

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, August 20, 2004
10:00 AM to 3:00 PM
Jones & Stokes
2600 V Street, Sacramento, CA
Conference Boardroom, 2nd Floor

Meeting Attendees: See Attachment A

Meeting Handouts: See Attachment B

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Robert Meacher, Watershed Subcommittee Co-chair, began the meeting with a round of introductions of all meeting participants (see Attachment A) and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He then opened the floor for public comments from the group.

Michael Wellborn of the California Watershed Network (CWN) announced that Bill 2690, which was put before the Assembly by Assemblywoman Loni Hancock, passed unanimously in both the Assembly and Senate and was expected to be signed into law by Governor Schwarzenegger soon. Mr. Wellborn explained that this bill would allow individuals to volunteer their time to a public works project or non-profit organization without having to be paid the prevailing wage. He noted that the bill excludes individuals who are already employed in the public works industry. Mr. Wellborn acknowledged that Ms. Hancock deserved recognition for proposing the bill and moving it forward through the legislative process. He also mentioned several other organizations that were instrumental in the success of the bill and thanked them for their work. Co-chairs, Martha Davis and Mr. Meacher, also thanked the CWN for their leadership in putting together a wonderful coalition to support the bill. Laurel Ames thanked the CBDA Watershed Subcommittee (Subcommittee) members for writing in and supporting the bill.

It was also noted that the California Conservation Corps was exempt from the bill. Mr. Meacher pointed out that the bill was adopted as an urgency law and would go into effect immediately once it was signed. Mr. Meacher also noted that resource conservation districts would be treated like local governments or special districts. Another Subcommittee member noted the bill had a sunset clause to end in 2009.

WATERSHED PROGRAM PLAN AND UPDATE

John Lowrie, with the Watershed Program, announced that since the last Subcommittee meeting, the Watershed Program Multi year Plan had been finalized and brought forth for approval by the California Bay-Delta Authority (Authority). The issue of who will be managing the next round of competitive grants was also resolved. The \$19 million currently appropriated to the

California Department of Water Resources (DWR) will continue to be managed by them. The 2005-2006 process will be managed by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), using the funds remaining from the latest Consolidated Request for Grant Proposals. The State Board will be managing money that mainly comes from Proposition 40, the Coastal Non-Point Source Pollution, and other programs, but includes the remaining funds from Propositions 13 and 50 dedicated to the Watershed Program. Since this issue has been resolved, the Watershed Program Plan can now move forward to be approved by the Authority.

Mr. Lowrie noted that it had been requested by the State Board that the Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT), which consists of representatives from the seven CALFED implementing agencies, as well as several cooperating agencies, refine the priorities associated with the proposal solicitation package (PSP) process. No schedule has yet been set for DWR to roll out the grants this year. Ms. Davis noted that the Subcommittee needed to be sure that the criteria that they wanted were included in the PSP and that this happened quickly so that everything could proceed on schedule.

Sam Ziegler noted that the main issues were discussed at last month's meeting; however, he reported that IWAT would be refining the criteria in terms of the other CALFED Programs and agency priorities. He reported that IWAT was in a two-week long period of gathering information on the criteria.

Ms. Davis wanted the Subcommittee members to be clear that future grant applicants should attempt to more explicitly address specific CALFED goals. She noted that the other CALFED Programs have their own set of goals that would be addressed in their PSPs, but that she hoped that all the programs would become more integrated with each other and also incorporate the Watershed Program's goals into their PSPs as well.

Nettie Drake asked how this push towards integration was being perceived by the leadership at the Authority. Mr. Ziegler noted that the development of PSP criteria was an evolutionary process and that all programs were taking time to refocus and review their priorities. He noted that this was an opportune time to focus on integration. He also stated that it will be important for criteria to be developed quickly and that IWAT will be working to devise a schedule in the next couple of months.

Lisa Holms, The CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program Manager, noted that one challenge in developing criteria would be how to translate certain watershed-based actions into concrete measurements of drinking water quality improvement. Dennis Bowker agreed and noted that he envisioned the Watershed Program promoting leadership and management capability to integrate the more specific goals of the other programs, including integrating the goals of the Drinking Water Program with those of the Watershed Program.

Ms. Davis noted that because of constrained dollars, there would be increased pressure for a using a business plan approach to allocate the remaining funding. Projects that will rise to the top of the list will increasingly be those that can easily be proven to make a measurable change than those projects that make changes at an incremental level. She stressed the need to identify potential linkages quickly and promised that the conversation to identify such linkages would start at the level of the California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC).

Bill Kier stated that he was concerned that the Watershed Program provided no clear guidance on conducting watershed assessments. He thought that the Watershed Program had been extremely generous with grant applicants in the past and was concerned that all the various watershed assessments might not be able to be reconciled with each other and entered into a single database. He stated that this would be important because there has to be data to support how the Watershed Program is benefiting water quality and drinking water, for example. Mr. Lowrie noted that the Watershed Program was not the only CALFED Program that was struggling with performance measurements.

A Subcommittee member mentioned that there was a California Watershed Assessment Manual (CWAM) available at <http://cwam.ucdavis.edu>. Chris Kelley replied that CWAM was a good start, but that the manual does not get at the specific questions raised by Mr. Kier. Mr. Kelley noted that CWAM should be treated more as a working document that is still in progress.

Another Subcommittee member noted that IWAT should be careful to maintain a balance in describing the requirements for a watershed assessment since many of the smaller watershed groups did not feel that past PSPs were accessible to them. The member cautioned that the more research/technical requirements that were listed, the fewer watershed groups there would be submitting proposals. Ms. Davis noted that there would always be tension surrounding the issues of attempting to clearly define a watershed assessment because of the inherent complexity of watersheds, and the variability of local watershed community goals.

There was a general discussion in which several Subcommittee members cautioned placing too much emphasis and spending too much money to attempt to identify performance measures and quantify success. Ms. Ames mentioned her experience in Lake Tahoe as an example.

Mr. Lowrie noted that with the completion of the Watershed Program Work Plan, the Program would now be able to begin working again to develop and conduct Watershed Partnership Seminars. The Watershed Program plans to hold three seminars over the course of the next two years. The first one is tentatively planned for late February or early March 2005. Another focus of the Program will be to continue to enhance the technical capability of those interested in receiving assistance in completing watershed assessments.

Ms. Davis asked when the Subcommittee should expect to participate in developing the final criteria for the next round of grant applications. It was decided that this will be the main focus of the next meeting to be held in September. She asked the Subcommittee members to be prepared to focus on this agenda item and asked IWAT to provide draft material for the Subcommittee to review at least one week to a few days prior to the next meeting.

A STRAW MAN PROPOSAL FOR THE 10-YEAR PROGRAM FINANCE PLAN

Mr. Meacher introduced this topic by providing an update to the Subcommittee on the status of the 10-Year Finance Plan. He informed the Subcommittee that at the last BDPAC meeting with CBDA, the co-chairs expressed that the \$10 million figure was way too low. He announced that the new amount now being proposed is a minimum average annual amount of \$25 million. With this amount determined, the discussion has now shifted to identifying where the money is going to come from. Mr. Meacher then introduced Roger Mann and Yating Liang to present some of

the issues surrounding the current 10-Year Program Finance Plan.

Ms. Liang informed the Subcommittee that the finance group had been tasked by BDPAC to focus on a 10-year time period for a finance plan. The 10-Year Finance Plan was based on the Finance Options Report, which is available on the CBDA Web site. As a starting point, the finance group chose the low-end figures presented in the Finance Options Report for each of the CALFED Programs. Ms. Liang noted that once the final program amounts have been agreed upon, the Authority is trying to move very quickly to finalize the Finance Plan for review at the next Authority meeting in October. The Authority would like to have the plan finalized by November in order to have some options in the governor's budget. Ms. Liang noted that the Issues Paper being presented today (Attachment B) represents an attempt to take a step back and ask the stakeholders what they think the issues are surrounding the 10-Year Finance Plan.

In order to get the discussion going, Ms. Davis asked Ms. Liang what she saw as some of the main issues were and asked if there were any changes from the Finance Options Report. Ms. Liang replied that the chart presented in the issues paper was not an allocation but a target.

Mr. Lowrie was asked if the cost analysis was done specifically for \$25 million or for a range. Harry Schueller of the State Board stated that first, the need should be demonstrated and then second, it should be determined who should satisfy the need. Mr. Lowrie responded that the development of the Watershed Program Plan had already demonstrated the need. Ms. Davis noted that a specific amount was never analyzed for any of the CALFED Programs and acknowledged that this could be problematic. Mr. Mann also noted that the Watershed Program was one of the more difficult programs to define. Ms. Davis responded that this comment tied back to the earlier discussion about reconciling the different approaches/languages/units of measure/etc. in conducting watershed assessments and said that this will always be a source of tension that exists within the CALFED Program.

Caitlan Cornwall stated that there are other realms where this problem of quantifying benefits exists and that there must be a way to come up with adequate measurements. She cited example of road maintenance or education. She suggested that perhaps this would be a good project for a directed action.

Ms. Holms stated that the Drinking Water Program appreciated that capacity building work that the Watershed Program was doing as part of the Watershed Program Plan. Because the Drinking Water Program could not always deal with the peaks, she stated that we need the Watershed Program for these times.

Ms. Liang said that while the number was important, the focus should now be on where the money would come from. Mr. Meacher suggested that Ms. Liang contact the co-chairs so that they could provide information on the beneficiaries of the Watershed Program from snowcap to tap. He stated that they may almost have to go watershed by watershed, but the information is available. Mr. Mann said that this would be a huge step forward. It was decided that the co-chairs would provide some information to the finance group hopefully by August 30, 2004.

Mr. Wellborn acknowledged that he was frustrated that the Watershed Program appeared to have to be justifying its funding need again. Mr. Meacher noted that this is because the Watershed

Program now has to come up with a self-funding mechanism for the 10-Year Finance Plan. Mr. Lowrie stated that he wanted to add a nuance to this discussion that all the CALFED Programs are linked and that if one program is out of balance, this triggers a balancing issue for all the CALFED Programs. Ms. Liang confirmed that all the programs are struggling with this issue.

Peter Jacobsen of the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) thanked Ms. Liang for putting together the Issues Paper and read a statement indicating that MWD has supported the Watershed Program in the past and will continue to do so; however, MWD will be submitting comments on the Finance Plan and was concerned about the identification of “water users” to financially support the program. Ms. Davis mentioned that it would be helpful for Kate Hansel and the finance group to go back to the documentation on the CBDA Web site from the first round of grants and find out who has been benefiting from the programs to date and also to find tiebacks to other CALFED Programs.

Jim Patterson noted that the conversation had appeared to shift from the budgeting process to justifying the Watershed Program through benefits. Ms. Liang commented that the group should finish going through the Issues Paper. She recommended that we presume that we have settled on a dollar amount and move to a discussion of how we were going to get the money. She questioned for example whether funding should come from the state or a federal source.

Nettie Drake pointed out that receiving federal funding directly for the CALFED Program or the Watershed Program could be very difficult. Ms. Liang responded that the point of the Issues Paper was to get feedback on what options the Subcommittee thought were realistic. Ms. Davis reminded the group that the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) had made a point to the federal government that it is a major landowner and needs watershed management programs.

Barbara Evoy of the State Board asked if the estimate was based on other money continually coming in for other federal programs that already existed. Mr. Lowrie responded that a regional assessment was used and that no assumptions were made in regards to existing funding sources. He noted that during the planning process, there was significant resistance by the agencies to link their funding with any one program. Mr. Schueller commented that you had to back out the federal funding first; however, Mr. Lowrie commented that the political reality was that the federal agencies really did not want that assumption made.

Ms. Cornwall said that she thought the funding pool should reflect the diversity of beneficiaries and include more groups than just the water users. She asked if it was possible to create an average picture of who benefits from the project and then reassess this every five years. Another Subcommittee member cautioned that local governments have already given a large increment of their income to the state and that it would be difficult to ask for more money.

Mr. Schueller asked what the \$25 million represents. He stated that he was not questioning the benefit of the Watershed Program, but rather the amount of \$25 million. He did not feel that that amount was very sound and thought this would be problematic in the future. Ms. Ames stated that it would be quite easy to go back and come up with a solid reason for the \$25 million amount, but that the number would likely increase by so much that it could get out of control.

Mr. Ziegler noted that grants do not seem to be the best way to fund the goals of the program and build capacity. The eventual goal is that the Subcommittee wants to put themselves out of business. Currently, the institution to do capacity building is broken. Proposition 13 (Jarvis-Gann) broke the resource conservation districts and now we are trying to fix this through this process. This is an opportunity to put some institutional fixes in place.

Mr. Schueller asked what might be different with the Watershed Program 10 years out. Ms. Davis responded that this was somewhat of a crystal ball exercise, but that we do need to be forthright about the funding difficulties to the extent that the traditional finance system is broken. She noted that this is the world we are in now for several years out. She said that it would be necessary to look at the local watersheds' problems and tie these back to CALFED and that we will also have to have a sense of the local benefits. She recommended being explicit about educating the public on the local benefits to build support for alternate sources of funding.. She noted that she was very proud of the local cost sharing program and acknowledged that in kind resources had been very important. She stated that the Authority needed to recognize the importance of these in kind resources and take this into consideration, without counting it against the 25-40 million dollar target..

Mr. Mann responded that there needs to be a way to tie this back to the source of funds.. Ms. Davis said that this is already happening in the context of the grants to date and that this includes information about CALFED goals and cost sharing.

Ms. Liang stated that the issues needed to be resolved because they will be presented in a public workshop. She asked if the Subcommittee had any changes that they would like to make to the Issues Paper. Mr. Meacher responded that he did not want the definition of "water users" to be limited. He doesn't want MWD to think that they are being singled out and stated that they should talk more about this issues when he and Ms. Davis met with the finance group.

A Subcommittee member inquired if there was an impact that was not being considered in the funding source, such as quantification of impermeable surfaces or fire prevention, for instance. It was also noted that the federal player for flood management was not included. In addition, it was suggested that an operations and maintenance fee be implemented for dealing with the challenges associated with peak flows. Another member reminded the Subcommittee that some areas were rural and not part of incorporated cities and that imposing additional charges on those residents could pose unfair financial hardships.

Ms. Liang asked if it would be feasible to identify beneficiaries in a particular region. Mr. Kier suggested possibly tagging the benefits through stormwater permits. A Subcommittee member noted that even in hardship counties, developers could pay fees for constructing something like a parking lot.

Mr. Lowrie said that maybe the Watershed Program should think about identifying projects first and then seeking specific funding for those specific projects. He noted that the federal funding agencies have said in the past that they do not want to fund a program, but would prefer to fund individual projects. Mr. Schueller noted that this makes the job of showing the relevancy of the Watershed Program much easier and suggested listing the problems and identifying projects to address those problems. The Subcommittee noted that this has already been done through

descriptions of desired outcomes, and Mr. Lowrie cautioned that solving specific problems as defined by the SWRCB, did not necessarily guarantee that the goals and objectives of the Watershed Program would be addressed.

In order to sum up the group's comments, Ms. Liang noted that one of the main issues would be clarifying funding sources and that additional sources related to recreation should be added. Other ideas raised by the Subcommittee included addressing local funding difficulties, strengthening grassroots assistance, broadening the definition of a match to include, for example, in kind assistance, and noting that the \$25 million amount needed to be increased. The Subcommittee also stressed the fact that the finance group should look at past PSPs to review how the need for the Watershed Program has already been identified. Ms. Liang encouraged members of the Subcommittee to attend the public meeting on August 30, 2004 regarding the 10-Year Finance Plan. Mr. Meacher announced that Ms. Davis and the members of IWAT would get together with the finance group and to let Mr. Lowrie know if anyone else was interested in attending that meeting.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Ms. Ames made an announcement that the State Board was in the process of developing a survey on how the 2003 round of grants was conducted. She encouraged the Subcommittee members to email dkendric@swrcb.ca.gov to let him know what type of questions the grant recipients would like to have asked and answered..

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT: BAY-DELTA WATERSHED ASSESSMENTS

Mr. Lowrie announced that the Watershed Program had compiled a draft map showing the extent of the area where watershed assessments have already been completed within the CALFED Solution Area. The established baseline was 2002. Mr. Lowrie asked the Subcommittee members to provide comments on the validity and accuracy of those assessments that had already been identified on the map. In addition, he asked the members to provide any information on additional assessments that were not shown on the map. The next step would be to work with USFS to get those areas plotted into their system. Mr. Lowrie announced that the map would also be available on the CBDA Web site for viewing.

It was noted that most of the data for this map came from CALWATER, the official California State hierarchical Watershed maps and GIS database and that CALWATER needs more money to better delineate watersheds. Currently, the funding is mainly from the federal government. CALWATER has also used the funding to put on various workshops on conducting delineations.

Another Subcommittee member inquired about how a watershed assessment should be defined. He noted that there were many assessments that did not have assessment in the title or other studies that did, but that were not actually watershed assessments. Mr. Lowrie acknowledged that the next steps needed to include characterizing what a scientifically valid assessment was. Dan Wermeil noted that for the time being, he would like to receive everything that is out there and then sort and focus the effort on the definition once more assessments had been received.

UPDATE ON THE DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE PROPOSITION 50 CHAPTER 8 INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER PROGRAM GRANTS

Ms. Davis announced that Draft Guidelines for Proposition 50 were now available for public

viewing at www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov. The State Board and DWR are working together to develop these guidelines and are soliciting public comments no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 30, 2004 by post or email. In addition, there will also be two public meetings, one on Tuesday, August 31, 2004 at 10:00 a.m. in Ontario, CA and the other on Tuesday, September 9, 2004 at CalEPA. There will be Internet access available to attend the second meeting remotely. Ms. Davis also noted that this item would be on the September meeting agenda so that the group could discuss it in greater detail.

Ms. Drake reported that the guidelines actually did not exist earlier this year and acknowledged that John Woodling of DWR had worked very hard to incorporate as many of the Subcommittee's comments as possible into the current document. She noted that the initial document was available on the Watershed Program Web site to get an idea of some of the history surrounding the development of the guidelines. She noted that this document has been very difficult to develop because of the challenge of defining concepts like region/regional/regional watershed management group. She noted that there was a page in the Guidelines explaining the definitions of various terms and called special attention to reviewing this because it could affect a group's eligibility to apply for funding. She encouraged the Subcommittee members to review the guidelines and provide comments. She also raised two other important questions. First, should the grants be broken into multiple rounds? And second, are the criteria clear on what is required to apply. She asked the group to pay special attention to how grant applicants were going to be judged and stressed that they ask questions about anything they did not understand.

Mr. Wellborn thanked Ms. Drake and her group for their work in ensuring that the term watershed made it into the guidelines, but noted that some references might not connect well to getting funding because the group wants everyone to have a chance to apply. Ms. Drake responded that this money was not intended for everyone, just those with a watershed plan. Ms. Davis acknowledged that it was a big challenge to note that was eligible and that there are statutory drivers that had to be followed that did not fit well with a watershed approach. However, she noted that this did not mean that the Subcommittee could not work with the State Board and DWR and that this is what the comment period is for.

One Subcommittee member asked how competitive the groups would be that did not have direct linkages to watershed support. Ms. Davis replied that it would be good to look at the statutory authority for funding to see who is in and who is out. She remarked that the definitions were not all that great and that the State Board and DWR needed to continue to clarify this and how they were going to frame the program.

Another Subcommittee member asked who was going to make a consolidated presentation to the State Board and DWR. Ms. Davis said that this needed to be decided, but that all eyes are on CWN to do this. It was announced that comments could be sent directly to Mr. Woodling at jwoodin@water.ca.gov.

A Subcommittee member asked what the rationale was for setting the local contribution match at 50%. Ms. Drake said that these are the types of questions that need to be sent to the State Board and DWR. She also stressed that it was essential to make recommendations and not just give criticism. Ms. Davis noted that the specific questions and issues raised by the Subcommittee would be revisited at the September meeting and that the Subcommittee would write a letter with

specific recommendations.

Mr. Ziegler also raised two questions he thought that the Subcommittee should be aware of: 1). Is the split between implementation and planning where we want it to be and 2). What is an Integrated Watershed Management Plan (IWMP)? Ms. Ames raised a point on page 18 that the weighting for local planning was one while the weighting for a work plan was three. She thought it would be a good idea to ask whether this weighting was appropriate.

Several Subcommittee members expressed interest in receiving information about what is required in an IWMP. Machado and SAWPA were recommended as good examples and a good place to start. It was also mentioned that Butte County has an example on their Web site as well.

Another Subcommittee member asked if Proposition 50 money was really meant for smaller watershed groups or more for larger ones? She also noted that the \$50 million available in Proposition 40 was specifically intended for planning and that the right language never really got in there. She noted that it would be a big disappointment if this new Proposition 50 money were meant to satisfy planning needs entirely.

It was also asked if there could be separate standards for separate projects; however, Mr. Lowrie commented that this would be contrary to the Watershed Program's goals.

There was a general discussion on the idea that the term regional was problematic. Mr. Kier noted that it was most likely that groups would have a better chance of being successful if they organized on a regional level. Mr. Lowrie noted that the authors of Proposition 50 did not have watershed management in mind when they wrote it. The overriding purpose of Prop 50 is to decrease dependence on imported water, which leads to a different scale. However, he noted that even if the original intent was not watershed management, there is now an opportunity to work together to develop the guidelines.

A Subcommittee member asked why she should bother applying. Ms. Davis noted that a successful applicant might be able to carve off a small chunk of planning money that could eventually lead to an IWMP. Another member noted that while it may not be fun to bring all these diverse groups together, it is likely that a lot of good things could come out of it. However, she noted that this success would depend a lot on attitudes.

Robin Freeman asked if the criteria would change. Lauma Jurkevics from the State Board answered that this should not happen because there would be more stability once the guidelines were established. Mr. Freeman asked if the Subcommittee's comments would be incorporated into the guidelines. Ms. Drake responded that Mr. Woodling was working really hard to get comments into the guidelines and stressed again that this is why it would be important for the Subcommittee to provide comments.

Mr. Meacher thanked the Subcommittee for their comments and asked that individuals attend the meetings if possible. He noted that this would be an ongoing issue for discussion.

UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA WATERSHED COUNCIL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Ms. Davis provided a brief history of the California Watershed Council (CWC) stating that it

was established one year ago and comprised of California EPA, the Resources Agency, and the public. The CWC was made up of different subcommittees, which includes:

- Data and Information Sharing;
- Planning;
- Education, Outreach, and Capacity Building;
- Funding and Economics; and
- Operations (which never really happened).

In July, this administration requested that the CWC put together their final report for their activity to date. Ms. Davis noted that the Subcommittee should be prepared that it will be found that the CWC is not meeting the current priorities of this administration.

Ms. Ames asked what this Subcommittee could do to save the CWC while this administration gets stabilized rather than just letting it go. She asked if it would be possible to have a forum for the CWC to meet once per year to keep it alive until a later year when it could be reenergized. A Subcommittee member wondered if the CWC could continue to meet even if the government did not sanction it. Mr. Kier noted that we have always had a citizen advisory committee and that this legislation might resonate to that kind of appeal.

Mr. Wellborn stated that the CWC was valuable and that there was still work to be done. Ms. Drake seconded that the CWC was valuable because it covered more than just the CALFED Solution Area and that it helped to address the frustrations of those that were dissatisfied with the CALFED Program. She asked the Subcommittee if it should combine its fund/time/etc. with the CWC until the administration stabilized. She noted that as long as the public was paying taxes, it was important for them to have a voice. Mr. Wellborn stated that the CWN was prepared to do what it could to preserve the CWC.

Ms. Davis remarked that she was surprised by the amount of support and that the Subcommittee should take some time at the next meeting to think about how to include other groups outside of CALFED. She also noted that there was a need to improve public participation in the CWC.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Lowrie announced that Ms. Jurkevics was the new Watershed Management Initiative/Non Point Source Pollution contact person for the State Board. She will be replacing a colleague and good friend, Ken Coulter who has been transferred to the Dairy Waste Management Program. Mr. Lowrie announced that the group was welcomed to join him and the co-chairs in celebrating his contribution and to thank him for his support and friendship. They were going to meet after the meeting at the K Street Pyramid Ale House on 12th and K.

OCTOBER ROADSHOW TO THE FEATHER RIVER WATERSHED

The co-chairs announced that we are now looking at the October timeframe for a roadshow. The Authority meeting is planned for October 14-15 so the third Thursday would probably not work. Mr. Meacher noted that we would most likely need 1½ days for the trip, and that the CALFED Watershed Program Team was still working on costs. Assuming that there is still interest in the event, more information would be presented at the September meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS UPDATES

Mr. Meacher announced that as of today, Mary Lee Knecht had not yet had her baby, but maybe she would by next week.

A sub committee member announced that the NRCS Conservation Security Program had made funding available for eight targeted watersheds and that everything centered on HUICS. In California, they are working on developing a list of priority watersheds for the next fiscal year. NRCS has offered to come to a Subcommittee meeting to talk about the prioritization process. Another member announced that next Thursday, August 26, 2004 at 9:00-12:00, the NRCS would be seeking input on this program.

It was also announced that the Water Use Efficiency PSP was out and was due on October 12, 2004.

There will be an Action Specific Implementation Plan (ASIP) discussion/workshop on Tuesday, September 7, 2004. Ask the CBDA/DWR representatives to learn more.

State Water Board training is available on September 18 and October 1, 2004.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, September 30, 2004 at the California Bay-Delta Authority (650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor, Delta Room, Sacramento) from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Attachment A

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Affiliation
Lia McLaughlin	USFWS
Kristin Carter	CSU
Fraser Shilling	UCD
Mick Klasson	SAFCA
Eugenia Laycheck	EJA and Associates
Robin Freeman	
Jane Lavelle	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Michael Anderson	UCD
Teri Murrison	ERMRC
Cindy Lashbrook	EMRC
Mike Wellborn	CWN
Rich Grishom	PCRCD
Jim Patterson	Colusa RCD
Laurel Ames	CWN
BethPardieck	Muir Heritage Land Trust
Luama Jurkevics	SWRCB
Harry Schueller	SWRCB
Mary Ian	Sutter Co.
Chris Keithley	CDF
Kathy Russick	SRWP
Shana Kaplan	BOR
Andrew Rush	DOC
Martha Dais	IGA
Leah Will	PCPW
Sam Ziegler	EPA
Carrie Austin	SFB RWRCB
Pamela Francis	Lake County Department of Water Resources
Jay Chamberlin	CBDA
Juliet Lamont	Urban Creeks Council
Peter Jacobson	MWD
Patrick Sanger	City of Sacramento Stormwater Quality Program
Cindy Horney	GCRCD
Pia Sevelius	Butte County
Erin Williams	USFWS
Robert Meacher	BDPAC
Bill Crooks	City of Sacramento
Bill Kier	Kier Associates/Institute of Fisheries Resources
Jim Cornelius	Colusa County WP
James Moller	WSRCD
Craig Benson	Sutter County Watershed Coordinator
Kevin Ward	CWN UC Davis
Name	Affiliation

Ben Wallace	CARCD
Caitlin Cornwall	Sonoma Ecology Center
Leigh Sharp	Napa RCD
Kathy Mannion	RCRC
Vickie Newlin	CBDA
Megan Sharez	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Josh Miller	Sierra Nevada Alliance
Tricia Bratcher	CDFG
Holly Savage	CCWG
Brandy Norton	CCWG
Vieva Swearingen	CCWG/DCWC
Syd Brown	DPR
Nettie Drake	MFG, INC./B&N Enterprises
Betty Yee	RWQCB

Attachment B

- Meeting Agenda
- Draft Guidelines to Chapter 8 of Proposition 50
- Watershed Program Finance Plan Issue Paper
- 10-Year Finance Plan Proposed Schedule, Process and Work Products
- 10-Year Finance Plan Workshop Notice
- Getting Started Garden Design Workshop Notice
- Award Nominations Handout

PUBLIC DRAFT 8/16/04
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM
GUIDELINES

FOR

PROPOSITION 50, CHAPTER 8
AUGUST 2004



DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
AND



STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

THE FOLLOWING INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM DRAFT GUIDELINES ARE BEING PROVIDED FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

THE GUIDELINES MAY BE ACCESSED VIA THE INTERNET AT:

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html>

<http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/integregio.cfm>

PUBLIC MEETINGS TO SOLICIT PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT GUIDELINES WILL BE HELD AS FOLLOWS:

TUESDAY, AUGUST 31, 2004

10:00 A.M.

AYERS SUITES HOTEL

1945 EAST HOLT BOULEVARD

BASQUE AND PYRENEES ROOMS

ONTARIO, CA 91764

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2004

10:00 A.M.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

1001 I STREET

2ND FLOOR – COASTAL HEARING ROOM

SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

THIS MEETING WILL BE WEB BROADCAST FOR INTERNET ACCESS.

CHECK <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/broadcast/>

DURING THIS MEETING PUBLIC COMMENTS MAY BE EMAILED TO

dfa_grants@swrcb.ca.gov

ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY

5:00 P.M. ON SEPTEMBER 30, 2004

PLEASE SEND OR EMAIL COMMENTS TO THE ADDRESS BELOW:

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

DIVISION OF PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE

ATTN: TRACIE BILLINGTON

POST OFFICE BOX 942836

SACRAMENTO, CA 94236-0001

tracieb@water.ca.gov

ACRONYMS USED IN THESE GUIDELINES AND APPENDICES

AB	Assembly Bill
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CWC	California Water Code
DWR	Department of Water Resources
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
PSP	Proposal Solicitation Package
ROD	Record of Decision
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish the process that the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) will use to jointly solicit applications, evaluate proposals, and award grants under the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program.

These guidelines do not include the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP). The PSPs, containing additional detailed information, will be issued separately after these guidelines are adopted by DWR and the SWRCB.

II. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Proposition 50, the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002, was passed by California voters in November 2002. It amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add, among other articles, Section 79560 *et seq.*, authorizing the Legislature to appropriate \$500 million for IRWM projects. The intent of the IRWM Grant Program is to encourage integrated regional strategies for management of water resources and to provide funding, through competitive grants, for projects that protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water. The IRWM Grant Program is administered jointly by DWR and the SWRCB and is intended to promote a new model for water management. Approximately \$380 million is anticipated to be available for IRWM grants during two funding cycles.

The legislature passed several pieces of legislation that impact the implementation of Proposition 50. The various Senate Bills (SB) and Assembly Bills (AB) include:

- ◆ SB 278 (Machado, Chapter 892, Statutes of 2002) requires the body awarding a contract for a public works project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 50 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program;
- ◆ SB 1473 (Machado, Chapter 618, Statutes of 2002) provides that DWR will administer 50 percent of the IRWM Grant Program funds and the SWRCB will administer the other 50 percent and requires that not less than 40 percent of the funds to be available to both [Southern California](#) and [Northern California](#). Prior to awarding a grant, DWR and the SWRCB must determine whether projects that include modification of a river or stream channel will fully mitigate environmental impacts;
- ◆ SB 1672 (Costa, Chapter 767, Statutes of 2002) authorizes a [regional water management group](#) to prepare and adopt an integrated regional water management plan; (CWC § 10530 *et seq.*)
- ◆ AB 1747 (Oropeza, Chapter 240, Statutes of 2003) provides specific mandates and guidance for implementing Proposition 50, includes an exemption from the Office of Administrative Law review and approval process, directs \$20 million from the IRWM Grant Program for competitive grants for groundwater management and recharge projects, and includes a preference for water quality projects that will eliminate or significantly reduce pollution into impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including [areas of special biological significance](#);
- ◆ SB 1049 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 741, Statutes of 2003) amended provisions in AB 1747 to provide the State additional flexibility in implementing Proposition 50 programs; and
- ◆ AB 866 (Pavely, Chapter 493, Statutes of 2003) provides a specific mandate to the SWRCB to fund the development of one or more integrated coastal watershed management plans. (CWC § 79563.5)

The CWC requires DWR and the SWRCB to conduct public outreach in the development of guidelines and criteria for the IRWM Grant Program. These guidelines were developed after consideration of input provided in the following venues:

- ◆ Legislative workshops conducted in the Spring of 2003;

- ◆ Meetings of the Economics and Funding workgroup of the California Watershed Council in late 2003 and early 2004;
- ◆ California Bay Delta Authority meeting in February 2004; and
- ◆ Two public scoping meetings in March 2004.

A. FUNDING

Grants will be provided to eligible grant recipients to develop IRWM Plans or Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans (Planning Grants) and to implement projects that meet the requirements of these guidelines (Implementation Grants). Eligibility requirements are contained in Section III.

Funding from the IRWM Grant Program is anticipated to be committed as shown below:

- ◆ First Funding Cycle – Approximately \$160 million
- ◆ Second Funding Cycle – Approximately \$220 million

B. MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT

The maximum grant amounts are:

- ◆ \$500,000 for Planning Grants; and
- ◆ \$50 million for Implementation Grants.

C. MINIMUM LOCAL MATCH REQUIREMENTS

- ◆ The applicant is required to provide a local match.
- ◆ The required minimum local match for a Planning Grant will be 50 percent of the total project costs.
- ◆ The required minimum local match for the Implementation Grant will be 10 percent of the total project costs.

The requirement for local match may be waived or reduced to the extent that applicants demonstrate the proposed planning effort or implementation project will: 1) encompass a region that includes at least one [disadvantaged community](#), 2) include representatives of the disadvantaged communities in the planning process, and 3) be designed to provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged community(ies). Such reductions in the required local match percentage would be in proportion to the percentage of disadvantaged population served relative to the entire population in the region. The PSP will provide more detail on the procedures for waiving or reducing the local match.

D. PROGRAM PREFERENCES

The CWC and implementing legislation specifies that preference will be given to specific project types. These program preferences are reflected in the project ranking criteria and will be taken into consideration during the review process ([Section V.F](#)). The program preferences are for projects that, as applicable:

- ◆ Are integrated and have multiple benefits;
- ◆ Support and improve local and regional water supply reliability;
- ◆ Contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards;
- ◆ Eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including coastal watersheds that influence water quality in areas of special biological significance;
- ◆ Are safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities; or

- ◆ Are groundwater management and recharge projects that are located: 1) in San Bernardino or Riverside counties; 2) outside the service area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; and 3) within one mile of established residential and commercial development.

[Appendix E](#) provides a listing of web links for accessing information on the Program Priorities.

E. STATEWIDE PRIORITIES

DWR and the SWRCB will give preference to projects that assist in meeting various Statewide Priorities. Such Statewide Priorities will be taken into consideration during the review process ([Section V.F](#)) and are as follows:

- ◆ Reduce conflict between water users or resolve water rights disputes, including interregional water rights issues;
- ◆ Implementation of Total Maximum Daily Loads that are established or under development;
- ◆ Implementation of Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans, and policies;
- ◆ Implementation of the SWRCB's Non-point Source Program Plan;
- ◆ Meet Delta Water Quality Objectives;
- ◆ Implementation of recommendations of the floodplain management task force, desalination task force, or recycling task force;
- ◆ Address environmental justice concerns;
- ◆ Assist in achieving one or more goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; and

[Appendix E](#) provides a listing of web links for accessing detailed information on Statewide Priorities.

F. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

Plans and projects throughout California will be considered for funding. The CWC requires that not less than 40% of the funds will be available for eligible projects in Northern California and not less than 40% will be available for eligible projects in Southern California. For the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program "Southern California" is defined as the Counties of San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, Orange, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, San Bernardino, and Ventura. "Northern California" means all other California counties. In addition to the required 40% minimum allocation of funding to both northern and southern California, additional geographic distribution factors may be taken into consideration during the review process ([Section V.F](#)).

G. PROJECT SOLICITATION

The application process will be structured as two separate project solicitations, for planning projects and implementation projects. The application contents and evaluation criteria are detailed in [Appendix B](#) and [Appendix C](#).

PLANNING GRANT SOLICITATION

Approximately \$10 million will be available for Planning Grants during the first funding cycle. The Planning Grants are intended to foster development or completion of IRWM Plans and Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans, to enhance regional planning efforts, and to assist more applicants to become eligible for Implementation Grant funding. The Planning Grant solicitation will be a one-step application process.

For IRWM Planning Grants, the applicant must provide documentation of the following:

- ◆ Major water-related issues within the region and objectives for the Plan;
- ◆ Consistency with IRWM Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b));
- ◆ Demonstration that applicant is an eligible grant recipient, as defined in [Section III.A](#);

- ◆ Process for development and adoption of IRWM Plan;
- ◆ Schedule for adoption;
- ◆ Participating Stakeholders;
- ◆ Local Match; and
- ◆ For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Planning Grants, in addition to the above items, that the grant proposal is located in a watershed that is tributary to an area of special biological significance and, if applicable, will allow for integration with projects funded by the State Coastal Conservancy.

IMPLEMENTATION GRANT SOLICITATION

Approximately \$150 million of funds will be released in the first funding cycle for IRWM implementation projects. Projects must meet one or more of the objectives of protecting communities from drought, protecting and improving water quality, and improving local water security by reducing dependence on imported water and include at least one of the project types listed in [Section III.C](#). The Implementation Grant program is designed for projects that are ready for or nearly ready to proceed to construction.

A two-step application process will be used to evaluate the proposed implementation projects. In Step 1, the Implementation Grant application must be submitted by regional agencies or groups, and the applicant must provide documentation of the following:

- ◆ Complete copy of the IRWM Plan, with proof of formal adoption by all participants;
- ◆ Demonstrated consistency with IRWM Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b));
- ◆ Description of specific implementation project(s) for which funding is being requested;
- ◆ Demonstrations that the applicant is an eligible grant recipient, as defined in [Section III.A](#);
- ◆ Prioritization of proposed projects listed in the IRWM Plan and within the application; and
- ◆ Local match for the proposed project(s).

The application must be submitted by regional agencies or regional water management groups, of which at least one is an eligible grant recipient, i.e. a public agency or non-profit organization. DWR and the SWRCB will evaluate the IRWM Implementation Grant, Step 1 applications, based on the criteria identified in [Appendix C, Section C.2](#). Selected applicants will be invited to compete for grant funding by submitting a detailed application under Step 2. To ensure that Step 2 is a competitive process, the total dollar value of applications from Step 1 invited to submit for Step 2 will be in excess of the total grant funding available in a funding cycle. In Step 2, the applicants will prepare a detailed project-focused proposal to provide technical, financial, environmental, and other information for the project or suite of projects proposed for funding. DWR and the SWRCB will evaluate the Step 2 proposals against the criteria in [Appendix C, Section C.4](#).

III. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A. Eligible Grant Recipients

Eligible grant recipients are [public agencies](#) and [non-profit organizations](#), as defined in Appendix D.

DWR and the SWRCB encourage partnerships to enhance the integration of water management throughout regions of California. Parties that wish to collaborate on a project may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship, a joint venture partnership, a joint powers authority, or other appropriate mechanism. Grant agreements will be executed with only one grant recipient for the region, which will then provide funding to the project proponents responsible to implement the awarded projects within the region. Applicants must identify one party responsible for payments, reporting, and accounting that meets the requirements for an eligible grant recipient. The application must include a detailed description of how the partners will operate, including the allocation of decision-making authority and liability.

B. Eligibility Criteria

Applications for IRWM grants must meet all Eligibility Criteria in order to be considered for funding. The Eligibility Criteria are as follows:

- ◆ Urban Water Management Planning Act Compliance – The Urban Water Management Planning Act (UWMPA or the Act), CWC § 10610 *et seq.* provides that urban water suppliers must prepare, adopt, and submit urban water management plans to DWR in compliance with the Act in order to be eligible to receive funding. Applicants or participating agencies that are urban water suppliers, as defined in CWC § 10617, must provide evidence of compliance with the UWMPA;
- ◆ Groundwater Management Plan Compliance – For groundwater management and recharge projects and for projects with potential groundwater impacts, the applicant must demonstrate that they either have an approved Groundwater Management Plan in compliance with CWC § 10753.7, or are in the process of updating their plan to meet the requirements of CWC § 10753.7; and
- ◆ Consistency with an [adopted IRWM Plan](#) – An applicant’s IRWM implementation project must be consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan that meets the minimum IRWM Plan standards as shown in Appendix A. This requirement may be waived if the agency or organization can show that it is engaged in the development of an IRWM Plan and that the IRWM Plan will be adopted before January 1, 2007 and demonstrates how the project fits into achieving the IRWM Plan objective(s) as evidenced by a draft IRWM Plan. (CWC § 79562.5(c))

C. Eligible Proposals/Project Types

The IRWM Grant Program provides funding for projects that protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water.

For Planning Grants, eligible proposals include:

- ◆ Development of new IRWM Plans;
- ◆ Completion or modification of IRWM Plans in progress; or
- ◆ Development of Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans;

For Implementation Grants, eligible proposals must include one or more of the following water management elements ([CWC § 79561](#)):

- ◆ Programs for water supply reliability, water conservation, and water use efficiency;
- ◆ Storm water capture, storage, treatment, and management;
- ◆ Removal of invasive non-native plants, the creation and enhancement of wetlands, and the acquisition, protection, and restoration of open space and watershed lands;
- ◆ Non point source pollution reduction, management, and monitoring;
- ◆ Groundwater recharge and management projects;
- ◆ Contaminant and salt removal through reclamation, desalting, and other treatment technologies;
- ◆ Water banking, water exchange, water reclamation, and improvement of water quality;
- ◆ Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood control programs that protect property; and improve water quality, storm water capture and percolation; and protect or improve wildlife habitat;
- ◆ Watershed management planning and implementation; and
- ◆ Demonstration projects to develop new drinking water treatment and distribution methods.

Proposals that include on-stream or off-stream surface water storage facilities **are not** eligible for funding (CWC § 79560). For the Implementation Grant Program, flood control and watershed management proposals must, at a minimum, include an implementation component.

The eligibility requirements for each grant program, as summarized below:

TABLE 1 – ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION

IRWM PLANNING GRANTS	Yes/No
Is the applicant a public agency or non-profit organization in accordance with Section III of these guidelines?	
If applicable, has an Urban Water Management Plan been adopted by the required agency and has this Plan been approved by DWR?	
Is the proposal an eligible proposal identified in Section III.C?	
STEP 1 IMPLEMENTATION GRANT	Yes/No
Is the applicant a public agency or non-profit organization in accordance with Section III of these guidelines?	
If applicable, has an Urban Water Management Plan been adopted by the required agency and has this Plan been approved by DWR?	
If applicable, has a Groundwater Management Plan consistent with CWC § 10753.7 been adopted by the applicant or is the applicant in the process of adopting a Groundwater Management Plan that will be consistent with CWC § 10753.7?	
Is the proposed project consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan or is the applicant in the process of developing an IRWM Plan that will be adopted before January 1, 2007?	
Does the proposal include one or more eligible water management elements identified in Section III.C?	
STEP 2 IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS	Yes/No
Is the applicant a public agency or non-profit organization in accordance with Section III of these guidelines?	
If applicable, has an Urban Water Management Plan been adopted by the required agency(ies) and has this Plan been approved by DWR?	
If applicable, has a Groundwater Management Plan consistent with CWC § 10753.7 been adopted by the applicant or is the applicant in the process of adopting a Groundwater Management Plan that will be consistent with CWC § 10753.7?	
Is the proposed project consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan or is the applicant in the process of developing an IRWM Plan that will be adopted before January 1, 2007?	
Does the proposal include one or more eligible water management elements identified in Section III.C?	

IV GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

A. Conflict of Interest

All participants are subject to State and federal conflict of interest laws. Failure to comply with these laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the application being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal action may also be taken. Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding conflict of interest requirements. Applicable statutes include, but are not limited to, California Government Code Section 1090 and California Public Contract Code §§ 10410 and 10411.

B. Confidentiality

Once the proposal has been submitted to DWR and the SWRCB, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived.

C. Labor Code Compliance

California Labor Code § 1771.8 requires the body awarding a contract for a public work project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 50 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program pursuant to California Labor Code § 1771.5(b).

D. Modification of a River or Stream Channel

Any projects that include any modification of a river or stream channel must fully mitigate any environmental impacts resulting from that modification. (CWC § 79560)

E. CEQA Compliance

Activities funded under Proposition 50 must be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 2100 *et seq.*). See [Appendix E](#) for web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook. (CWC § 79506)

F. CALFED Program Consistency

Any project that assists in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals must be consistent with the CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision (ROD) and must be implemented, to the maximum extent possible, through local and regional programs. See [Appendix E](#) for web links to the CALFED Programmatic ROD. (CWC § 79509)

G. Groundwater Monitoring Requirements

Any groundwater projects and projects that affect groundwater shall include groundwater monitoring requirements consistent with the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (Part 2.76 [commencing with § 10780] of Division 26 of the CWC).

H. Watershed Management Plan Consistency

Any watershed protection activities must be consistent with the applicable, adopted, local watershed management plans and the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) adopted by the RWQCB. See [Appendix E](#) for web links to the Basin Plans. (CWC § 79507)

I. Waiver of Litigation Rights

Grant agreements funded by the SWRCB will specify that acceptance of grant funds constitutes a waiver of litigation rights (including pending actions) to challenge any SWRCB or RWQCB regulation or order that requires performance of the project or whose conditions would be satisfied, in whole or in part, by performance of the project.

V. PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A. Solicitation Notice

A PSP for the IRWM Planning Grant and Step 1 IRWM Implementation Grant programs will be issued within two months after adoption of these guidelines. The PSPs will provide more detailed instructions on the mechanics of submitting proposals and specific information on submittal requirements. The PSPs will be posted on DWR and the SWRCB websites at:

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html>

<http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/integrehio.cfm>

and will be e-mailed to all interested parties on the IRWM Grant Program mailing list. In order to be placed on the e-mail list, please e-mail your contact information to:

dfa_grants@swrcb.ca.gov

Paper copies of the PSPs will be made available upon request.

B. Applicant Assistance Workshops

Four informational workshops will be conducted to address applicant questions and to provide general assistance to applicants in preparing their application for the Planning Grants and Implementation Grants. Additional workshops will be scheduled and held for the Implementation Grants, Step 2. The dates and locations of the workshops will be provided in the PSPs. In addition to the informational workshops, applicants are encouraged to seek assistance, as needed, from DWR, SWRCB, and RWQCB staff for developing proposals. Technical assistance on how to prepare an application will be available during the application preparation period (i.e. between the release of the guidelines and the application submittal date). DWR and the SWRCB do not have the resources to provide technical assistance in the form of assisting applicants with the actual preparation of an application.

C. Proposal Submittal

The procedure for submitting a complete proposal will be provided in the PSPs. To the extent feasible, the Planning Grants and Implementations Grant, Step 1 application process will be an on-line process. DWR and the SWRCB will provide assistance to applicants that do not have Internet access to submit an application.

The proposal must contain all the required items listed in the PSP. Proposals may include attachments with supplemental materials and may include design plans and specifications, detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot projects, additional maps, diagrams, letters of support, copies of agreements, or other items applicable to the implementation of the proposed project. **All attachments and supporting documentation must be provided by the deadline for submittal of proposal. Any material submitted after the deadline will not be considered and will be returned to the applicant.**

D. Completeness Review

All information requested in the PSP must be provided. Each application will first be evaluated in accordance with the PSP for completeness. If certain sections are not relevant to a particular applicant or project, the applicant must clearly state the rationale for such determination. **Applications not containing all required information will not be reviewed and will not be considered for funding.**

E. Eligibility Review

Complete applications will be evaluated for compliance with eligibility criteria, Section III, above. **Applications that are determined to be ineligible will not be reviewed or considered for funding.**

F. Review Process

All eligible proposals will be scored by [technical reviewers](#). The group of technical reviewers for each proposal will include one technical reviewer each from DWR headquarters, the SWRCB, and the applicable RWQCB or DWR District. At least three technical reviewers will be assigned to each eligible proposal. Furthermore, DWR and the SWRCB may request technical reviewers from other agencies, and assign them reviews based on technical elements of the projects. The technical reviewers will individually score proposals in accordance with criteria in Appendices B and C, Tables B.1, C.1, and C.2, as applicable. Following completion of the individual technical reviews, the reviewers will discuss the projects and develop a consensus review and score.

Following completion of the consensus scoring of all eligible proposals, DWR and the SWRCB will convene a [Project Selection Panel](#) to review the technical scores and comments. The Project Selection Panel will generate a preliminary project ranking list of the projects and make initial funding recommendations. When developing the preliminary project ranking list and initial funding recommendations, the Project Section Panel will consider the following items:

- ◆ Amount of funds available for the grant type,
- ◆ Consensus technical reviews,
- ◆ Program Preferences ([Section II.D](#)),
- ◆ Statewide Priorities ([Section II.E](#)), and

◆ Geographic distribution ([Section II.F](#)).

The Project Selection Panel may recommend reducing individual project grant amounts from that requested to allow a greater number of high-ranked projects to receive funding. Additionally, the Project Section Panel may adjust individual scores to ensure that: scoring criteria has been consistently applied; the recommended funding list reflects the breadth of the Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities; and that funding is equitably distributed throughout the State.

G. Applicant Notification and Public Meeting

The list of recommended projects will be posted on DWR and the SWRCB websites and the applicants will be notified of the availability of the recommended funding list.

The recommended funding list will be presented at a public meeting held by DWR and the SWRCB to solicit public comments on the proposed funding recommendations. Interested parties will be notified of the public meeting by a notice placed on DWR and the SWRCB websites at:

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html>

<http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/integrehio.cfm>

and by a news release informing the public of the date, time, and location of the meeting.

H. Funding Awards

Based on the individual project evaluations, the preliminary project ranking list and initial funding recommendations developed by the Project Section Panel, and the comments received during the public comment period, DWR and the SWRCB will jointly approve a final funding list and the associated funding commitments. DWR's Director will approve the final funding list through DWR's existing administrative procedures. SWRCB approval will take place at a SWRCB meeting. Following approval by DWR and the SWRCB, the selected grant recipients will receive a commitment letter officially notifying them of their selection for a grant, the grant amount, and the granting agency.

I. Grant Agreement

Although the grant solicitation and selection process is being implemented jointly by DWR and the SWRCB, the grant funding will be managed separately. Project oversight will be coordinated between DWR and the SWRCB depending on the scope of the project.

Following funding commitment, the granting agency will execute a grant agreement with the applicant. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by authorized representative of the applicant and the granting agency. Costs incurred prior to the granting agency's commitment to award a grant agreement may not be eligible for reimbursement, but may be considered as a part of the applicant's costs share. Only work performed **after** the execution date of the agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Disbursement of IRWM funds may be provided on a monthly basis to reimburse the grant recipient for work performed. **Advance funds cannot be provided.**

APPENDIX A

IRWM PLAN STANDARDS

Whether applying for a grant to develop or complete an IRWM Plan (Planning Grant) or a grant to implement a project that is part of an adopted IRWM Plan (Implementation Grant), the proposed or adopted IRWM Plan must meet the standards outlined in this Appendix. The “Plan” need not be called an “IRWM Plan.” An existing watershed management plan, integrated resource plan, urban water management plan, or other regional planning effort may be utilized as long as the plan(s) meet the standards set forth below, or is functionally equivalent. For the purposes of this Appendix, “Plan” refers to an IRWM Plan or equivalent.

Listed below are the IRWM Plan standards.

- A. **Regional Agency or Group** – Describe the [regional water management group](#) or regional agency responsible for development and implementation of the Plan. Include the member agencies and organizations and their management responsibilities related to water. Demonstrate that all agencies and organizations necessary to satisfy the objectives of the Plan were involved in the planning process.
- B. **Region Description** – Explain why the region is an appropriate area for integrated regional water management. Describe internal boundaries within the region (boundaries of municipalities; service areas of individual water, wastewater, and land use agencies, including those not involved in the plan; groundwater basin boundaries, watershed boundaries, county boundaries, etc.), major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions. Describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region, including surface waters, ground waters, reclaimed water, imported water, and desalted water. Describe important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries. Describe the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values. Describe economic conditions and important economic trends within the region.
- C. **Objectives** – Identify IRWM Plan objectives and the manner in which they were determined. Describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon, and address major water related objectives and conflicts within the region.
- D. **Water Management Strategies** – Document the range of water management strategies considered to meet the objectives. Not all options will have applicability in every region – provide a brief discussion of why an option is not applicable. In some regions, additional elements may be needed. Strategies to be considered could include:

TABLE A-1 – WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

◆ Imported water	◆ Non-point source pollution control
◆ Groundwater management	◆ Storm water capture and management
◆ Conjunctive use	◆ Flood management
◆ Water recycling	◆ Recreation and public access
◆ Desalination	◆ Wetlands enhancement and creation
◆ Water conservation	◆ Environmental and habitat protection and improvement
◆ Water transfers	◆ Watershed planning
◆ Surface storage	◆ Land use planning
◆ Water and wastewater treatment	

- E. **Integration** – Present the mix of water management strategies selected for inclusion in the Plan and discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives. Include a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies.

- F. **Regional Priorities** – Include short-term and long-term priorities for implementation of the Plan. Discuss process for modifying priorities in response to regional changes.
- G. **Implementation** – Identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented. Identify the agency(ies) responsible for project implementation and clearly identify linkages or interdependence between projects. Demonstrate economic and technical feasibility on a programmatic level. Identify the current status of each element of the Plan, such as existing infrastructure, feasibility, pilot or demonstration project, design completed, etc. Include timelines for all active or planned projects and identify the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation.
- H. **Impacts and Benefits** – Include an evaluation of potential impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from Plan implementation. Identify the advantages of the regional plan; including a discussion of the added benefits of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts. Identify which objectives necessitate a regional solution. Identify interregional benefits and impacts. Describe the impacts and benefits to disadvantaged communities. Include an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources, such as air or energy. Include documentation of completion or a plan for completion of CEQA/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and other environmental documentation and permitting, as applicable.
- I. **Technical Analysis and Plan Performance** – Include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in selection of water management strategies. Include a discussion of measures that will be used to evaluate project/plan performance, monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operation and plan implementation based on performance data collected.
- J. **Data Management** – Include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public, and include discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs. Assess the state of existing monitoring efforts, both for water supply and water quality, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed. If the Plan includes a water quality component, include a discussion of the integration of data into the SWRCB’s Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment program. [Appendix E](#) provides a listing of web links for accessing information on the SWRCB’s statewide data management strategies.
- K. **Financing** – Identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for Plan implementation. Discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects.
- L. **Statewide Priorities** – Identify statewide or State agency priorities that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the Plan or specific projects. Describe how the projects were developed pursuant to Statewide Priorities ([Section II.E](#)).
- M. **Relation to Local Planning** – Discuss how the identified actions, projects, or studies relate to planning documents established by local agencies. Demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers. Discuss how these local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two planning documents. Discuss the linkages between the IRWM Plan and general plans, habitat conservation plans, urban water management plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, and other water or land use planning documents.
- N. **Stakeholder Involvement** – Identify stakeholders included in developing the Plan. Identify how stakeholders were identified, how they participate in planning and implementation efforts and how they can influence decisions made regarding water management. Include documentation of stakeholder involvement such as inclusion of signatory status or letters of support from non-agency stakeholders, i.e. those who have not “adopted” the Plan. Include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the Plan. Discuss watershed or other partnerships developed during the planning process. Discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process. Identify possible obstacles to Plan implementation.
- O. **Coordination** – Identify state or federal agencies involved with strategies, actions, and projects. Identify areas where a state agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication, cooperation, or implementation of Plan components or processes, or where state or federal regulatory decisions are required for implementation.

For Implementation Grant applications to be considered for funding, the proposed or adopted Plans must meet all of the following minimum standards:

- ◆ [Adoption](#) by January 1, 2007, by all appropriate agencies and organizations;
- ◆ Participation of at least three agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water;
- ◆ A map of the region showing the local agencies in the area covered by the Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects;
- ◆ Contains of one or more regional objectives;
- ◆ Documentation that the water management elements considered include: water supply reliability, groundwater management, water quality protection and improvement, water recycling, water conservation, storm water capture and management, flood management, recreation and public access, ecosystem restoration, and environmental and habitat protection and improvement (CWC §§ 79562.5 and 79564);
- ◆ Integrates two or more water management strategies (see Table A-1 – Water Management Strategies); and
- ◆ Project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs.

APPENDIX B PLANNING GRANT

B.1 PROPOSAL CONTENTS – PLANNING GRANTS

This section describes the required elements to be included in a Planning Grant application. Specific instructions for application submittal and required content of acceptable proposals will be contained in the PSP. In all cases, the prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program Guidelines, with specific emphasis on the IRWM Plan standards ([Appendix A](#)), the evaluation criteria ([Section B.2](#)), and the PSP prior to submitting an application to ensure that the submittal will meet grant program requirements. For the purposes of this Section, “Plan” refers to either an IRWM Plan or an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan, unless the plan type is specifically referenced.

Applicants must submit a complete proposal by the deadline specified in the PSP. Each application must include Items A through O below to be deemed complete.

A. Project Title, Administrative Information, Summary and Resolution

This section must include the project title and agency or organization responsible for the proposal and its relationship to a regional planning agency or group. The applicant must provide administrative information that will include, but is not limited to the following information: agency/organization name; address; authorized representative name and phone number; project locations include longitude and latitude; basin description; and legislative representatives within the region. The Project Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

The applicant will also need to provide a resolution adopted by the applicant’s governing body designating an authorized representative to file an application and enter into an agreement for a grant.

B. Applicant Authority

The applicant must certify that it is a [public agency](#) or [non-profit organization](#). The legal authorities of the applicant and partners to conduct the work and to receive and spend state funds must be provided. The applicant must also describe any legal agreements among partners that ensure project performance and tracking of funds. **If DWR and the SWRCB determine the applicant does not have the authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State, the applicant will not be eligible for funding and the application will not be reviewed.**

C. Work Plan

The applicant must submit a complete, detailed work plan consisting of a description of tasks, a project budget, and a schedule for development of the Plan. The work plan must include a description of deliverables as well as a description of the final product proposed by the applicant. The project budget must identify local match consistent with the minimum local match requirements [Section II.C](#).

D. Regional Agency Description

Describe the agency or group responsible for development of the proposed Plan. The description should include the relationship of agencies or organizations to water management; how these entities envision adopting a final plan; and the entities to adopt the final plan. This group should include at least one representative from a disadvantaged community if disadvantaged community status is claimed in the proposal.

E. Description of Region

Describe the region that the proposed Plan will cover. Explain why the region encompassed is an appropriate area for water management. Provide a map and narrative description showing internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region. Describe the quality and quantity of

water resources of the region; important ecological processes and environmental resources; social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values; and economic conditions and important trends within the region. The applicant must describe the benefits of planning for this region and managing water within the region as compared to individual local efforts. If applicable, disadvantaged communities within the region should be noted on the figure/map.

F. Objectives

Describe the planning objectives for the proposed Plan to address the major water related issues and conflicts in the region. If the planning objectives have not been established, describe a process for determining planning objectives. The planning objectives should relate to the water issues of the region as discussed in the Description of Region, Section B.1.E.

G. Integration of Water Management Strategies

Describe the water management strategies that will be considered in the Plan and how they were determined. If the water management strategies to be considered have not been determined, describe the process that will be used to determine the range of strategies to address planning objectives. In either case, describe how the selected strategies are seen to work together to benefit water management. Discuss the linkages between and integration of the Plan and general plans, habitat conservation plans, urban water management plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, and other water or land use planning documents.

For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans, describe how the proposed Plan's components are consistent with the Critical Coastal Areas Program "Watershed Action Plan Outline." [Appendix E](#) provides a link to that outline.

H. Implementation

Discuss activities through which the Plan will be implemented and an institutional structure to ensure implementation of the Plan. If the project implementation component is not developed, describe the process that will be used in the development of the proposed Plan to identify specific implementable projects and prioritize such projects. Include a proposed implementation schedule or a process to develop one that looks beyond the adoption of the proposed Plan.

I. Impacts and Benefits

Describe the potential impacts and benefits of plan development and implementation. If the potential impacts and benefits have not been identified, describe a process for determining impacts and benefits of plan development and implementation. Impacts should be inclusive of the region and adjacent areas. Include in your description a plan for, or progress on, CEQA/NEPA compliance as it is applicable to development and implementation of the proposed Plan.

J. Data and Technical Analysis

Describe the types and amount of data that are available to support development of the Plan. Describe studies that have been conducted or will be conducted to support the planning process. The applicant should identify data gaps where additional monitoring or studies are needed.

K. Data Management

Discuss how data used in plan development will be disseminated to the stakeholders, agencies, and the public. The proposal must also discuss how data management efforts will support statewide data needs and how proposed water quality monitoring will allow integration of data into the SWRCB's statewide data management efforts. Specific reporting requirements and formats will be included in the PSPs. Web links to additional information of the SWRCB's statewide data management effort is provided in [Appendix E](#).

L. Stakeholder Involvement

Discuss how the proposed Plan development incorporates stakeholder involvement via existing or planned activities or tasks. Describe specific outreach activities and the target groups. The proposal should include a list of proposed stakeholders, how stakeholders were/will be identified, how they participate in the planning and implementation, and how they influence decisions made regarding water management. Discuss a process by which additional stakeholders may be identified and included during plan development or implementation. If any water related agencies or organizations within the plan boundaries are not included in the planning process, discuss why they were omitted.

M. Disadvantaged Communities

If applicable, the application should discuss how [disadvantaged communities](#) will be involved in the planning process. The application should address whether the region covered by the Plan encompasses disadvantaged communities. The application should document the water supply and water quality needs of such disadvantaged communities and how these needs will be considered in the planning effort.

N. Relation to Local Planning

The proposal must identify existing local planning documents that will be considered during development of the Plan, such as general plans, urban water management plans, habitat conservation plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, etc. Discuss how these local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents.

O. Agency Coordination

Discuss how the proposed plan will provide for coordination and cooperation with relevant local, State, and federal agencies, including efforts to coordinate with State and federal regulatory agencies as necessary for project implementation. In particular, describe how the proposed plan will facilitate coordination of water management with local land-use planning decision-makers.

B.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA – FOR PLANNING GRANTS

The criteria for Planning Grant proposals will be used evaluate the extent to which the IRWM standards will be met. For Planning Grant proposals the criteria will apply to the proposed planning work as well as to any work conducted on development of a plan to date. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “low” and 5 being “high.” The PSP will contain a more detailed description of scoring methods and procedures.

TABLE B-1 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PLANNING GRANTS

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<p>Work Plan <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal.</i> Does the proposal include a work plan with specific tasks, schedule, and budget for developing the proposed Plan? Is the work plan clear and implementable? Were deliverables identified? Are the work plan, budget, and schedule consistent with respect to tasks and sequence of tasks? Is the budget reasonable, logical, and supported with other documentation, assumptions, or estimates? Does the budget demonstrate a minimum local match of 50% of the total project costs? Is the schedule reasonable, based on an assumed contract award date, and show a definite end date? Will the IRWM Plan be adopted by January 2007?</p>	5	3

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<p>Description of Region <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region.</i> Is the region for the proposed Plan well defined? Was the basis for the region's boundaries presented? Are the water and resource management agencies within the region and neighboring entities to this region identified and included? Are local agencies' service areas included in the proposed Plan? Are the water related features, including impaired water bodies, of this region identified? Were sensitive habitats, including areas of special biological significance, identified? Are the major water-related conflicts and issues defined? Are the benefits of defining this region and managing water within it versus individual local efforts described in the application? Did the application include a figure/map of the region showing the agencies involved in the proposed Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects?</p>	5	1
<p>Planning Objectives <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives.</i> Are the regional planning objectives explained? How were these objectives determined? Will the proposed Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region? Does the Plan include statewide objectives?</p>	5	2
<p>Integration <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated.</i> Does the proposed Plan include multiple water management strategies or a technical process for determining water management strategies to be considered in the Plan? Does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of how the selected water management strategies work together to produce some synergistic effect in water management? Do the water management strategies to be considered meet the IRWM standards? Were the linkages between land use policies and plans and their relationship to water issued discussed? Does the proposed Plan integrate with other existing plans and projects? <i>For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans, will the Plan's components be consistent with the Critical Coastal Areas Program "Watershed Action Plan Outline"?</i></p>	5	2
<p>Implementation <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation.</i> Does the proposed Plan development have a general schedule for implementation of the Plan beyond adoption or a process to determine such a schedule? Does the proposed Plan include or will it develop an institutional structure to ensure project implementation? Is there a mechanism or process in the proposed Plan that allows for monitoring the performance of the plan implementation and changes to the Plan?</p>	5	2
<p>Impacts and Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan.</i> Will the proposed Plan include an analysis of potential impacts within the region and adjacent areas? Does the proposed Plan include an analysis of potential benefits of developing the Plan? Does the proposed Plan assess the impact and benefits to water supply and water quality? Does the proposed Plan include a process for completion of environmental documentation and permitting?</p>	5	2

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<p>Data and Technical Analysis <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal.</i> Will available data adequately support the proposed planning? Have technical studies been conducted, or are they planned, that will support the proposed planning? If applicable, were appropriate management measures and practices, responsibilities, and schedule included?</p>	5	1
<p>Data Management <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures.</i> Does the proposed Plan include a process for gathering and managing data from development and implementation of the Plan and disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public? Does the proposed Plan demonstrate how the data management will support statewide data needs?</p>	5	1
<p>Stakeholder Involvement <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns.</i> Does the proposed Plan include processes for stakeholder involvement in plan development and implementation of the Plan, including how they may influence decisions? Are water related agencies and organizations within the region included in the planning process? Are all appropriate stakeholders included? Is there a process to identify and include additional stakeholders?</p>	5	1
<p>Disadvantaged Communities <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns.</i> Does the region include one or more disadvantaged community(ies)? Does the Plan document water supply and water quality needs of disadvantaged communities? Will implementation of the Plan and associated projects benefit disadvantaged communities? Are representative of disadvantaged communities included in the planning process?</p>	5	1
<p>Relation to Local Planning <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plans relationship to local planning efforts.</i> Does the application identify existing local planning documents that will form a foundation for the regional plan? Does the application indicate how local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents?</p>	5	1
<p>Agency Coordination <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues.</i> Does the proposed Plan provide for coordination and cooperation with the relevant local, State, and federal agencies in plan components? Does the Plan facilitate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? Does the Plan facilitate coordination with State and federal regulatory agencies?</p>	5	1
<p>Total Possible Points</p>	90	

APPENDIX C IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

C.1 PROPOSAL CONTENTS – FOR IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP I

This section describes the required elements to be included in the Implementation Grant, Step 1 application. Specifics of submittal instructions and required contents of acceptable proposals will be contained in the PSP. In all cases, the prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program guidelines with specific emphasis on the IRWM Plan standards ([Appendix A](#)) as well as the evaluation criteria ([Section C.2](#)) and the PSP prior to submitting their applications to ensure that their submittals meet grant program requirements.

Applicants must submit a complete application by the deadline specified in the PSP. Each application must include the following Items A through L below to be deemed complete. For Step 1 submittals for IRWM Implementation Grants, the evaluation criteria below will apply to: 1) finalized, adopted IRWM Plans; 2) functionally equivalent planning documents; 3) IRWM Plans that are under development; and 4) the project(s) proposed for funding.

For Step 1 the application must be submitted by regional agencies or regional water management groups, of which at least one member is an eligible grant recipient, i.e., a public agency or non-profit organization, and must include projects from one or more of the water management elements listed in [Section III.C](#).

A. Project Title, Administrative Information, Summary and Resolution

This section must include the proposal title, the agency or organization responsible for the proposal, and the applicant's relationship to the regional agency or regional water management group. The applicant must provide administrative information that will include, but is not limited to the following: agency/organization name; address; authorized representative name and phone number; project location including longitude and latitude; basin description, and legislative representatives within the region. The Project Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

The applicant will also need to provide a resolution adopted by its governing body designating an authorized representative to file an application and enter into an agreement for a grant.

B. Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption

The applicant must provide a copy of an adopted IRWM Plan, including a signed signature page of all agencies and organizations approving the IRWM Plan or other documentation that the IRWM Plan has been adopted. The applicant may submit alternative planning documents that are functionally equivalent to an IRWM Plan and describe this equivalency in detail. The applicant must also provide a discussion on how the alternate documents function as an IRWM Plan. If such functionally equivalent planning documents are utilized, the applicant must provide a copy of each such document and also provide documentation that each individual planning document has been adopted. An applicant may submit an IRWM Plan that is under development and will be adopted by January 1, 2007. Such plans will be evaluated using the same criteria as existing adopted plans.

C. Demonstrated Consistency with IRWM Standards

The applicant must describe how, the IRWM Plan meets the IRWM Standards listed in [Appendix A](#). This discussion must address each of the IRWM Standards and how its IRWM Plan meets the specification of each individual standard. To be eligible for funding, the applicant must document that its IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards for an IRWM Plan, [Appendix A](#).

If functionally equivalent planning documents are provided, the applicant must also provide a discussion on how the alternate documents meet the IRWM Plan Standards contained in Appendix A. If the Plan has not been adopted, the applicant must demonstrate that it is engaged in the development of an IRWM Plan, how the proposal fits into achieving the IRWM Plan objective, and provide copy of the draft the draft IRWM Plan and a schedule detailing the step to be completed and showing that the IRWM Plan will be adopted before January 1, 2007.

D. Description of Proposed Projects

The application must include a detailed description of the proposed implementation project(s) for which funding is requested. The proposed implementation project(s) must implement one or more of the eligible water management element listed in [Section III.C](#). The goals and objectives of the project(s) must be identified. Also provide a discussion on how the project(s) is consistent with the IRWM Plan. For proposed IRWM Plans, the applicant must also discuss how the proposed project(s) fit into achieving the IRWM Plan objectives.

The rationale for the proposed project(s) activities and facilities should be sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan. Where requested funding is for a component of a larger project, the proposal must describe all of the components of the larger project and identify which elements of the larger project are the subject of the grant funding request. The description must identify how the integration of the project components provides multiple benefits and identify project linkages that are critical to the success of the project(s) proposed for funding. The project description should match the cost estimate and schedule provided in Sections C.1.E and C.1.F

E. Cost Estimate

The proposal must provide an estimate of costs for each project contained in the proposal. The estimate must provide summary detail of land acquisition costs, planning and design costs, construction costs, and local match by each project or task for which funding is requested. More detailed cost information will be required in the Step 2 proposal. The costs estimate should match the project description and schedule provided in Sections C.1.D and C.1.F.

The sources for the local match must be identified. The applicant must demonstrate a commitment of a minimum local match of 10 percent of the total project costs. The requirement for local match may be waived or reduced for applicants that demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities.

F. Schedule

The applicant must provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing of implementation of the proposed project(s). The schedule should match the project description and cost estimate described in Sections C.1.D and C.1.E

G. Project Prioritization

The applicant must provide a prioritization of the project(s) within the IRWM Plan and within the proposal itself. The prioritization of the proposed project(s) activities and facilities should be sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship to implementation of the IRWM Plan.

H. Need

Relative to the need for the project(s), the applicant must describe the current water management systems and the expected long-term regional water management needs. Describe how the proposed project(s) will help meet those needs. Discuss the local and regional economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts conditions relative to the need for the proposed project(s). Discuss critical impacts that will occur if the project(s) is not implemented.

I. Disadvantaged Communities

Applicants requesting waiver or reduction of the local match requirements for [disadvantaged communities](#) must demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will be designed to provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities. The PSP will provide information on the procedures to be used for applicants to receive credit for providing benefits to disadvantaged communities.

J. Program Preferences

Discuss the proposed project elements that meet the Program Preferences identified in [Section II.D](#).

K. Statewide Priorities

Discuss the proposed project elements that meet the Statewide Objectives identified in [Section II.E](#).

L. Environmental Compliance

The project proposal must include a plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements. The plan should address all the potential environmental and economic impacts of the proposed project(s), including mitigation, as required under the CEQA and, if applicable, NEPA. The plan should also address compliance with local, county, State, and federal permitting requirements. [Appendix E](#) provides web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook.

C.2. EVALUATION CRITERIA – FOR THE IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 1

The criteria for IRWM Implementation Grant, Step 1 proposals will be used to evaluate the extent to which the applicant's proposal addresses the standards for IRWM Plans and how well the proposed project(s) meet regional needs. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "low" and 5 being "high." The criteria will apply to both the IRWM Plan and the project proposal. The PSP will contain the description of scoring methods and procedures.

TABLE C-1 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Adequacy of IRWM Plan		
<p>Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards <i>This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards:</i></p> <p>Was the IRWM Plan adopted by all appropriate agencies or will it be adopted by January 1, 2007? Does the Regional Agency or Group include at least three local public agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water? Was a map of the region showing the member agencies involved in the IRWM Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects included? Does the IRWM Plan include one or more regional objectives? Does the IRWM Plan document that the following minimum water management elements were considered: water supply reliability, groundwater management, water quality protection and improvement, water recycling, water conservation, storm water capture and management, flood management, recreation and access, ecosystem restoration and environmental and habitat protection and improvement? Does the IRWM Plan include the integration of at least two or more water management strategies or elements? Does the IRWM Plan include a project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs?</p>	Pass/Fail	
<p>Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards <i>In addition to the pass/fail evaluation above, the IRWM Plan will be evaluated against the entire set of IRWM standards.</i></p>		
<p>Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption Is the IRWM Plan adopted? Did the applicant submit documentation of formal adoption of the IRWM Plan or functional equivalent, or a schedule for adoption by January 1, 2007?</p>	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<p>Description of the Region <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described the IRWM Plan region, and whether the defined region is appropriate to the planning and implementation.</i> Was a map or maps, with accompanying descriptive narrative, showing the region encompassed by the IRWM Plan provided? Did the map/maps include appropriate internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region? Did the IRWM Plan describe the current and future water resources of the region? Did the applicant explain why the region is an appropriate area for regional water management? Were important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries discussed? Did the IRWM Plan discuss the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values; and describe economic conditions and important trends within the region?</p>	5	1
<p>Objectives <i>In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described appropriate IRWM Plan objectives.</i> Did the IRWM Plan identify regional planning objectives and the manner in which they were determined? Does the IRWM Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region covered by the Plan?</p>	5	1
<p>Water Management Strategies & Integration <i>In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on how well the IRWM Plan integrates as wide range of water management strategies.</i> Did the IRWM Plan describe the range of water management strategies that were considered to meet the objectives of the plan? Was a brief discussion of why a water management strategy was not applicable provided? Did the applicant discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives? Was a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies provided?</p>	5	1
<p>Priorities and Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan has adequately described the priorities of the region.</i> Was a presentation of regional priorities for implementation provided? Did the applicant identify short-term and long-term implementation priorities? Does the IRWM Plan discuss how: 1) decision-making will be responsive to regional changes; 2) responses to implementation of projects will be assessed; and 3) project sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses?</p>	5	1
<p>Implementation <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is implementable and implementation steps are well documented.</i> Does the IRWM Plan identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented? Did the IRWM Plan include timelines for active or planned projects? Did the applicant identify the entities responsible for project implementation? Were the linkages or interdependence between projects clearly identified? Was the economic and technical feasibility of projects demonstrated on a programmatic level? Was the current status of each element of the IRWM Plan presented? Was the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation discussed?</p>	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<p>Impacts & Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan clearly and fully describes the impacts and regional benefits of the Plan.</i> Does the IRWM Plan include an evaluation of potential negative impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from its implementation? Does the IRWM Plan include the advantages of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts? Does the IRWM Plan identify which objectives necessitate a regional solution? If applicable, does the IRWM Plan must identify interregional benefits and impacts? If applicable, did the applicant describe the benefits to disadvantaged communities? Was an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources provided? Did the applicant document completion or a plan for completion of CEQA/NEPA and other environmental documentation and permitting requirements?</p>	5	1
<p>Technical Analysis and Plan Performance <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is based on sound scientific and technical analysis and includes measures to assess performance.</i> Did the IRWM Plan include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in selection of water management strategies? Did the IRWM Plan discuss measures that will be used to evaluate project/plan performance; monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operation and plan implementation based on performance data collected?</p>	5	1
<p>Data Management <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan provides for management of data generated during plan development and implementation</i> Does the IRWM Plan include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public? Was a discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs provided? Did the IRWM Plan assess the state of existing monitoring efforts, both for water supply and water quality? Were data gaps identified? If applicable, did the IRWM Plan discuss the integration of data into the SWRCB's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment Programs?</p>	5	1
<p>Financing <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of projects.</i> Did the IRWM Plan identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for plan implementation? Does the IRWM Plan discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects?</p>	5	1
<p>Relation to Local Planning <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is well coordinated with local.</i> Did the IRWM Plan discuss how the identified actions, projects, or studies relate to planning documents established by local agencies? Does the IRWM Plan demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? Did the IRWM Plan discuss how local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents? Did the IRWM Plan discuss the linkages between the IRWM Plan and general plans, habitat conservation plans, urban water management plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, and other water or land use planning documents?</p>	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<p>Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination <i>Scoring will be based on whether development and implementation of the IRWM Plan includes stakeholder involvement through a collaborative regional process</i> Does the IRWM Plan identify stakeholders and the process used for inclusion of stakeholders in development of the plan? Does the process include a discussion of how: Stakeholders are identified, They participate in planning and implementation efforts, and They can influence decisions made regarding water management? Did the IRWM Plan document public outreach activities specific to individual stakeholder groups? Does the IRWM Plan include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during plan implementation? Are partnerships developed during the planning process discussed? Did the application discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process? Were any possible obstacles to IRWM Plan implementation identified? Was coordination with State or federal agencies discussed? Did the IRWM Plan identify areas where a State agency or agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of plan components or processes, or identify any state or federal regulatory actions required for implementation?</p>	5	1
Adequacy of Proposed Project(s)		
<p>Local Match <i>This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that it will meet the minimum local match standard.</i> Did the applicant propose a minimum Local Match that meets the minimum standards as shown in Section II.C?</p>	Pass/Fail	
<p>Description of Proposed Project(s) <i>Scoring will be based on how well the proposed project(s) serve to implement the IRWM Plan and achieve its objectives.</i> Did the application include a detailed description of the proposed implementation project(s) for which funding is requested? Do the proposed implementation project(s) consist of one or more of the eligible water management element (Section III.C)? Were the goals and objectives of the project(s) identified? Did the application discuss how the project(s) is consistent with the IRWM Plan? For proposed IRWM Plans, did the applicant also discuss how the proposed project(s) fit into achieving the IRWM Plan objectives? Was the rationale for the proposed project(s) activities and facilities sufficient to understand the relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan? For projects affecting water quality, does the application include: A description of the water body that the project(s) addresses and corresponding beneficial uses; A discussion of water quality problems the project(s) addresses including specific pollutants or parameters and the importance of addressing the specific water quality problem relative to the overall health of the region; A description of how the proposed project(s) is consistent with the applicable RWQCB Watershed Management Initiative Chapter, plans, and policies; and For non-point source pollution control projects, a description of which Management Measures?</p>	5	3
<p>Cost Estimate <i>Scoring will be based on whether the costs of the proposed project(s) are well presented and reasonable</i> Did the applicant provide an estimate of costs for each project contained in the proposal? Did the estimate provide summary detail of land acquisition costs, planning and design costs, construction costs, and local match by each project or task for which funding is requested?</p>	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<p>Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on the reasonableness of the proposed schedule.</i> Did the applicant provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing of the implementation of the proposed project(s)? Did the applicant demonstrate that related elements of the IRWM Plan, not proposed for funding, will be completed on schedule?</p>	5	1
<p>Project Prioritization <i>Scoring will be based on the extent to which the proposed project(s) implement the highest priorities of the region.</i> Did the application provide a prioritization of the project(s) within the region and within the proposal itself? Was the prioritization of the proposed project(s) activities and facilities sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan?</p>	5	2
<p>Need <i>Scoring will be based on the degree of need for the proposed project(s).</i> Did the applicant describe the current water management systems and the expected long-term regional water management needs? Did the applicant describe how the proposed project(s) will help meet that need? Were local and regional economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts conditions discussed relative to the need for the proposed project(s)? Are there critical negative impacts that would result from not completing the projects?</p>	5	2
<p>Disadvantaged Communities <i>Scoring will be based on the degree that disadvantaged communities will benefit from the proposed project(s).</i> Will the proposed project provide(s) direct benefits to one or more disadvantaged community?</p>	5	2
<p>Program Preferences <i>Scoring will be based on the extent that the proposed project(s) meet the specified Program Preferences.</i> Did the application discuss the proposed project elements that will meet the IRWM Grant Program preferences identified in Section II.D?</p>	5	1
Total Possible Points	120	

C.3 PROPOSAL CONTENTS – FOR IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS, STEP 2

The following text describes elements of a proposal for IRWM Implementation Grant Step 2. Specifics of submittal instructions and required contents of acceptable proposals will be contained in the PSP. In all cases, the prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program guidelines with specific emphasis on the evaluation criteria ([Section C.4](#)) and the PSP prior to submitting their proposals to ensure that their submittals meet grant program requirements.

Applicants must submit a complete proposal to DWR and the SWRCB by the deadline specified in the PSP. Each proposal must include sections that discuss Items A through L below to be deemed complete. For Step 2 submittals the criteria will apply only to the proposed project(s) for which funds are being requested.

A. Project Title, Administrative Information, Summary, and Resolution

This section must include the project title(s) and the agency or organization responsible for the project and its relationship to the IRWM regional planning agency or group. The applicant must provide administrative information will include, but is not limited to the following: agency/organization name; address; authorized representative name and phone number; project location including longitude and latitude; basin description; and legislative representatives within the region. The Project Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

The applicant must also provide a resolution adopted by its governing body designating an authorized representative to file an application and enter into an agreement for a grant.

B. Applicant Authority

The applicant must certify that it is a [public agency](#) or [non-profit organization](#). The applicant must also provide the legal authorities of the applicant and partners to conduct the work and to receive and spend state funds. The applicant must also describe any legal agreements among partners that ensure project performance and tracking of funds. **If DWR and the SWRCB determine that the applicant does not have the authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State, the applicant will not be eligible for funding and application will not be reviewed.**

C. Work Plan

All proposals must include a detailed description of the proposed implementation project(s) for which funding will be requested. The goals and objectives of the proposed project(s) must be identified. Where requested funding is for a component of a larger project, this section must describe all of the components of the larger project and identify which elements of the project the IRWM grant is proposed to fund. Linkages to any other projects that must be completed first or that are essential to obtain the full benefits of the proposed project must be discussed.

Based on the goals and objectives of the proposal, a description of all work that will be necessary to complete the project or suite of projects must be included in this section. The work plan should include a description of work items to be performed under each task and project deliverables for assessing progress and accomplishments. The description should include as much detail as possible, and explain all tasks necessary to complete the project and how the applicant will coordinate with the granting agency.

A vicinity map must be provided to show the general location of the project or suite of projects. A more detailed map showing at a minimum the location of activities or facilities of the project, the groundwater basins and surface water bodies that will be affected; the natural resources that will be affected; and proposed monitoring locations must also be provided. Disadvantaged communities within the region should be identified on the detailed map.

The tasks shown on the work plan must agree with the tasks shown on the budget and schedule discussed in Sections C.3.D and C.3.E. Additionally, the application must describe how the proposal is consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan and clearly identify any changes to either the IRWM Plan or the proposal that was evaluated in Step 1. The PSP will include detailed instructions on the requested work plan components.

D. Budget

The proposal must provide a detailed estimate of project costs and funding sources. The estimate must at a minimum include the following for each individual project within the proposal:

- ◆ Land acquisition costs, planning and design costs, environmental documentation costs, construction costs shown by project task, or phase, and the contingency amount for the project;
- ◆ All sources of the local match;
- ◆ The amount of local match applied to each task; and
- ◆ Tasks that are completely supported by local match.

The detailed budget should be commensurate with the design stage that is being submitted and be broken out by tasks used in the work plan. The detailed budget should clearly identify the amount of any contingencies amounts and provide an explanation for the rationale used to determine the percentage contingency used in the estimate. The tasks shown on the budget must agree with the tasks shown on the work plan and schedule discussed in Sections C.3.C and C.3.E. Additionally, the application must clearly identify any significant differences between the Step 2 budget and the cost estimate provided in Step 1. The PSP will include detailed instructions on the requested budget components.

E. Schedule

Provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing of the proposed project or suite of projects. The schedule should show the start and end dates and project milestones. The schedule should illustrate any dependencies or predecessors by showing links between tasks. At a minimum, the following tasks must be included on the schedule:

- ◆ Development of financing;
- ◆ Development of environmental documentation;
- ◆ Project design and bid solicitation process;
- ◆ Acquisition of rights of way, if required;
- ◆ Acquisition of all necessary permits;
- ◆ Construction start and end dates with significant milestones included;
- ◆ Implementation of any environmental mitigation or enhancement efforts; and
- ◆ Post construction project performance monitoring periods.

The tasks shown on the schedule must agree with the tasks shown on the work plan and budget discussed in Sections C.3.C and C.3.D. Additionally, the application must clearly identify and significant differences between the Step 2 schedule and the schedule provided in Step 1, especially noting any project delays. The PSP will include detailed instructions on the requested schedule components.

F. Local Match

Applicants must identify minimum [local match](#) of at least 10 percent for the total project costs. The requirement for local match may be waived or reduced for those applicants that demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities.

For scoring purposes, local match in excess of 10% will be scored on a sliding scale with the maximum point awards for local matches equal to or greater than 60% of the total project costs. For projects that will provide benefits directly to one or more disadvantaged community, the local match score will be determined on a sliding scale adjusted based on the percentage of costs of the project elements that benefit disadvantaged communities relative the total project cost.

G. Disadvantaged Communities

Applicant requesting waiver or reduction of the local match requirements for [disadvantaged communities](#) must demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will be designed to provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities. The PSP will provide information on the procedures to be used for applicants to receive credit for providing benefits to disadvantaged communities.

H. Economic Analysis

Applicants will be required to provide an economic analysis of their proposed project(s) showing that the project(s) is economically feasible, including an enumeration of the costs of construction and operation of the proposed project, as well as the economic benefits related to water supply and water quality derived from the proposed project that accrue to those parties directly involved in the project. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements of any economic analysis.

I. Other Expected Project Benefits

Describe the other expected project benefits that will accrue to habitat restoration, ecosystem improvements, fish and wildlife enhancement, in-stream flows, water quality improvement, or other environmental benefits; flood control; recreation and access; energy use and cost; or other benefits not included in Section C.3.H. When

economic values cannot be assigned to an expected project benefit, the benefit should be quantified in physical terms. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements for documenting the other expected project benefits. Describe Statewide Priorities ([Section II.E](#)) that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the projects.

J. Scientific and Technical Adequacy

The applicant will be required to demonstrate the scientific and technical adequacy of the project or suite of projects. Such demonstration may include:

- ◆ Submittal of a copy(ies) of all reports and studies prepared for the proposed project that form the basis for or include information pertaining to this application;
- ◆ A brief summary of the types of information in each reference;
- ◆ If feasibility and pilot studies have not been completed for the proposed implementation project(s), an explanation what has been done to determine the project's feasibility; and
- ◆ Provide copies of the most complete design plans and specifications for the proposed project(s).

K. Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

Describe the performance measures that will be used to quantify and verify project performance. Provide a discussion of the monitoring system to be used to verify project performance with respect to the project benefits or objectives identified in the proposal. Indicate where the data will be collected and the types of analyses to be used. Include a discussion of how monitoring data will be used to measure the performance in meeting the overall goals and objectives of the IRWM Plan.

Monitoring and performance assessment are integral parts of project implementation, and all capital and ongoing costs must be included in the budget and economic analysis as appropriate.

L. Program Preferences

Describe the project elements meet the IRWM Grant Program Preferences detailed in Section II.D. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements for documenting Program Preferences.

C.4. EVALUATION CRITERIA – FOR THE IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 2

The criteria for Implementation Grant, Step 2 proposals will evaluate the extent to which the applicant's proposal meets each individual criterion. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "low" and 5 being "high." The PSP will contain the description of the scoring methods and procedures and additional detail on the evaluation criteria.

TABLE C-2 - EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 2

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Work Plan <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal.</i>	5	3
Budget <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the proposal.</i>	5	1
Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the proposal.</i>	5	1
Local Match <i>The criterion will be scored on a sliding scale based upon the percent of local match to total project costs.</i>	5	1
Economic Analysis <i>Scoring will be based on the economic benefits of the project(s) relative to costs. The scores will be assigned relative to all other proposals.</i>	5	2
Environmental and Other Multiple Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on the certainty that the project will provide the benefits claimed as well as the magnitude and breadth of the environmental and other multiple benefits.</i>	5	2
Scientific and Technical Adequacy <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal is scientifically and technically adequate.</i>	5	3
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented an adequate monitoring and assessment program that included performance measures.</i>	5	1
Program Preferences <i>Scoring will be based on whether the proposed project meets one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program preferences.</i>	5	1
Total Possible Points		75

APPENDIX D DEFINITIONS

Adopted IRWM Plan – means an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan that has been formally accepted by the governing body(ies) of the entity(ies) that participated in the development of the Plan and have responsibility for implementation of the Plan as evidenced by a resolution or other written documentation.

Applicant – means an entity that files an application for funding under the provisions of Proposition 50 with the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Resources Control Board.

Areas of Special Biological Significance – means areas designated by the SWRCB as requiring protection of species or biological communities to the extent that alteration of natural water quality is undesirable. All areas of special biological significance are State Water Quality Protection Areas as defined in Public Resources Code § 36700(f). There are 34 designated areas of special biological significance, which are listed in the California Ocean Plan.

Bay-Delta – is as defined in Section 79006 of the California Water Code.

CALFED Bay-Delta Program – refers to the collaborative State-federal program to address ecosystem restoration and water management issues in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system. The CALFED Program is being implemented under the guidance of the California Bay-Delta Authority, by a consortium of State and federal agencies with management and regulatory responsibilities in the Bay and Delta, pursuant to the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Record of Decision (August 28, 2000).

California Bay-Delta Authority – refers to the State agency that was established by legislation enacted in 2002 (SB 1653, Costa) to oversee implementation of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Critical Coastal Areas Program – means the innovative program to foster collaboration among local stakeholders and government agencies, to better coordinate resources and focus efforts on coastal-zone watershed areas in critical need of protection from polluted runoff.

Disadvantaged Community – means a municipality, including, but not limited to a city, town or county, or a reasonably isolated and divisible segment of a larger municipality, that has an average median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income.

Eligible Costs – means costs that may be funded under Proposition 50. Eligible costs include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement acquisition, legal fees, preparation of the application to establish eligibility, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, and project construction. Costs that are not eligible for grant funding include, but are not limited to:

- a. Costs, other than those noted above, incurred prior to applying for or receiving a grant;
- b. Operation and maintenance costs;
- c. Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project;
- d. Establishing a reserve fund;
- e. Purchase of water supplies;
- f. Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs;
- g. Support of existing agency requirements and mandates;

- h. Purchase of land in excess of the minimum required acreage necessary to operate as an integral part of the project, as set forth and detailed by engineering and feasibility studies, or land purchased prior to granting agency's commitment letter to award a contract to an agency; and
- i. Payment of principal or interest of existing indebtedness or any interest payments unless the debt is incurred after issuance of a letter of commitment of funds by the granting agency, the granting agency agrees in writing to the eligibility of the costs for reimbursement before the debt is incurred, and the purposes for which the debt

Evaluation Criteria – means the set of requirements used to choose a project for a given program or for funding; the specifications or criteria used for selecting or choosing a project based on available funding.

Funding Cycle – is used to denote the entire grant selection and approval process from initial project solicitation to grant award.

Granting Agency – means the agency that is funding an individual project, with which a grant recipient has a grant agreement, and will be either DWR or the SWRCB.

Impaired Water Body – mean surface waters identified by the RWQCB as impaired because water quality objectives are not being achieved or where the designated beneficial uses are not fully protected after application of technology-based controls. A list of impaired water bodies is compiled by the SWRCB pursuant to § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

Local Match – means funds made available by the grant recipient from non-state sources, which may include, but are not limited to donated services from non-state sources. For a State agency local match may include state funds and services.

Management Measures – means economically achievable measures for the control of the addition of pollutants from existing and new categories and classes of nonpoint sources of pollution, which reflect the greatest degrees of pollutant reduction achievable through the application of the best available nonpoint pollution control practices, technologies, processes, siting criteria, operating methods, or alternatives.

Non-point Source Pollution – mean a diffuse discharge of pollutants throughout the natural environment.

Non-point Source Pollution Plan – means the plan, developed in collaboration with the RWQCBs and the California Coastal Commission, adopted by the SWRCB to meet the requirements of § 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 and § 319 of the Clean Water Act. The plan addresses California's non-point source pollutions by assess the State's non-point source pollution problems/causes and implementing management programs.

Non-profit Organization – means any California corporation organized under Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the federal Internal Revenue Code.

Northern California – means those counties not listed below as "Southern California".

Project Proponent – means the entity responsible for implementation on an individual project funded with grant funds. A project proponent must be either a public agency or a nonprofit organization, as defined in these guidelines.

Project Selection Panel – means a group of agency representatives at the supervisory or management level assembled to review and consider project evaluates and scores developed by the Technical Reviewers and to make initial funding recommendations.

Proposition 50 – is the "Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002", as set for in division 26.5 of the California Water Code (commencing at Section 79500).

Public Agency – means a city; county; city and county; district, the state or any agency or department thereof, and applicants eligible for technical assistance under Section 319 of the federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1329) or for grants under Section 320 of the federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1330), which includes State, interstate, and regional water pollution control agencies; State coastal zone management agencies; interstate agencies; other public and non-profit private agencies; institutions; organizations; and individuals.

Region – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a geographic area. The physical area, efficacy, and benefits derived from a regional plan are impacted by many variables (physical, political, environmental, societal, and economic) therefore no physical size or dimension will be prescribed for this term. Rather an IRWM Plan and associated applicant must define its region and explain why the geographic area encompassed is appropriate and yields effective, synergistic, efficient water management planning.

Regional Agency – means public agencies with statutory authority over land-use or water management whose jurisdiction encompasses an area greater than the jurisdictional boundaries of any one local public agency.

Regional Water Management Group – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a group in which, at a minimum, includes three or more local public agencies, at least two of which have statutory authority over water supply, participate by means of a joint powers agreement memorandum of understanding, or other written agreement, as appropriate, that is approved by the governing bodies of those local public agencies (CWC § 10537). Other public agencies or community-based organizations may also be members of a Regional Water Management Group.

Southern California – means the Counties of San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, Orange, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

Stakeholder – is an individual, group, coalition, agency or others who are involved in, affected by, or have an interest in the implementation of a specific program or project.

Technical Reviewers – means a group of agency representatives assembled to evaluate the technical competence of a proposed project and the feasibility of the project being successful if implemented.

303d List – means the list, developed pursuant to § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, of water body segments within the State that do not meet water quality standards as defined by established Total Maximum Daily Loads.

Total Maximum Daily Load – means the maximum quantity of a particular water pollutant that can be discharged into a water body without violating a water quality standard.

APPENDIX E

USEFUL WEB LINKS

RWQCB Program Priorities

Region 1:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb1/programs/watermanageinit.html
Region 2:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/2004grants.doc
Region 3:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3/WMI/WMI 2002, Final Document, Revised 1-22-02.pdf
Region 4:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/html/fundings.html
Region 5:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/available_documents/watershed/R5_WMI_chapter.html
Region 6:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb6/WMI/WMI_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb7/wmi.html
Region 8:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/html/wmi.html
Region 9:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/programs/units/grants/wmchT15trgtproj103.PDF http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/programs/wmc.html

Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans)

Region 1:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb1/programs/basinplan/basin.html
Region 2:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/basinplan.htm
Region 3:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3/BasinPlan/Index.htm
Region 4:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/html/meetings/tmdl/Basin_plan/basin_plan.html
Region 5:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/available_documents/index.html#anchor616381
Region 6:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb6/BPlan/BPlan_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb7/documents/RB7Plan.pdf
Region 8:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/html/basin_plan.html
Region 9:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/programs/basinplan.html

SWRCB Program Priorities:

303d List:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/docs/2002_cwa_section_303d_list_wqls_020403.pdf
TMDL List:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/docs/tmdl/list.doc
Non-point Source Program:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/nps/protecting.html
Non-point Source 5 Year Plan:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/nps/5yrplan.html
Critical Coastal Areas Program:	http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-nps.html
California's Ocean Plan:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/plnspols/oplans/index.html

SWRCB Statewide Data Management Programs

Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/swamp/index.html
Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/gama/

DWR

Home Page	http://www.water.ca.gov/
Division of Planning & Local Assistance	http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov
Northern District	http://www.dpla.water.ca.gov/nd
Central District	http://www.dpla.water.ca.gov/cd
San Joaquin District	http://www.sjd.water.ca.gov/
Southern District	http://www.dpla.water.ca.gov/sd
Grants & Loans	http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/
Water Use and Planning	http://www.water.ca.gov/nav.cfm?topic=Water_Use_and_Planning
Bulletin 118 California's Groundwater	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov/bulletin118
Groundwater Information Center	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov

CEQA Information

Environmental Information	http://ceres.ca.gov/index.html
California State Clearinghouse Handbook	http://www.opr.ca.gov/planning/PDFs/sch_handbook.pdf

CALFED Bay-Delta Program

http://calwater.ca.gov/
http://calwater.ca.gov/Archives/GeneralArchive/RecordOfDecision2000.shtml

California Watershed Portal

http://cwp.casil.ucdavis.edu/

Watershed Program CALFED 10 Year Finance Plan Background and Issues

Background

The Watershed Program includes ongoing technical assistance, science, and administrative functions, but the largest share of program funding is provided for financial assistance for watershed assessments and local projects. During the program's initial four years of activity, funding has averaged about \$27 million per year (ranging from a low of \$14 million to a high of \$42 million). Roughly 75% of the funding has been provided by State funds (bonds and General Funds) and 25% provided by grant matching through local, federal, and water user sources. This amount does not include the costs of watershed protection and restoration activities carried out by other public and private organizations, especially local government entities, independent of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Issues

Funding Targets: The estimated funding target is \$283 million over 10 years, based on a target of \$25 million per year plus adjustments for inflation. Water Users have questioned what activities more specifically will be funded in order to better understand the basis for the \$25 million per year target.

Federal Funding: The Finance Options Report includes federal funding for each of the allocation examples (one half of the public share, or 30-45% of total program needs). If Federal funding is sought for the Watershed Program, should this funding be sought from existing programs or from new appropriations specifically for the CALFED Program?

Existing Funding: Federal agencies indicated that the feasibility of earmarking money already in their budgets for the CALFED Watershed program may be problematic due to competing nationwide interests and decreased budgets. However, existing federal programs and funds that also accomplish the goals and objectives of the CALFED Watershed program could be counted as the federal share. For example, EPA has funding for a non point source pollution program, some of which meets the goals of the Watershed program. Crediting existing spending by agencies against their cost share would require that the spending clearly address one or more goals of watershed program and that achieving that goal is included in the watershed cost estimate. There must be an overlap of goals and spending.

New Funding: Federal agencies have indicated that a more feasible and viable source of federal funding would be to seek out new funding and use a directed line item for the program. If funding is sought from new appropriations, what federal agency or agencies should be the source?

Water User Funding: The Finance Options Report includes water user contributions that range from 0-20%. To what extent should water users share in the costs of the Watershed Program? Are fees an appropriate source of funding? What about a regional or project-specific fee rather than a water user fee? State and Federal agencies have concerns about the difficulty of identifying beneficiaries. Water users question the need for a water user fee for the Watershed program because they question whether the benefits for water users justify a fee. According to the Planning and Conservation League's recent report "Draft Investment Strategy for California Water", Watershed management approach is a cost-effective means to efficiently achieve multiple benefits. To that end, the public, local residents, and downstream water users are all beneficiaries that should invest in watershed management.

Local Funding: The Finance Options Report includes funding by local governments and project-specific partners for each of the allocation examples, ranging from 10-20% (note that partners can include local water users that voluntarily participate in the cost of specific projects).

- To what extent should local governments and project-specific partners share in the costs of the Watershed Program?
- How should this share be covered?
- Should it be solely from cost-sharing for grants?
- Do specific projects justify directed actions?

State and Federal agencies indicated that a cost-share arrangement where a local match requirement may be appropriate. Some assistance provided to local governments and grassroots organization may be necessary to help them meet their share. Watershed Program priority projects may be funded through directed grants where beneficiaries are designated and given the option of participating with the State and Federal agencies by cost-sharing.

Watershed Program
10-Year Funding Targets & Unmet Needs
(\$ in millions)
August 10, 2004

Program Year	Funding Targets		Available Fund Sources					Total Available	Unmet Needs
	2005 Dollars ¹	Adjusted for Inflation	State			Federal	Local		
			GF	Prop 50 PY approp. ²	Prop 50 ³	Approps.			
Years 5-9	\$125.0	\$132.1	\$0.5	\$7.7	\$38.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$46.5	\$85.6
Year 5	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$0.1	\$7.7	\$12.2			\$20.0	\$5.0
Year 6	\$25.0	\$25.7	\$0.1		\$10.2			\$10.3	\$15.4
Year 7	\$25.0	\$26.4	\$0.1		\$10.5			\$10.6	\$15.8
Year 8	\$25.0	\$27.1	\$0.1		\$5.4			\$5.5	\$21.6
Year 9	\$25.0	\$27.9	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$27.8
Years 10-14	\$125.0	\$151.5	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.5	\$151.0
Year 10	\$25.0	\$28.6	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$28.5
Year 11	\$25.0	\$29.4	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$29.3
Year 12	\$25.0	\$30.3	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$30.2
Year 13	\$25.0	\$31.1	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$31.0
Year 14	\$25.0	\$32.0	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$31.9
Total, Years 5-14	\$250.0	\$283.5	\$1.0	\$7.7	\$38.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$47.0	\$236.6

NOTES:

1. Assumes the midpoint between the low and high levels of funding as defined in the Draft Finance Options Report. Future costs (beginning with Year 6) are adjusted for inflation.

2. Prop 50 Prior Year appropriation includes Prop 50 funding that was appropriated prior to Year 5 but not spent or allocated to projects, and therefore available for future years.

3. \$38.25 million remaining from Prop 50 for Year 5 and beyond. Actual timing of bond approval and issuance may differ.

Watershed Program CALFED 10 Year Finance Plan Background and Issues

Background

The Watershed Program includes ongoing technical assistance, science, and administrative functions, but the largest share of program funding is provided for financial assistance for watershed assessments and local projects. During the program's initial four years of activity, funding has averaged about \$27 million per year (ranging from a low of \$14 million to a high of \$42 million). Roughly 75% of the funding has been provided by State funds (bonds and General Funds) and 25% provided by grant matching through local, federal, and water user sources. This amount does not include the costs of watershed protection and restoration activities carried out by other public and private organizations, especially local government entities, independent of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Issues

Funding Targets: The estimated funding target is \$283 million over 10 years, based on a target of \$25 million per year plus adjustments for inflation. Water Users have questioned what activities more specifically will be funded in order to better understand the basis for the \$25 million per year target.

Federal Funding: The Finance Options Report includes federal funding for each of the allocation examples (one half of the public share, or 30-45% of total program needs). If Federal funding is sought for the Watershed Program, should this funding be sought from existing programs or from new appropriations specifically for the CALFED Program?

Existing Funding: Federal agencies indicated that the feasibility of earmarking money already in their budgets for the CALFED Watershed program may be problematic due to competing nationwide interests and decreased budgets. However, existing federal programs and funds that also accomplish the goals and objectives of the CALFED Watershed program could be counted as the federal share. For example, EPA has funding for a non point source pollution program, some of which meets the goals of the Watershed program. Crediting existing spending by agencies against their cost share would require that the spending clearly address one or more goals of watershed program and that achieving that goal is included in the watershed cost estimate. There must be an overlap of goals and spending.

New Funding: Federal agencies have indicated that a more feasible and viable source of federal funding would be to seek out new funding and use a directed line item for the program. If funding is sought from new appropriations, what federal agency or agencies should be the source?

Water User Funding: The Finance Options Report includes water user contributions that range from 0-20%. To what extent should water users share in the costs of the Watershed Program? Are fees an appropriate source of funding? What about a regional or project-specific fee rather than a water user fee? State and Federal agencies have concerns about the difficulty of identifying beneficiaries. Water users question the need for a water user fee for the Watershed program because they question whether the benefits for water users justify a fee. According to the Planning and Conservation League's recent report "Draft Investment Strategy for California Water", Watershed management approach is a cost-effective means to efficiently achieve multiple benefits. To that end, the public, local residents, and downstream water users are all beneficiaries that should invest in watershed management.

Local Funding: The Finance Options Report includes funding by local governments and project-specific partners for each of the allocation examples, ranging from 10-20% (note that partners can include local water users that voluntarily participate in the cost of specific projects).

- To what extent should local governments and project-specific partners share in the costs of the Watershed Program?
- How should this share be covered?
- Should it be solely from cost-sharing for grants?
- Do specific projects justify directed actions?

State and Federal agencies indicated that a cost-share arrangement where a local match requirement may be appropriate. Some assistance provided to local governments and grassroots organization may be necessary to help them meet their share. Watershed Program priority projects may be funded through directed grants where beneficiaries are designated and given the option of participating with the State and Federal agencies by cost-sharing.

**Watershed Program
10-Year Funding Targets & Unmet Needs**
(\$ in millions)
August 10, 2004

Program Year	Funding Targets		Available Fund Sources					Total Available	Unmet Needs
	2005 Dollars ¹	Adjusted for Inflation	State			Federal	Local		
			GF	Prop 50 PY approp. ²	Prop 50 ³	Approps.			
Years 5-9	\$125.0	\$132.1	\$0.5	\$7.7	\$38.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$46.5	\$85.6
Year 5	\$25.0	\$25.0	\$0.1	\$7.7	\$12.2			\$20.0	\$5.0
Year 6	\$25.0	\$25.7	\$0.1		\$10.2			\$10.3	\$15.4
Year 7	\$25.0	\$26.4	\$0.1		\$10.5			\$10.6	\$15.8
Year 8	\$25.0	\$27.1	\$0.1		\$5.4			\$5.5	\$21.6
Year 9	\$25.0	\$27.9	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$27.8
Years 10-14	\$125.0	\$151.5	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.5	\$151.0
Year 10	\$25.0	\$28.6	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$28.5
Year 11	\$25.0	\$29.4	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$29.3
Year 12	\$25.0	\$30.3	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$30.2
Year 13	\$25.0	\$31.1	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$31.0
Year 14	\$25.0	\$32.0	\$0.1					\$0.1	\$31.9
Total, Years 5-14	\$250.0	\$283.5	\$1.0	\$7.7	\$38.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$47.0	\$236.6

NOTES:

1. Assumes the midpoint between the low and high levels of funding as defined in the Draft Finance Options Report. Future costs (beginning with Year 6) are adjusted for inflation.

2. Prop 50 Prior Year appropriation includes Prop 50 funding that was appropriated prior to Year 5 but not spent or allocated to projects, and therefore available for future years.

3. \$38.25 million remaining from Prop 50 for Year 5 and beyond. Actual timing of bond approval and issuance may differ.

CALFED Bay-Delta Program 10-Year Finance Plan Proposed Schedule, Process and Work Products

Based on direction from the California Bay-Delta Authority (Authority) and the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) and consistent with advice given by the Finance Plan Independent Review Panel, Authority staff has started to process of working with stakeholders and agencies to develop a 10-year finance plan for the CALFED Program. The proposed Finance Plan, which will be submitted to the Authority in October 2004 will be: (1) based on likely program actions over the next 10 years; (2) informed by agency and stakeholder views and information; and, (3) capable of delivering credible and durable financing mechanisms. The proposed strategy for engaging this issue over the next four months is detailed below. This approach is intended to be responsive to previous stakeholder and agency comments, but has not yet been vetted with stakeholders.

Key Meetings, Schedule and Expected Work Products

Below is a synopsis of the key meetings, schedule and expected work products for the next several months. The steps called out below are intended to satisfy two needs: (1) ensure stakeholder and agency representatives are partners in the development of a 10-year plan; and (2) ensure a proposed plan is developed in time to meet fall 2004 budgetary deadlines.

Initial funding targets and unmet funding needs –Draft information will be prepared by Program Element and task including: proposed annual funding targets for a 10-year period, identification of available funding and remaining unmet needs, and preliminary finance strategies that describe the type of finance tools likely to support each Element. (Note: These documents are expected to evolve into the eventual 10-year finance plan.)

- ***June BDA Meeting*** -- Present summary of expected cost estimates, available funding and unmet needs
- ***July 8th BDPAC Meeting*** -- Present updated funding targets and available funding, describe process and schedule, and review preliminary finance strategies as presented at BDA in June.
- ***August 11th & 12th BDA Meeting*** -- Present revised funding targets, discuss preliminary finance strategies, review process and schedule, and highlight issues.
- ***August thru September*** -- Continue to refine the funding targets as part of the development of the Finance Plan.

Finance Plan – A 1-2 page description will be developed for each Program Element that lays out: likely activities and associated funding targets; current funding available; likely funding gaps, key issues and options for cost-sharing arrangements to cover the unmet funding needs.

- ***August thru September*** – Meet with agencies, stakeholders and public interests to identify funding issues and to the extent possible reach agreement on cost allocations.
- ***August 30th***– Public Finance meeting/workshop focused on cost allocation issues and funding targets for Program Elements.
- ***September 8-9 BDPAC Meeting*** -- Present revised funding targets, unmet needs, funding issues, and cost allocation options for 11 Program Elements. Discuss highlights and key issues. In those cases where there is agency and stakeholder support for a cost allocation approach, a single proposal rather than options will be presented.

- **September** -- Public Finance meeting/workshop focused on funding targets and cost allocations in preparation for October BDA meeting.
- **October 14th BDA Meeting** -- Present 10 Year Finance Plan. As necessary, discuss remaining gaps/issues.
- **October thru November** – As needed, continue discussion on funding targets and cost allocations if not resolved before the October BDA meeting.
- **November** - For any remaining issues not resolved at the Oct BDA meeting, a November BDA meeting will be held. Final submittal to the Dept of Finance will be no later than November 19th.

Stakeholder and Agency Involvement

Below is an outline of the proposed approach for ensuring the above work products are informed by extensive stakeholder and agency involvement, insights and information.

Public Workshops

- BDA staff convene public finance workshops to ensure there are cross-cutting discussions with interested stakeholders to review progress and consider Program-wide integration issues.
- Open attendance; materials posted in advance on web; email reminders to those who demonstrated interest in this topic over the past year
- Seek feedback on evolving Finance Plan; not striving for consensus at these meetings

Ad Hoc Involvement

Support and participate in work groups that are interested in discussing the material in greater detail to ensure stakeholder/agency understanding, refine stakeholder/agency input into BDA deliberations and foster a bottoms-up discussion. It is expected that these work groups can and should take on different formats. For example:

- Stakeholder-driven groups such as water user discussions
- Briefings and discussions with standing BDPAC Subcommittees
- BDA initiated discussions with groups such as environmental water caucus.
- BDA convened meetings with agency and stakeholders focused on specific program elements and issues.

Legislative Budget and Policy Committees

- Committees have expressed an interest in holding interim hearings on CALFED financing. If scheduled, the hearings are likely to be held in September.

August 9, 2004

- Meeting Notice -

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA AUTHORITY
10-Year Finance Plan Public Workshop
Monday, August 30, 2004
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor
Delta Room
Sacramento, California

Agenda¹

1:00 – 1:15	Welcome and Introductions
1:15 – 2:00	Background, Proposed Schedule, and Process
2:00 – 3:30	Discuss Draft 10-Year Finance Materials
3:30 – 4:00	Public Comments

-
- ◆ If you have any questions, please contact Yating Liang of the California Bay-Delta Authority, Policy and Finance, at (916) 445-5511.
 - ◆ If you need reasonable accommodation due to a disability, please contact Pauline Nevins at the California Bay-Delta Authority at (916) 445-5511 or TDD (800) 735-2929.

For more information, please visit our website at <http://calwater.ca.gov>

¹ Order of agenda items is subject to change.

❖ **Getting Started Garden Design Workshop**

Join us for a hands-on introduction to designing and building a green school garden from the ground up, including:

- ◆ basic layout and elements of school garden planning;
- ◆ how to obtain and use recycled building materials in your garden;
- ◆ preparing and caring for your soil naturally and strategies for water conservation

Cost: \$20.

When and Where:

(The following dates and locations are open to educators in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties Please indicate which workshop you would like to attend when you register)

August 28, 2004

9:00 am to 12:30 pm

Chabot Elementary School, Oakland

September 19, 2004

9:00 am to 12:30 pm

Lindsey Wildlife Museum, Walnut Creek

To register: Please send a non-refundable check of \$20.00 to The Watershed Project with the registration form below to:

The Watershed Project
GSGD Registration
1327 South 46th Street, Bldg. 155
Richmond, CA 94804

Please register me for
Getting Started Garden Design

Date/location: _____

Name: _____

Home Address: _____

City and Zip: _____

Home Phone: _____

E-mail (We will not share this information.):

School/Work: _____

Work Address: _____

City and Zip: _____

Work Phone: _____

Grades taught: _____

Does your school have a garden? _____

You may also register by contacting us in one of the following ways:

Phone: (510) 231-9430

Email: workshops@thewatershedproject.org

Fax: (510) 231-5703

**AWARD NOMINATIONS AND SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATIONS SOUGHT BY
THE CALIFORNIA WATER POLICY CONFERENCE**

The 14th annual California Water Policy Conference entitled, "California Dreaming: Time to Wake Up", will be held November 18 & 19, 2004 at the Wilshire Grand Hotel in Los Angeles. The planning committee is actively seeking award nominees and scholarship applicants for this event.

This year the planning committee seeks to recognize individuals, public and nonprofit agencies and companies that enliven and expand the California Dream by pursuing environmental justice while advancing innovation, breakthrough technologies, community and collaborative programs, and/or new ways of thinking about water in California. Deadline for nominations is Wednesday, September 15.

The scholarship application form for this conference is also available for download at the conference website. Anyone interested in attending the conference, but would not be able to attend without financial assistance is encouraged to apply. Last year 35 scholarships to the conference were awarded. The deadline for applying for a scholarship is Friday, September 17.

For more information on the conference program and to download forms, visit the conference website at www.cawaterpolicy.org or contact Debbi Dodson at ddodson@san.rr.com or at 858-272-9627.