing legislation. All applicants will be notified of any new developments or necessary revisions.

This program is intended to fund agricultural and urban water use efficiency projects that contribute to one or more of the CALFED objectives: reducing irrecoverable water losses; attaining water quality benefits; and attaining environmental benefits.

B-II. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

- (a) cities
- (b) counties
- (c) cities and counties
- (d) joint power authorities
- (e) other political subdivisions of the State, (including public water districts, but not State Agencies)
- (f) incorporated mutual water companies
- (g) investor-owned utilities
- (h) non-profit organizations
- (i) tribes
- (j) universities
- (k) state agencies
- (l) federal agencies

Neither private individuals nor private entities may apply for any of these programs. Applicants that wish to collaborate on a proposal may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship or a joint powers authority. Contracts will only be executed with one applicant. The proposal shall clearly indicate who will sign the contract and the nature of the agreement between the other participants.

B-III. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

This **DWR WUE** Program relates to the first action item of the CALFED Water Use Efficiency Plan: implement agricultural and urban conservation incentive programs to provide funding for water management projects that will provide multiple benefits which are cost-effective at the statewide level, including the reduction of irrecoverable water losses; attainment of water quality benefits; and the attainment of environmental benefits.

This may be accomplished through the implementation of established Urban Best Management Practices (BMPs), Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices, (EWMPs) or Quantifiable Objectives (QOs) that demonstrate a potential for achieving CALFED objectives. Or, the applicant may propose a broader or different approach to

implementation of water use efficiency with an emphasis on linkage to CALFED objectives and the expected outcomes and benefits of the project. Priority will be given to implementation projects, and especially those that implement Quantifiable Objectives.

In addition to implementation projects, applicants may submit a proposal for another type of project. Other project types include innovative projects (initial investigation of new technologies, methodologies, approaches, or institutional frameworks), research, pilot projects, feasibility studies, and education/public information projects.

For more information about BMPs, contact the California Urban Water Conservation Council at www.cuwcc.org, or call (916) 552-5885. For more information about EWMPs, contact the Agricultural Water Management Council at (916) 651-9675. For more information about Quantifiable Objectives, contact the CALFED's Water Use Efficiency Program Manager, Tom Gohring, at gohring@water.ca.gov, (916) 651-7102 or see the CALFED website at http://calfed.ca.gov/current/quantifiable_objectives.html.

B-IV. INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Projects that generate benefits that would ordinarily be accrued as a result of carrying out an existing law, regulation, or contract within the same time frame as the project described in the Proposal are not eligible for funding. For example, if Federal law requires the installation of meters by an applicant, funding of that meter program would not be eligible. However, if funding would accelerate the meter installation project, that portion of the project that would be facilitated by funding over and above the applicant's existing commitments would be eligible.

Implementation projects that are locally cost effective (where the applicant receives benefits in excess of their costs) will not be funded through the **DWR WUE** program.

Wellhead rehabilitation, new storage tanks providing expanded capacity, water supply, water treatment, wastewater treatment, flood control, conjunctive use, or groundwater banking projects are not eligible for funding through the **DWR WUE** program. No funds will be available to replace existing funding sources for on-going projects, for political advocacy, for the purchase of water, for the establishment of a reserve fund, or for an applicant's litigation costs.

B-V. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

Projects from throughout the State that contribute to the CALFED objectives will be considered for funding by the **DWR WUE** program. Consideration will be given in the selection process to the distribution of projects throughout these geographic regions of California: Southern California, Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, or Sacramento Valley.

B-VI. AVAILABLE FUNDS

Presently, there is no specific authorization or funding for the *DWR WUE* program. By seeking proposals for funding of *DWR WUE* projects, the need for such funding can be demonstrated and documented. The distribution of funds will depend on the eventual authorization and funding of the program and the quality of submitted proposals. There is no per-project funding limitation.

B-VII. DURATION OF PROJECTS

Funds shall be expended within three years of the execution of the contract. If the project exceeds one year in duration, a budget with discrete 12-month periods shall be provided.

Projects may be multi-year efforts if necessary and appropriate, but proposal timelines and budgets that will be incorporated into the contract shall not exceed three years. In addition, since funding may be awarded for only a portion of each submitted project, the applicant should clearly show which tasks could be funded separately. When a portion of a project is funded, there is no guarantee that the remaining portions or future phases of that project will be funded. Future funding will depend on the progress of the project, the nature and extent of competing proposals, priorities, program authorization and funding availability.

B-VIII. AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS

DWR WUE Projects selected for funding will be subject to standard terms and conditions as specified by authorizing legislation and DWR procedures. The recipient must sign an agreement containing standard terms and conditions with DWR before the State can disburse funds. Funds will be delivered in accordance with the executed agreement.

B-IX. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The same conflict of interest and confidentiality requirements apply to *DWR WUE* proposals as to Proposition 13 proposals as detailed in Section A-IX.

B-X. PROPOSAL REVIEW, SELECTION, AND AWARD PROCESS

The process for *DWR WUE* projects will be the same as the *Proposition 13* grants detailed in Section A-X.

B-XI. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE

The schedule for *DWR WUE* projects will be the same as the *Proposition 13* grants detailed in Section A-XI.

B-XII. SELECTION CRITERIA

Proposals for the *DWR-WUE* projects will be reviewed according to the same criteria established in Section A-XII for the *Proposition 13* grants.

B-XIII. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

The Proposal, including one original, eight photocopies and one electronic copy on 3.5 inch diskettes or CD-ROM (preferably in a PDF format or in MS Word and/or Excel compatible format) must be received by 3:00 p.m, March 1, 2002 at:

**California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236-0001
Attention: Marsha Prillwitz, (916) 651-9674**

**or by overnight carrier or hand delivered to:
California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
1416 Ninth Street, Room 338, Sacramento, CA 95814
Attention: Marsha Prillwitz, (916) 651-9674**

The entire Proposal shall be in 12 point font or larger on 8 1/2 -11 inch paper. The Proposal, Parts One and Two combined, shall not exceed 20 single-spaced, consecutively numbered pages. Resumes and letters of support attached to the Proposal are not included in the 20-page limit. Proposals that exceed the 20-page limit will be excluded from consideration. The Proposal will be appended to the contract, if the project is selected for funding.

A complete Proposal for a **DWR WUE** project is the same as that for a **Prop. 13 Grant**, consisting of the following:

Proposal Part One:

- A. Project Information Form
- B. Signature Page

Proposal Part Two:

Project Summary

- A. Scope of Work: Relevance and Importance
- B. Scope of Work: Technical/Scientific Merit, Feasibility, Monitoring and Assessment
- C. Qualifications of the Applicants and Cooperators
- D. Benefits and Costs
- E. Outreach, Community Involvement and Acceptance

Proposal Part Three:

(Items in Part Three are required only if the project is selected for funding.)

- A. Matching Funds Commitment Letter
- B. Resolution
- C. Environmental Documentation

Proposal Parts One, Two and Three for a **DWR WUE** proposal are the same as the **Prop. 13 Grants** Section A-XIII, except for Part Two, D: Benefits and Costs. Following are the directions for D: Benefits and Costs for **DWR WUE** projects.

D. Benefits and Costs.

1. Budget Breakdown and Justification.

Provide a detailed budget that includes the following line items and justification for each, indicating the amount of cost sharing for each element:

For capital outlay project proposals:

- k. Land Purchase/Easement
- l. Planning/Design/Engineering
- m. Materials/Installation
- n. Structures
- o. Equipment Purchases/Rentals
- p. Environmental Mitigation/Enhancement
- q. Construction/Administration/Overhead
- r. Project/Legal/License Fees
- s. Contingency (up to 15%, amount must be fully justified by applicant)
- t. Other

For proposals other than capital outlay projects:

- l. Direct Labor Hours (hours for each individual).
- m. Salaries (rate of compensation for each individual).
- n. Benefits (overall rate for each category of employee).
- o. Travel (purpose and estimated cost for all non-local travel).
- p. Supplies and Expendables (list separately amounts for office, lab, computing, field supplies).
- q. Services or Consultants (identify specific tasks, time required, hourly or daily rate).
- r. Equipment (identify property having a useful life of more than one year and cost more than \$5,000 per unit).
- s. Other Direct Costs (including project management, planning, design, construction, maintenance, etc. Describe the specific costs associated with insuring accomplishment of the project, such as inspection of work in progress, validation of costs, report preparation, giving presentations, and necessary costs directly associated with specific project oversight).
- t. Total Direct Costs. Total items (a) through (g).
- u. Indirect Costs. (Explain what is encompassed in the overhead rate (indirect costs). Overhead should include costs associated with general office requirements such as rent, phones, furniture, general office staff, etc., generally distributed by a predetermined percentage of specific costs).
- v. Total Costs.

2. Cost-Sharing. The applicant cost share is based on the split between applicant benefits and CALFED benefits. The applicant cost share shall be obligated during the period of performance. The applicant cost share shall be met during each 12-month budget period.

The proposal shall identify other funding commitments, the status of these commitments (tentative approval, contract, etc.), source, and any cost-sharing requirements. Successful proposals that commit cost sharing funds shall have the commitment of those funds within 30 days of notification of approval. If an applicant fails to secure the cost share funds identified in the proposal, and as a result has insufficient funds to complete the project, DWR has the option to amend or terminate the contract.

3. Benefit Summary and Breakdown. List expected project outcomes (the physical changes that will occur as a result of the project) and expected benefits (the value of those outcomes).

a. Quantify project outcomes and benefits. Quantify outcomes and benefits to the degree possible. For example, if the expected outcome of a project is to reduce dry-year demands in a particular region, the amount and value (benefit) of this reduction should be listed if known.

Indicate how each quantified outcome and benefit will be shared among the project's beneficiaries. For example, if an outcome will result in an avoided cost benefit for the applicant and/or the project partners, this should be identified as an applicant benefit. Identify and delineate quantified outcomes and benefits expected to directly or indirectly contribute to CALFED goals.

b. For project outcomes and benefits that are not quantifiable, provide a qualitative description of such project outcomes and benefits. List and describe in words all outcomes or benefits that cannot be quantified at present. One way to describe the significance of a project's non-quantified benefits is in terms of institutional, public, or scientific recognition. Indicate how each non-quantified outcome or benefit will be shared among the project beneficiaries. Identify and delineate non-quantified outcomes expected to directly or indirectly contribute to CALFED goals.

4. Assessment of Costs and Benefits. Include an assessment that summarizes the costs and benefits of the proposed project. The assessment shall adhere to the following general guidelines:

a. List and explain all major analysis assumptions and methodologies. Provide enough detail for a thorough review of the assessment.

b. Express all benefits and costs in year 2001 dollars. Do not adjust future dollar values for expected general inflation.

c. Convert all costs and benefits to their present value equivalents prior to aggregating them. Use a six percent discount rate.

d. Compile a table showing the present value of the quantified costs and benefits for the applicant, each project beneficiary, CALFED, and any other parties affected by the project. Compile a summary of the non-quantified costs and benefits to the applicant, each project beneficiary, CALFED, and any other parties affected by the project.

e. Demonstrate that the project is not locally cost effective to the applicant, but is cost-effective from a state-wide perspective. Implementation projects that are locally cost effective (where the applicant receives benefits in excess of their costs) will not be funded through the **DWR WUE** program.

For **DWR WUE** innovation, research, pilot projects, education or public information programs ONLY:

Provide the following Benefits and Costs information in place of Sections D3 and D4:

Potential Benefits to be Realized and Information to be Gained

Demonstrate the potential benefits and information to be gained that the project will explore in terms of water use efficiency: water supply, water quality improvements, and environmental enhancements.

Benefit Realized and Information Gained versus Costs

Compare the potential benefits and information that are anticipated to be gained to the anticipated costs.



*California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001*

Scope of Work

Executive Summary

The Bear Valley Community Services District is a member of the California Urban Water Conservation Council, and as such, implements the fourteen best management practices for urban water conservation. Our BMP reports for the reporting period of July 1998 through June 2001 revealed that, despite staff's continuing efforts to implement the BMPs, we have not kept pace with the targets established by CUWCC. Causes for this failure are many, however, all of them stem from the fact that the district is implementing this program on an "as available" basis, meaning that the program has simply been added to the existing workload of staff, who tries to fulfill program goals with whatever time can be carved out of their current schedules. Consequently, the program suffers, as the results show. This grant request is designed to correct this shortcoming by funding a full-time employee, a Water Conservation Specialist for three years to implement the BMPs and report the results.

A summary of the amounts requested is as follows:

DWR Water Use Efficiency grant	33,473
Local contribution	<u>95,270</u>
Total Project	128,743

This project has local and statewide import. Although Bear Valley CSD is a small agency, serving 2,400 residential customers and a handful of commercial accounts, and the absolute water savings are small in comparison to other agencies, the projects are important nonetheless. Bear Valley CSD is the only signatory to the MOU in the greater Tehachapi area. By fully implementing the BMPs, Bear Valley CSD becomes an example for other water agencies in the Tehachapi area (there are two other CSDs, one city and one wholesale water agency in the area, all of which sell water). The programs have statewide implications as well. Bear Valley CSD operates a conjunctive use program whereby we draw water from wells in an adjacent basin (Cummings Valley, which, by the way is an adjudicated basin) and pump the water to Bear Valley Springs. The Cummings Valley basin is then recharged with State Project water from Jacobsen Reservoir through a spreading area at the northeast corner of Cummings Valley. Reductions in water consumption will have a one-to-one impact on the amount of water needed from the State Water Project, and therefore, the Bay-Delta solution will be advanced.

Schedule

The schedule for this program is as follows:

- 6/1/02 Advertise for the position of part-time Water Conservation Specialist
- 7/1/02 Water Conservation Specialist employment begins.
- 7/1/02 - Water Conservation Specialist implements all BMPs, keeping pace with CUWCC

- 6/30/03 targets. BMP #9 (programs for CII accounts) fully implemented and complete.
- 10/31/03 BMP reports for period of 7/1/00 to 6/30/02 submitted to CUWCC.
- 6/30/04 BMP #5 fully implemented and complete (except for on-going elements which are never complete)
- 6/30/05 Grant funding ceases. District retains Water Conservation Specialist to continue BMP implementation (if Board appropriates funds). All BMPs on schedule for full implementation.

Monitoring and Assessment

The Water Conservation Specialist will report progress on the BMPs to the Assistant General Manager, who is the district's appointed Water Conservation Coordinator, quarterly. The Assistant General Manager will ensure that BMP implementation is on pace to meet annual targets. Adjustments, such as reassignment of resources, advertising thrusts, etc will be made as needed to keep implementation on track. Data will be stored in the district's water billing software files, attached to the customer maintenance files or the location maintenance files as appropriate. All of this information will be fully accessible at all times and can be retrieved using any sort criteria desired.

Training, Employment and Capacity Building Potential

This project will employ one person full-time. They will be trained by district staff and will attend one Conservation Coordinator Training Workshop offered by CUWCC. The district will recruit at the California State University, Bakersfield since they have an active public administration department and they offer both the BA and MA degrees. If a CSUB student gets the job, their activities can become a source of information to share with other public administration students at the university. In this way, water conservation issues gain exposure within the ranks of those studying to be tomorrow's decision makers.

Information Dissemination

The district publishes The CSD Report, an eight-page quarterly newsletter, which is the main vehicle for water conservation information (we also use it to publish our annual consumer confidence report). At least three of the four issues contain some kind of water conservation message and, in the spring issue it is usually the featured article. In addition, we buy inserts in the local newspaper for the six months of April through September. These inserts contain water conservation tips, rebate coupons, water survey bounty coupons, etc. in an effort to spur customer participation. Moreover, we issue monthly water bills and regularly include a water conservation comment or some type of stuffer containing water conservation information.

Other Agencies Impacted by the Proposal

There are no other agencies directly impacted by the proposal. Other agencies will have a

working example in their community of an agency that makes water conservation work and, when articles in the local newspaper appear about what Bear Valley CSD is doing, their customers and constituents will inquire about what they are doing to save water. Perhaps a water conservation value will spread by contact with the Bear Valley CSD.

Qualifications of the Applicants, Cooperators and Establishment of Partnerships

Resume of Project Managers

See the resume of the Assistant General Manager, who is the appointed Water Conservation Coordinator (attachment A).

External Cooperators

The public administration department of the California State University, Bakersfield will be contacted for a list of names of students, undergraduate and graduate, who are interested in employment at a small public agency.

Partnerships

There are no partnerships foreseen at this time.

Costs and Benefits

Budget Summary and Breakdown

A summary of the amounts requested is as follows:

Cost for full-time Water Conservation Specialist – Year 1

Current annual base salary (full-time)	\$27,504
--	----------

Annual fringe benefits

FICA/Social Security	2,104
Health insurance	5,941
Dental/optical	720
Life insurance	300
Retirement	1,926
Worker's Comp	550
Unemployment Ins.	<u>358</u>
Total fringe benefits	11,899
Total year 1 salary and benefits	<u>\$39,403</u>
Total year 2 salary and benefits	42,752

Total year 3 salary and benefits	46,386
Training	200
Total salary/benefits and training	<u>\$128,743</u>

(Note: increases for years two and three are 8.5% added to previous year’s total, consisting of a 5% annual step increase and 3.5% cost-of-living adjustment).

Budget Justification

The salary figures shown above are for the district’s pay grade 73, which is the same as that paid to the secretary and the bookkeeper. Benefits are based on current actual rates.

Benefit Summary and Breakdown

The proposed Water Conservation Specialist will implement all of the BMPs. Program benefits may be found in Section F of Exhibit 1 to the MOU, titled “Water Saving Assumptions.”

Project outcomes and benefits (quantified)

The primary outcome of the project will be the full implementation of all BMPs for the three-year grant period, meaning that the district will be on schedule per the coverage requirements in Section C of Exhibit 1 to the MOU. Moreover, the district will finish the requirements of BMPs #5 and #9. Water saving assumptions over the three-year grant period are as follows:

BMP #1	2.67 acre feet
BMP #2	6.63
BMP #5	50.40
BMP #9	8.46
BMP #14	<u>8.10</u>
Total	76.26 acre feet

Water Savings Calculations

BMP#1: Assumption: Average household has three persons and annual water consumption of 185 ccf (89 ccf indoor use and 96 ccf outdoor use).

Per CUWCC water savings assumptions for Best Management Practices the district will conserve 0.5 gcd in leak repairs and 10% of all outdoor water use in all homes surveyed. Given the assumptions stated above, we will conserve 1.5 gallons per day or 548 gallons per year per surveyed house in leak repairs (0.0017 afy). We will also save 9.6 ccf per year in outdoor water use (0.0220 afy). The combined water savings per year per house, therefore, is 0.0237 acre feet. Completion of 75 surveys per year yields annual water savings of 1.78 acre feet, therefore, over the three-year grant period, 5.34 acre feet of water will be conserved from BMP #1. Without the new Water Conservation Specialist, the

district could implement this program at half pace, therefore, the water savings directly attributable to the Water Conservation Specialist is 2.67 acre feet. Water savings for showerhead replacement and toilet retrofit are not considered here because savings from these programs are calculated under BMPs 2 and 14 respectively.

BMP #2: Assumptions: Average household has two showers and three persons.

Per CUWCC water savings assumptions for Best Management Practices the district will conserve 7.2 gcd and 2.9 gcd for showerhead replacements in pre-1980 homes and post-1980 homes respectively. If the BVCS D distributes 350 showerheads per year with roughly 20% going to homes built before 1980 (70 showerheads) and 80% (280 showerheads) going to homes built between 1980 and 1992, we will conserve 551,880 gallons per year in pre-1980 homes and 889,140 gallons per year in post-1980 homes. The combined water savings is 1,441,020 gallons per year, 4.42 acre feet per year, 13.26 acre feet over the three-year grant period. Without the new Water Conservation Specialist, the district could implement this program at half pace, therefore, the water savings directly attributable to the Water Conservation Specialist is 6.63 acre feet.

BMP #5: Assumption: "Landscape surveys will result in a 15% reduction in demand for landscape uses by surveyed accounts" (CUWCC Water Savings Assumptions).

In fiscal years 1998-2000 BVCS D delivered 448 acre feet of water (224 acre feet per year) to large landscape accounts. Surveys performed on these accounts by our new Water Conservation Specialist will result in savings of 33.60 acre feet per year (224 x 15%). Over the three-year grant period the water conserved will be 100.80 af. Without the new Water Conservation Specialist, the district could implement this program at half pace, therefore, the water savings directly attributable to the Water Conservation Specialist is 50.40 acre feet.

BMP #9: Assumptions: For commercial accounts, "estimated reduction in gallons per employee per day...: 12%" (CUWCC Water Savings Assumptions). Commercial employment remains stable.

In fiscal year 1999-2000 BVCS D delivered 47 acre feet of water to commercial and institutional water customers that are not large-landscape customers. Implementation of BMP #9 (surveys, fixture retrofits, etc) performed on these accounts by our new Water Conservation Specialist will result in savings of 5.64 acre feet per year (47 x 12%). Over the three-year grant period the water conserved is 16.92 af. Without the new Water Conservation Specialist, the district could implement this program at half pace, therefore, the water savings directly attributable to the Water Conservation Specialist is 8.46 acre feet.

BMP #14: Assumptions: Water savings per ULFT installed in BVCS D service area is 18.6 gpd (0.0208 afy).

If BVCS D replaces 130 old high- and mid-consumption toilets with ULFTs each year (target) it will conserve 2.70 acre feet per year. Over the three-year grant period, we will save 16.20 acre feet (2.70af in year one, 5.40af in year two and 8.10af in year three). Without the new Water Conservation Specialist, the district could implement this program at half pace, therefore, the water savings directly attributable to the Water Conservation Specialist is 8.10 acre feet.

The calculated value of marginal water supply for BVCS D is \$952/af. Therefore, the benefit of this program is valued at \$72,600 (\$952 x 76.26 acre feet of water saved). CALFED benefits are assumed to

be \$330 per acre foot. This is the figure cited in the CUWCC publication Guidelines for Preparing Cost-Effectiveness Analyses of Urban Water Conservation Best Management Practices for State Water Project water delivered to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (page 2-10). The dollar value of the CALFED benefits for this program, therefore, is \$25,166 (76.26af x \$330 each).

Project outcomes and benefits (qualitative)

By conserving water locally, the Bear Valley Community Services District will reduce its need for water imported from Cummings Valley and, thereby, reduce demand on the State Water Project. The water savings will continue for years after the project is over, providing long-term benefits to the Bay-Delta system.

Attachment A

JOHN MARTIN

29541 Butterfield Way • Tehachapi, CA 93561 • 661.821.1516

OBJECTIVE

To secure a grant from the California Department of Water Resources for water use efficiency

EMPLOYMENT

ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER 1993 TO PRESENT
Bear Valley Community Services District Tehachapi, California

Responsibilities include oversight of all financial functions, including budgeting, accounts payable and receivable, payroll, general ledger and reporting, including the analysis of trends and projections; fiduciary duties as Treasurer of the district; administration of the district's injury and illness prevention program as the designated Safety Officer of the district; administration of the water conservation program as the designated Water Conservation Coordinator of the district; administration of the district's emergency preparedness program acting as the liaison with the district's citizen-volunteer Disaster Council; oversight of all office procedures including water billing and related customer service; management of all district functions in the absence of the General Manager.

KEY CARRIER 1976 TO 1993
Vons Grocery Company Bakersfield, California

Responsibilities included supervision of retail store operations during evening hours, including the security of cash, customer service, personnel management, oversight of nighttime stocking operations and store security. The Key Carrier position was held from 1988 to 1993. Previous to 1988, job responsibilities included receiving clerk, warehouse clerk, checker, stock clerk and courtesy clerk.

EDUCATION

MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 1996
California State University, Bakersfield Bakersfield, California

BACHELOR OF ARTS; PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 1992
California State University, Bakersfield Bakersfield, California

SKILLS

Management of a large number of dissimilar tasks simultaneously.
Excellent service to customers and the public in a friendly and professional manner.
Execution of many software programs, including all Microsoft office products (Word, Excel, etc.) and Corel office products (WordPerfect, Quattro Pro, etc.) as well as the Multiple Operations Management Software of Corbin Willits Systems (general ledger, payroll, utility billing, purchase order, accounts payable and receivable, cash management and utility billing).