

Agenda Item: 14B
Meeting Date: June 8, 2005

**CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES THAT IT PROCEED WITH THE
AWARD OF WATER USE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM GRANTS**

Summary: This resolution would recommend to the Department of Water Resources that it proceed with awarding Proposition 50 funds to the recommended water use efficiency projects.

Recommended Action: The Authority adopt the attached Resolution 05-06-02, recommending to the Department of Water Resources that it proceed with its 2005 Proposition 50 water use efficiency Proposition 50 grant recommended projects.

Background:

In November 2002, California voters passed Proposition 50, the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002. The source of funding for the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) 2004 Water Use Efficiency (WUE) Proposal Solicitation is Water Code Chapter 7, Section 79550(g) of Proposition 50.

The Draft 2004 Water Use Efficiency Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) was submitted to the California Bay-Delta Authority (Authority) on December 11, 2003 (see Authority Resolution 03-12-04) and released for public review by DWR's, Office of Water Use Efficiency on December 12, 2003. The Draft PSP was made available on the DWR website for public review and to accept public comments. Three workshops were held on August 31, September 1 and September 2, 2004 in Southern and Northern California and the San Joaquin Valley, respectively, to explain the application process for the 2004 WUE Final PSP.

The PSP was further modified and, after receiving public comments, the Final PSP was released on November 15, 2004, upon recommendation from the Authority (Resolution 04-10-05), with a deadline for submitting applications of January 11, 2005. DWR held three workshops to explain the Final PSP to interested parties in Southern and Northern California and the San Joaquin Valley in December 2004.

The PSP solicited proposals from local public agencies for implementation or research and development projects. Applicants for implementation projects are required to provide a cost share. Entities involved with water management activities including cities, counties, joint power authorities, public water districts, universities and colleges, tribes, non-profit organizations, watershed management groups, State and Federal agencies are eligible to apply. Private entities are eligible for implementation projects funds only.

Section A (Implementation Projects) funding is available to projects from Bay-Delta watersheds, State Water Project watersheds and any watershed that can exchange water with the above watersheds. Section B (Research and Development) funding is available to projects throughout the State.

Locally not-cost effective projects are eligible for State cost share. Section A applicants are required to qualitatively describe the Bay-Delta and local benefits. Section A applicants are also required to quantify monetary local benefits and are also encouraged, but not required, to quantify the physical Bay-Delta and local benefits.

Also, locally cost-effective projects are eligible for State funding only if the project, in addition to Bay-Delta system benefit, would provide broad transferable benefits, overcome implementation barriers, or accelerate implementation. Furthermore, these projects are only eligible for State cost share of up to 25 percent of project cost through this grant. DWR will only provide up to approximately 10 percent of the Section A grants to these types of projects. Regulatory, contract, and law-required projects are not eligible for State funding if the projects are currently required to comply.

Cost share is based on the balance of Bay-Delta system and local benefits. Projects with quantitative assessment of Bay-Delta system benefits will score higher.

Section B (Research and Development) applicants are required to qualitatively describe the Bay-Delta and local benefits and costs. While it is encouraged, no applicant cost share is required.

Proposals Review and Selection Process

DWR committed to a process that included an outreach to potential applicants and a project selection that was based on science, economic, and technical review involving experts as well as stakeholders.

The project review and selection process was initiated following the receipt of 168 eligible proposals by the submittal deadline. This process included the following:

- **Reviewer Orientation.**

An orientation meeting was scheduled for January 25, 2005 for science, economics, tribal, and technical reviewers. A group of nearly 50 qualified individuals drawn from CALFED agencies as well as environmental, urban, agricultural and environmental stakeholder groups actively involved in water use efficiency programs were selected by DWR staff for proposal review. The session provided reviewers an opportunity to hear from DWR staff on the review and scoring guidelines and process and their roles and responsibilities. DWR informed the reviewers of ground rules regarding review guidelines, confidentiality and non-conflict of interest. Reviewers were given a Non-Conflict of Interest Statement to read and sign. Any reviewer with potential conflict of interest for proposals as defined in the Statement was excused from reviewing proposals.

- **Science, Economic and Tribal Review.** Each proposal was reviewed initially by an economist, a scientist, and the Authority's Tribal Coordinator. These reviews are designed to generate detailed, project-by-project critiques. The Economic and Science Reviewers provided a score and written comments for each proposed project. The option of indicating where and why projects did not, in their view, merit funding. The review comments and scores were provided to both the Technical Review Panel (TRP) and the WUE Agency Team (WUE-AT) (described below) for their deliberation.
- **Technical Review.** Each proposal was reviewed by a three-member TRP. Five panels reviewed 62 agricultural water use efficiency proposals and 8 panels reviewed 106 urban water use efficiency proposals. Each panel member was asked to review and score 10 to 17 proposals individually. The TRPs were asked to use the Science and Economic scores and comments as guidance to help them to complete the Technical Review and score the proposals for ranking. Each reviewer also was asked to indicate those projects that merited a "do not fund" characterization if the proposal didn't get the minimum required score of 70. The TRP members submitted their draft scores to DWR on March 11, 2005.
- **Reviewers Meeting.** Economic, Science, and Technical Reviewers and Tribal Coordinator were asked to meet on March 15, 2005 for deliberation and developing final scores for submittal to DWR.

At the March 15 meeting, DWR facilitated discussions within TRPs and in some cases across panels. DWR provided the Science, Economic and Technical Review scores for all the proposals to all reviewers. The Science and Economic Reviewers were present to answer any questions. The Tribal Coordinator did not contribute any comments. The meeting allowed panel members to share information and perspectives on the various projects, as well as normalize scoring within a panel. Reviewers adjusted their scores during the meeting, if appropriate, for normalization and submitted a signed hard copy of final scores. DWR staff calculated the average score for each proposal from the three final scores. The average score determined proposal's rank.

- **WUE Agency Team Review.** The WUE Agency Team (WUE-AT) consisting of managers from DWR, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and California Bay-Delta Authority (Authority) met several times to develop the draft funding recommendation. Relying on the TRP ranking, the WUE-AT met on March 17, 18, 24, April 7, April 8, April 20 and May 10 and used the following process and criteria to guide its deliberations and developing draft recommendation(s):
 - Review "do not fund" recommendations by TRP, ineligible because of not complying with the Urban Water Management Planning Act requirements, and legally required projects. All proposals with scores of less than 70 were rejected

and 3 proposals that did not comply with the Urban Water Management Planning Act requirements were not considered for funding. DWR staff called these applicants to assure there was no error in UWMPs.

- Review and assign each proposal according to the most appropriate topic category Section A and Section B for both agriculture and urban and locally cost effective or not-locally cost effective categories. For example, one project was moved from Agriculture to Urban category.
- Review Disadvantaged Community (DC) claims. DWR staff used the 2002 census data to calculate the annual average medium household income (MHI) for the project service area. If the MHI was less than \$37,994 the applicant was considered DC and eligible for waiver of local cost share. Two Urban Implementation Section A applicants who claimed DC were found to be ineligible for waiver of applicant cost share
- Applicant's proposed local cost share was accepted whether or not the applicant was a Disadvantaged Community.
- Review locally cost effective claims. The locally cost effective projects were subject to 25 percent cost share and 10 percent of total Section A projects. Based on the Economic Review comments, WUE-AT determined that 2 of the 3 applicants who claimed locally cost effective were actually not locally cost effective based on the applicant's data presented in the proposal. One applicant was found to be locally cost effective. The unused funding allocated to locally cost effective projects was used to fund not-locally cost effective projects.
- Review funding levels. The WUE-AT reviewed and considered for funding the projects in each category of A and B based on their final scores. Cost share considered the balance of benefit between local and CALFED systems, direct or indirect benefit to CALFED, and quantitative or qualitative benefits. The WUE-AT recommended full requested funding for some projects, and reduced requested funding for other projects by reducing or eliminating specific tasks or by reducing project duration, or eliminating unacceptable project costs to achieve a mix of projects from different topics and geographic regions. If project tasks were eliminated or scaled down or duration was reduced, the applicant is required to complete the approved tasks or scaled down project and the applicant's proposed local cost share was reduced appropriately. Staff considered scalability of project and recommended tasks be reduced or eliminated without unproportionately affecting the Bay-Delta system benefits.
- WUE-AT used the final score as the criteria for selection of proposals for funding. However, among Ag's Section B subcategories (research and development, feasibility studies, pilot and demonstration projects, technical assistance, and education), 11 research proposals were eligible for funding. Most of them earned the top scores followed by other project subcategories.

WUE-AT recommends funding only the top 6 research proposals to allow other subcategories of projects to be funded. To fund proposals from other subcategories WUE-AT decided to bypass 5 research proposals as a result, in addition to 6 research proposals all the other eligible proposals in Section B were funded.

- The WUE-AT recommends DWR consider requiring:
 - Section A applicants monitor, document, and report project's quantitative or qualitative Bay-Delta benefits to ensure the Bay-Delta system benefits. DWR should utilize the contract process to ensure project's Bay-Delta system benefits as proposed by the applicant are achieved. Applicant's that are qualified under the DC for the waiver of local cost share, are required to monitor, document, and report how disadvantaged communities in their project service area were served by the project.
 - Section B applicants monitor, document, and report project's Bay-Delta system and Statewide potential benefits.
 - Applicants comply with their cost share requirement in all cases.
 - If applicant declines DWR's recommended funding, DWR has discretion to shift the remaining funding to other scaled down projects or not to use it in this cycle of funding.
- **Public Workshop.** DWR will hold a public workshop on June 1, 2005.
- **Appeal Period.** DWR will give PSP applicants 5 days to appeal funding decisions.

Draft Funding Recommendations

The agricultural proposals submitted to DWR for Sections A and B ranked by score are included as Tables 1 and 2. The Urban Section A and B proposals ranked by score are included as Tables 3 and 4. WUE-AT recommended funding for Agriculture Sections A and B are included as Tables 5 and 6. Urban recommended projects for Section A and B are included as Tables 7 and 8. Tables include application number, application's rank, requested funding, applicant's proposed cost share, DWR recommended funding, adjusted applicant cost share, and comments.

Funding highlights are as follows:

- Staff recommends awarding \$28,132,982 in grant funding to 72 projects. This represents \$11,237,791 in grant funding to 27 agricultural projects (10 in Section A and 17 in Section B) with an estimated \$5,237,165 in local match and \$16,895,191 in grant funding to 45 urban projects (22 in Section A and 23 in Section B), with an estimated \$16,976,957 in local match.

- Projects recommended for funding are located in a number of regions throughout the State. The overview of the geographic distribution is provided in Table 9 below.
- Projects recommended for funding are expected to generate significant quantified and non-quantified benefits. Quantified conservation benefits include water savings and instream flow benefits. Non-quantified benefits include improvements in water quality and local flexibility.

Draft Funding Recommendations is posted on DWR's website and staff will discuss the Draft Funding Recommendations, the award, and the contract process at a public workshop on June 1, 2005. Following Authority approval of Resolution 05-06-02, staff will request the DWR Director to approve the final funding decision in time to commit the funds by the June 10, 2005 deadline. This deadline is critical in order to commit and encumber the FY 04-05 funds for the approved projects.

Fiscal Information

Funding Source: Water Code Chapter 7, Section 79550 (g) of Proposition 50

Term: First Year: July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005

Total Funding:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Available Funding</i>	<i>Recommended Funding</i>
Agricultural Section A	\$12,671,249	\$ 7,013,849
Agricultural Section B	\$4,223,749	\$ 4,223,942
Urban Section A	\$12,671,249	\$12,671,249
Urban Section B	\$4,223,749	\$ 4,223,942
Totals	\$33,789,996	\$28,132,982

List of Attachments

- Attachment 1 – Agricultural Proposals (Section A)
- Attachment 2 – Agricultural Proposals (Section B)
- Attachment 3 – Urban Proposals (Section A)
- Attachment 4 – Urban Proposals (Section B)
- Attachment 5 – Funding Recommendations for Agricultural (Section A)
- Attachment 6 – Funding Recommendations for Agricultural (Section B)
- Attachment 7 – Funding Recommendations for Urban (Section A)
- Attachment 8 – Funding Recommendations for Urban (Section B)
- Attachment 9 – Proposition 50 Submitted and Funded Proposals by CALFED Region

Contacts

Tom Gohring, Deputy Director
Water Management and Regional Coordination
California Bay-Delta Authority

Phone: (916) 445-0936

Manucher Alemi
Office of Water Use Efficiency and Transfers
Department of Water Resources

Phone: (916) 651-9662

**Table 1 - Agricultural Proposals
Implementation Projects (Section A)**

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4129	1	Lost Hills Water District	7N Canal Lining	\$61,440	\$245,760	\$307,200
4130	2	Lost Hills Water District	4 Canal Lining	\$186,380	\$559,140	\$745,520
4163	3	Amador Water Agency	Canal to Main line	\$11,584,384	\$3,447,897	\$15,032,281
4008	4	Western Canal Water District	Replacement AND Automation of Elevation Control Structure 875	\$314,786	\$104,929	\$419,714
4038	5	Patterson Irrigation	Decision Support for Implementation and Evaluation of Agricultural Water Reuse Best Management Practices to Improve District-Level Irrigation Efficiency	\$647,000	\$1,053,000	\$1,700,000
4128	6	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Yolo County Flow Monitoring Network	\$327,144	\$272,000	\$599,144
4161	7	Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District	Canal Modernization	\$200,000	\$10,900,000	\$11,100,000
4168	8	Modesto Irrigation District	Ditch Pipeline Replacement	\$529,000	\$500,000	\$1,029,400
4013	9	Deer Creek Irrigation District	Deer Creek Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Program Near-Term System Improvements Project	\$0	\$1,230,218	\$1,230,218
4164	10	Stevinson Water District	Lateral Canal Piping	\$107,200	\$896,000	\$1,003,200
4090	11	South Feather Water and Power Agency	Canal Seepage Reduction Program	\$66,200	\$315,480	\$381,680
4116	12	Oakdale Irrigation District	Tailwater Recovery Program	\$1,377,750	\$731,500	\$2,109,250
The following proposals with Technical Score below 70 were not considered for funding.						
4147	13	Solano Irrigation District	Spill Measurement SCADA System	\$49,684	\$97,628	\$147,312
4097	14	Agricultural Water Management Council	Investigation to Develop Aids to Support Formulation and Evaluation of System Automation Applications	\$0	\$283,900	\$283,900
4035	15	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority	Tehama-Colusa Canal Automation Upgrade	\$619,705	\$929,558	\$1,549,263
4125	16	Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District	Irrigation Efficiency Improvement Program	\$1,052,079	\$1,052,079	\$2,104,158
4104	17	Georgetown Divide Utility District	Pipe Placement Structures 2 and 3	\$18,000	\$519,600	\$537,600
4148	18	Sutter Mutual Water Company	Tisdale Variable Frequency Drive and SCADA Demonstration Project	\$50,000	\$200,000	\$250,000

Table 2 Agricultural Proposals
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4032	1	University of California, Davis	Monitoring Wetting Front Advance Rate for Irrigation Management in Flood Irrigated Alfalfa Production Systems	\$0	\$296,015	\$296,015
4089	2	Regent of the University of California	Benefits and Costs of Deficit Irrigation in Alfalfa	\$0	\$981,984	\$981,984
4070	3	University of California, Davis	Water Use Efficiency in Sacramento Valley Rice Cultivation	\$58,508	\$681,294	\$739,802
4063	4	California State University, Monterey Bay - Foundation	Characterizing Spatiotemporal Variations in Canopy Density, Soils, Climate, and Vineyard Water Balances to Derive Spatially-Explicit Irrigation Strategies: Developing of the VITicultural Information System (VITIS)	\$0	\$399,701	\$399,701
4115	5	University of California, Davis	California Regulated Deficit Irrigation Program and Remote Sensing to Quantify Evapotranspiration	\$1,453,600	\$1,432,398	\$2,885,998
4015	6	United States Department of Agriculture	Improved Water Use Efficiency for Vegetables Grown in the San Joaquin Valley	\$372,150	\$372,150	\$744,300
4046	7	University of California, Davis	Ground-Based Remote Sensing Technology for Improved Agricultural Water Use Efficiency In Furrow Irrigation systems	\$0	\$462,340	\$462,340
4047	8	California Poly Technic State University Foundation	Technology Transfer to Irrigation Districts	\$450,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,800,000
4133	9	Glenn Colusa Irrigation District	Regulating Reservoir Feasibility	\$51,400	\$257,000	\$308,400
4102	10	University of California, Davis	Updating Crop Coefficients Information to Improve Crop Water Estimation	\$90,900	\$298,058	\$388,958
4158	11	San Joaquin County Resources Conservation District	Expanded Mobile Irrigation Lab and Irrigation Workshops in Spanish	\$974,100	\$865,000	\$1,839,100
4166	12	Anderson-cottonwood Irrigation District	Churn Creek Lateral Improvement	\$5,000	\$144,000	\$149,000
4021	13	Deer Creek Irrigation District	Deer Creek Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Program Long-Term Ssystem Improvements Feasibility Investigation	\$0	\$368,332	\$368,332
4022	14	Orland Unit Water Users Association	Orland Project Regulating Reservoir Feasibility Investigation	\$8,000	\$168,153	\$176,153
4170	15	Biggs-West Gridley Water District	Regional Water Measurement Program	\$73,500	\$270,459	\$343,959
4126	16	Reclamation District 108	Reclamation/BWMP Cooperative Water Measurement Study	\$20,500	\$458,500	\$479,000
4095	17	Yolo County Resource Conservation District	Yolo/Colusa Mobile Water Lab : Integrating Water Quality into On-Farm Irrigation Water Management Improvements	\$58,320	\$414,085	\$472,405

Table 2 Agricultural Proposals
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4096	18	Agricultural Water Management Council	Agricultural Water Management Informational Resources Directory	\$0	\$62,680	\$62,680
4101	19	University of California, Davis	California Irrigation Management Information System Phase II	\$0	\$3,587,859	\$3,587,859
4113	20	California State University, Fresno	Optimizing a Tailwater Return System to Improve Water Quality	\$102,219	\$1,027,779	\$1,129,998
4162	21	Reclamation District 108	Sacramento River BWMP Sub-Basni-Level Water ManagementProgram Demonstration Project	\$20,500	\$444,700	\$465,200
The following proposals with Technical Scores below 70 were not considered for funding.						
4016	22	Northeastern San Joaquin County	Eastern San Joaquin County: Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Feasibility Study	\$47,596	\$153,125	\$200,721
4159	23	Anderson-cottonwood Irrigation District	ACID Water Balance Study and Sprinkler Evaluation	\$100,000	\$200,000	\$300,000
4150	24	Water Education Foundation	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Booklet and Workshops	\$0	\$167,579	\$167,579
4027	25	California State University, Fresno Foundation	Monitoring and Assessment of Soil Salinity, Boron, and Selenium in Drainage-Impacted Lands	\$100,000	\$192,872	\$292,872
4165	26	Western Shasta RCD	Demonstration Irrigation Ditch System	\$76,056	\$1,351,011	\$1,427,069
4037	27	Tehama County Resource Conservation District	Northern Sacramento Valley Mobile Irrigation Lab	\$74,348	\$421,312	\$472,057
4117	28	University of California, Davis	Development of Strategies to Enhance Water Use Efficiency and quality Using field Studies and Modeling at the Regional Scale	\$291,313	\$1,421,980	\$1,713,293
4105	29	Agricultural Water Management Council	Investigation of Regulated Deficit Irrigation	\$0	\$90,675	\$90,675
4056	30	California State University, Fresno - Foundation	Development of a Standardized Procedure for Rapid Identification and Quantification of Canal Seepage	\$54,088	\$215,196	\$269,284
4001	31	United States Department of Agriculture	Improved Management Practices for Water Use Efficiency in Floriculture Production	\$0	\$182,000	\$182,000
4106	32	Agricultural Water Management council	Agricultural WUE Monitoring and Evaluation Project	\$0	\$334,820	\$334,820
4167	33	California State University, Fresno Foundation	Pilot Water Meter Flow Testing and Certification	\$569,030	\$395,978	\$965,008
4120	34	National Heritage Institute	Sierra Foothill Vineyard: Promoting Water Management Practices for Public Benefits	\$0	\$218,228	\$218,228
4098	35	Rancho California Water District	Water Conservation Sustainable Agricultural Management (SAM) Project	\$113,500	\$886,378	\$921,039
4060	36	West Hills Community College District	Remote Sensing Irrigation Schedule	\$885,132	\$1,036,688	\$1,921,800

Table 2 Agricultural Proposals
 Research and Development Projects (Section B)

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4138	37	Glenn County, Department of Agriculture	Utilizing GIS-Based Pesticide Permitting Application to Facilitate Advancing Water Management	\$0	\$610,115	\$610,115
4068	38	West Hills Community College District	Irrigation Model Demonstration Farm	\$350,040	\$379,678	\$729,118
4123	39	Placer County Water Agency	Heritage Center Water-Wise Irrigation Demonstration Site Project	\$489,800	\$458,600	\$948,400
4023	40	California Avocado Commission	Water Use Efficiency Using ET Controllers: Research and Development of Irrigation Management Database System	\$264,000	\$888,918	\$1,152,918
4093	41	California State University, Chico Research Foundation	Development of Water Conservation Curriculum	\$0	\$186,218	\$186,218
4092	42	Water Education Foundation	Project Wet (Agricultural Focus)	\$0	\$469,704	\$469,704
4024	43	North West Kern Resource Conservation district	On-Farm Irrigation System Evaluations	\$87,500	\$50,000	\$137,500

**Table 3 Urban Proposals
Implementation Projects (Section A)**

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4014	1	Contra Costa Water District	High Efficiency Toilet and Urinal Replacement Program	\$647,446	\$647,446	\$1,314,892
4110	2	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	Multi-Family UFL Toilet Direct - Install Program	\$2,436,659	\$1,710,000	\$4,146,659
4131	3	Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC)	Industrial Process Water Use Reduction Program	\$414,208	\$404,801	\$819,009
4172	4	Los Angeles, City of	Cooling Tower Conductivity Controller Replacement Program	\$675,000	\$350,000	\$1,025,000
4139	5	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Rebate Program for Cooling Tower Conductivity Controllers	\$3,780,187	\$2,183,036	\$5,963,223
4134	6	Los Angeles, City of	Los Angeles City Park Irrigation Efficiency Program	\$778,970	\$362,000	\$1,140,970
4156	7	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Urban Water Agency One-Stop Rebate Program	\$4,328,080	\$3,573,322	\$7,901,402
4173	8	West Sacramento, City of	Parks Irrigation Retrofit	\$0	\$324,551	\$324,551
4091	9	El Dorado Irrigation District	EID CII/Multi-Family Landscape Sub-Metering and ET Controller Installation Project	\$84,201	\$83,098	\$167,299
4025	10	Sacramento, City of	Park Irrigation Infrastructure Improvements	\$200,000	\$1,053,661	\$1,253,661
4081	11	San Benito County Water District	Water Softener Rebate Program	\$305,560	\$300,000	\$605,560
4029	12	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Residential High Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$6,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$11,000,000
4033	13	Pittsburg, City of	Innovative Irrigation Saving Our Delta "I2SOD"	\$277,984	\$409,487	\$687,472
4071	14	Port Hueneme, City of	Citywide Meter Retrofit and System Audit Program	\$2,789,093	\$1,360,800	\$4,149,893
4005	15	Cathedral City, City of	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$54,450	\$36,900	\$91,350
4073	16	Newhall County Water District (NCWD)	Residential ET Controller Rebate Program(No UWMP)	\$149,459	\$71,874	\$221,330
4064	17	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	California Friendly Communities	\$547,725	\$1,500,000	\$2,047,725
4142	18	Los Angeles, City of	Large Landscape "Smart Irrigation" Program	\$374,840	\$367,500	\$742,340
4067	19	Metropolitan Water district of Southern California	High-Efficiency Toilet Rebate Program	\$4,200,000	\$5,000,000	\$9,200,000
4031	20	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	Residential Water Use Audits Program	\$627,103	\$773,279	\$1,400,382

**Table 3 Urban Proposals
Implementation Projects (Section A)**

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4039	21	Richgrove Community Services District	Richgrove Water Meter Retrofit Program	\$0	\$119,683	\$119,683
4080	22	West Basin Municipal Water District	West Basin Municipal Water District Restroom Retrofit Project	\$889,100	\$884,500	\$1,773,600
4127	23	Electric and Gas Industries Association (EGIA)	Regional Resource - Efficient Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$8,143,560	\$5,742,675	\$13,886,235
4042	24	Los Angeles County Waterworks Districts	Commercial, Industrial, Institutional Water Use Audits and Dedicated Landscape Meter Installation Program	\$245,484	\$329,776	\$575,260
4069	25	Friars Village Homeowners' Association	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$64,220	\$46,870	\$111,090
The following proposals with Technical Scores below 70 were not considered for funding.						
4043	26	West Basin Municipal Water District	West Basin Municipal Water district Landscape Irrigation Mangement Project	\$358,050	\$358,050	\$716,000.00
4082	27	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Water Conservation in Santa Clara County Schools	\$666,746	\$479,438	\$1,146,184.00
4045	28	Benecia, city of	Large Landscape ET Controller system Project	\$8,109	\$33,000	\$41,295.00
4074	29	Lake Arrowhead Community Services District	Autmatic Meter System Project	\$431,325	\$431,325	\$862,650.00
4169	30	Sacramento Suburban Water District	Installation of Meters and Metered Rates for Single-Family Residencesa	\$2,691,600	\$980,000	\$3,671,600.00
4041	31	Western Municipal Water District	BRAC Cost Reduction: Metering and Urban Retrofit	\$13,200	\$471,343	\$484,543.00
4135	32	Calaveras County Water District	West Point/Bummerville Proposition 50 Water Use Efficiency Project	\$0	\$2,291,000	\$2,291,000.00
4012	33	Lodi, City of	Commercial Industrial Water Meter Project	\$146,698	\$147,422	\$294,120.00
4009	34	Lake County Special Districts	Residential Plumbing Retrofit	\$11,000	\$1,245,000	\$1,256,000.00
4076	35	Lake Arrowhead Community Services District	Evapotranspiration (ET) Controller Irrigation Technology Project	\$57,198	\$57,198	\$114,395.00
4011	36	Needles, City of	Residential ULFT Replacement	\$0	\$495,316	\$495,316.00
4030	37	Los Angeles County Waterworks Districts	Residential Ultra Low Flush Toilet/High Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Program	\$167,547	\$196,685	\$364,232.00
4019	38	Maxwell Public Utility District	2005 Water Meter Replacement Project	\$0	\$515,922	\$515,922.00
4124	39	Tracy, City of	Tracy Automated Water Accounting Project	\$447,110	\$2,234,936	\$2,682,046.00
4050	40	Beverly Hills, City of	Enhanced Rebates for CII Water Saving Devices - Zero consumption Urinals	\$36,000	\$267,000	\$303,000.00

**Table 3 Urban Proposals
Implementation Projects (Section A)**

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4044	41	Calistoga, City of	Commercial/Transient Ultra-low Flow Toilet Replacement and Residential Ultra-Low Flow Toilet Replacement Project	\$0	\$413,352	\$413,352.00
4149	42	Beverly Hills, City of	"Smart" Irrigation Management System Upgrade	\$292,783	\$281,301	\$574,084.63
4084	43	Elk Grove Water Service	Tariff Area 1 Meter Retrofit	\$8,193,750	\$8,193,750	\$16,387,500.00
4103	44	Yucaipa Valley Water District	Summerwind Conservation Demonstration Project	\$143,390	\$1,100,610	\$1,244,000.00
4140	45	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Turf Buy Back Program	\$1,084,790	\$764,790	\$1,849,581.00
4007	46	Cucamonga Valley Water District	Landscape Rebate Program	\$0	\$110,200	\$110,200.00

Table 4 Urban Proposals
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4109	1	California Urban Water Conservation Council	California WaterStar Initiative: Water Efficiency Product Rating and Labeling	\$350,000	\$700,000	\$1,050,000
4086	2	Alameda Point Collaborative	Water Efficient Landscaping	\$0	\$792,000	\$792,000
4054	3	Irvine Ranch Water District	Statewide Study of Water Use Efficiency	\$235,000	\$761,668	\$996,668
4132	4	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Urban Water Efficiency Technical Assistance Program	\$603,584	\$1,911,349	\$2,514,933
4112	5	South Yuba river Citizens League	"The Great Water Mystery" School Assemblies and School Water Audit	\$161,380	\$155,150	\$316,530
4017	6	Irvine Ranch Water District	Rotary Nozzle Retrofit Study	\$60,166	\$71,819	\$131,985
4085	7	Alameda Point Collaborative	Ploughshares Demonstration Garden	\$0	\$193,460	\$193,460
4136	8	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Smart From the Start	\$65,583	\$314,250	\$379,833
4174	9	University of California Regents - Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory	Determining Waste of Water and Energy in Residential Hot Water Distribution Systems	\$935,000	\$935,000	\$1,870,000
4114	10	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Online/Web-Based Irrigation Efficiency Training	\$155,000	\$155,000	\$310,000
4083	11	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Water Efficiency Demonstration Garden	\$240,865	\$730,000	\$970,865
4020	12	Central Basin Municipal Water District	Commercial Landscape Wireless Valve End Use Management Research Project	\$414,667	\$492,155	\$906,822
4036	13	Clovis Botanical Garden Committee	Clovis Botanical Garden Expansion	\$904,147	\$1,773,079	\$2,677,226
4141	14	East Bay Municipal Utility District	New Business Plan Review Program For Water Use Efficiency	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000
4118	15	Efficiency Partnership	Flex Your Power at the Tap	\$23,543,726	\$3,450,000	\$26,995,231
4049	16	The Regents of the University of California, division of Agriculture and Natural Resources /UCCE San Bernardino County	Conserving Water and Improving Plant Health in Large Southern California Landscapes	\$119,622	\$390,026	\$509,648
4157	17	Pacific Institutet for Studies in Devolpment, Environment, and Security	Development of a Water Use Efficiency Implementation Cost and Cost Effectiveness Model	\$0	\$142,385	\$142,385
4111	18	California State University, Fresno Foundation	Irrigation System Audits by Students	\$0	\$318,783	\$318,783
4143	19	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Multi-Family Submeter Pilot Study	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000
4119	20	Stockton East Water Dist	Children Museum WUE	\$6,000	\$54,000	\$60,000
4057	21	San Diego, city of	Recirculating Hot Water Systems: Residential Survey and Feasibility Study	\$0	\$30,100	\$30,100
4034	22	University of California, Davis	Improvement in CIMIS California Statewide Potential Evapotransporation Maps	\$0	\$400,770	\$400,770
4151	23	Water Education Foundation	Project Wet (Urban Focus)	\$0	\$406,969	\$406,969

The following proposals with Technical Scores below 70 were not considered for funding.

Table 4 Urban Proposals
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4058	24	San Diego, City of	Pressure Regulator Incentive Pilot Program	\$43,214	\$138,501	\$181,715
4155	25	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Empirical Analysis of Rate Impacts on Urban Water Conservation	\$147,414	\$399,704	\$547,118
4055	26	Inland Empire Utilities Agencies	Landscape Irrigation system audit and Tune Up Program	\$57,000	\$31,000	\$88,000
4051	27	Steelworkers Oldtimers Foundation	Youth, Children and Families Water Use Efficiency Educational Project	\$0	\$2,078,145	\$2,078,145
4100	28	University of California, Davis-UC Regents, Department of Land, air and Water Resources	Demonstration and Application of New Water Use Efficiency Tool for Reducing Urban Landscape Irrigation Water Use	\$0	\$915,026	\$915,026
4175	29	University of California Regents - Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory	Environmental Benefits of Best Management Practices in Urban Water Conservation: Establishing a Baseline	\$20,000	\$300,000	\$320,000
4072	30	Western Municipal Water District	Water-Wise Zone	\$35,982	\$81,303	\$117,285
4003	31	Palmdale Water District	Pilot ET Control Program	\$13,584	\$93,983	\$107,466
4153	32	California Urban Water Agencies	Conservation Implementation Challenges and Opportunities	\$100,016	\$394,630	\$494,646
4059	33	Irrigation Training and Research Center, Cal Poly State Univ San Luis Obispo	Integration and Enhancement of WBMConserve	\$300,000	\$363,812	\$663,812
4152	34	California State University, Fresno Foundation	Development of Standardized Testing for Soil Moisture, Sensors, Climatologically, Based Controllers, and Other Equipment for High Efficiency Watering	\$0	\$206,193	\$206,193
4052	35	Corona, City of	City of Corona Landscape Learning Center	\$303,243	\$183,245	\$486,488
4026	36	Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc	Interactive Learning Modules for Irrigation Water Management	\$0	\$148,877	\$148,877
4006	37	Eastern Municipal Water District	Incentives for Outdoor Conservation by Residential Customers	\$113,000	\$75,000	\$188,000
4002	38	Palmdale Water District	Demonstration Conservation Garden	\$2,476,499	\$2,332,363	\$4,677,159
4010	39	Interdisciplinary Spatial Information Systems Center, CSU Fresno	Identifying Total Urban Irrigated Landscape Areas San Joaquin Valley Satellite Remote Sensing Image Spectral Mixture Analysis	\$0	\$165,685	\$165,685
4004	40	Millbrae, City of	Water Wise Gardening CDROM	\$0	\$21,000	\$21,000
4078	41	Project Amiga	Youth and Community Environmental Career Training Program	\$0	\$700,000	\$700,000
4088	42	Friends of Deer Creek	Increasing Water Efficiency in the Sierra Nevada-A Collaborative Water Conservation Planning Project for Developing Foothill Communities and Counties	\$78,000	\$512,500	\$638,500
4075	43	Downey, City of	Apollo Park Irrigation Renovation Project	\$294,370	\$241,367	\$535,737

Table 4 Urban Proposals
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4065	44	Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District	USGVMWD Landscape and Irrigation Project	\$141,350	\$137,470	\$278,820
4145	45	Oakland Releaf	Releaf To Less Water - Street Tree Irrigation Research	\$5,250	\$151,338	\$156,588
4144	46	California building Performance Contractors Association	Integrated Home Water Savings with Energy Star	\$20,000	\$568,902	\$588,902
4094	47	Water Education Foundation	Water Saver Home Website Promotion and customer Feedback Program	\$0	\$696,026	\$696,026
4066	48	Long Beach, City of	Marina Vista Coastal-Friendly Gardens	\$302,738	\$529,976	\$832,713
4107	49	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Water Education Center (WEC) and Demonstration Garden	\$3,500,000	\$500,000	\$4,000,000
4040	50	San Diego, City of	San Diego State of the Urban Forest Report	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000
4018	51	Oxnard, city of	South Oxnard Library, Xeriscape Demonstration Project	\$104,642	\$104,642	\$209,284
4160	52	Unitarian Universalist Church of Fresno	Previous Parking Lot Demonstration Project	\$0	\$798,290	\$798,290
4137	53	California Water Awareness Campaign	Public Information and Awareness Campaign	\$150,000	\$7,006,000	\$7,156,000
4079	54	Northern California Golf Association	Improving California Golf Course Water Use Efficiency	\$207,376	\$125,008	\$332,383
4108	55	Inland Empire Utilities agencies	IEUA Water-Efficient Residential and Landscape Facility	\$684,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,684,000
4077	56	Lake Arrowhead Community Services District	Artificial Turf Technology Demonstration Project	\$0	\$138,760	\$138,760
4121	57	San Jose, City of	Large Landscape Alternatives	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,500,000
4087	58	Sustainable Silicon Valley (SSV)	SSV Water Initiative for Businesses, Residents, and Ecosystems	\$7,500	\$397,830	\$405,330
4099	59	Redding, City of	Tiger Field Demonstration Project	\$500,000	\$686,260	\$1,186,260
4053	60	Great Valley Center	Central Valley Landscape Water Education Program	\$0	\$1,585,000	\$1,585,000
4062	61	Pacific Institute in Development, Environment, and Security	Clarification of Key Concepts in Water Use Efficiency: Reducing barriers to Understanding, Quantification, and Implementation	\$0	\$108,043	\$108,043

Table 5 - Funding Recommendation for Agricultural
Implementation Projects (Section A)

Proposal as Submitted							Proposal as Recommended				
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs	Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Costs	Comments	
4129	1	Lost Hills Water District	7N Canal Lining	\$61,440	\$245,760	\$307,200	\$245,760	\$61,440	\$307,200	Approve requested fund.	
4130	2	Lost Hills Water District	4 Canal Lining	\$186,380	\$559,140	\$745,520	\$559,140	\$186,380	\$745,520	Approve requested fund.	
4163	3	Amador Water Agency	Canal to Main line	\$11,584,384	\$3,447,897	\$15,032,281	\$0	\$0	\$0	Do no fund. No Urban Water Management Plan.	
4008	4	Western Canal Water District	Replacement AND Automation of Elevation Control Structure 875	\$314,786	\$104,929	\$419,714	\$104,929	\$314,786	\$419,715	Fully fund	
4038	5	Patterson Irrigation	Decision Support for Implementation and Evaluation of Agricultural Water Reuse Best Management Practices to Improve District-Level Irrigation Efficiency	\$647,000	\$1,053,000	\$1,700,000	\$775,000	\$725,000	\$1,500,000	Approve \$775,000 to fund tasks 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 of the project. Excessive cost were also reduced. Local share to complete project \$725,000.	
4128	6	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Yolo County Flow Monitoring Network	\$327,144	\$272,000	\$599,144	\$272,000	\$327,144	\$599,144	Fully funded	
4161	7	Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District	Canal Modernization	\$200,000	\$10,900,000	\$11,100,000	\$1,775,266	\$40,000	\$1,815,266	Approve total of \$1,775,266 to do scaled down project in a three-phase contract. Applicant to complete and submit project environmental review including verification of water balance to demonstrate CALFED water use efficiency benefit in phase 1, complete and submit final project design in phase 2. Total project costs for phase 1 and 2 not to exceed \$775,266. Applicant implement portions of the project for \$1,000,000. Total state share \$1,775,266. Any unused funds from phase 1 and 2 to be used in phase 3. Cost details to be negotiated with the applicant. Include monitoring and verification to demonstrate its benefits. Results may be used to justify future phase of project. Applicant's proposed local share is prorated to \$40,000.	
4168	8	Modesto Irrigation District	Ditch Pipeline Replacement	\$529,000	\$500,000	\$1,029,400	\$500,000	\$529,000	\$1,029,000	Fully fund	
4013	9	Deer Creek Irrigation District	Deer Creek Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Program Near-Term System Improvements Project	\$0	\$1,230,218	\$1,230,218	\$1,154,254	\$0	\$1,154,254	Fund at \$1,154,254. Reductions include monitoring and assessment (\$46,545) task is funded under applicant's Section B application already, and management cost reduced by \$30,000 for a total reduction of \$75,964.	
4164	10	Stevinson Water District	Lateral Canal Piping	\$107,200	\$896,000	\$1,003,200	\$896,000	\$107,200	\$1,003,200	Approve requested fund. Applicant's share is \$107,200.	
4090	11	South Feather Water and Power Agency	Canal Seepage Reduction Program	\$66,200	\$315,480	\$381,680	\$0	\$0	\$0	Do not fund. This implementation project depends on the applicant's Section B project (4056) which was not funded.	
4116	12	Oakdale Irrigation District	Tailwater Recovery Program	\$1,377,750	\$731,500	\$2,109,250	\$731,500	\$1,377,750	\$2,109,250	Fully fund	
				\$15,401,284	\$20,255,924	\$35,657,607	\$7,013,849	\$3,668,700	\$10,682,549		

Table 6 Funding Recommendation - Agricultural
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted							Proposal as Recommended			
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs	Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project cost	Comments
4032	1	University of California, Davis	Monitoring Wetting Front Advance Rate for Irrigation Management in Flood Irrigated Alfalfa Production Systems	\$0	\$296,015	\$296,015	\$197,343	\$0	\$197,343	Complete proposed work in two years at 2/3 proposed budget
4089	2	Regent of the University of California	Benefits and Costs of Deficit Irrigation in Alfalfa	\$0	\$981,984	\$981,984	\$632,000	\$0	\$632,000	Reduce crop loss payment to \$120,000 for the two year program. Fund field assistants at 50% time, Do not fund Eddy covariance equipment. Fund for a total of \$632,000.
4070	3	University of California, Davis	Water Use Efficiency in Sacramento Valley Rice Cultivation	\$58,508	\$681,294	\$739,802	\$428,000	\$39,005	\$467,005	Eliminate third year of the project, may apply in future. Applicant may compare pesticide application loads vs cultural practices.
4063	4	California State University, Monterey Bay - Foundation	Characterizing Spatiotemporal Variations in Canopy Density, Soils, Climate, and Vineyard Water Balances to Derive Spatially-Explicit Irrigation Strategies: Developing of the VITicultural Information System (VITIS)	\$0	\$399,701	\$399,701	\$118,590	\$0	\$118,590	Fund verification of VISM model using vinyard ground data and remote sensing. Do not fund meterological work. No funding for one of the investigators, students; supplies reduced to \$19,000, travel reduced to \$2,000.
4115	5	University of California, Davis	California Regulated Deficit Irrigation Program and Remote Sensing to Quantify Evapotranspiration	\$1,453,600	\$1,432,398	\$2,885,998	\$563,000	\$563,000	\$1,126,000	6 sites to include 2 almond, 1 pistachio, 1 citrus, and 2 winegrapes. Almonds include one SJV valley site and one Sacramento Valley site. Applicant use monitoring and verification to measure ET under RDI. No remote sensing project to be funded in this cycle.
4015	6	United States Department of Agriculture	Improved Water Use Efficiency for Vegetables Grown in the San Joaquin Valley	\$372,150	\$372,150	\$744,300	\$248,000	\$260,000	\$508,000	Fund project for two years. Local share for two years is \$260,000.
4046	7	University of California, Davis	Ground-Based Remote Sensing Technology for Improved Agricultural Water Use Efficiency In Furrow Irrigation systems	\$0	\$462,340	\$462,340	\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
4047	8	California Poly Technic State University Foundation	Technology Transfer to Irrigation Districts	\$450,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,800,000	\$387,500	\$127,800	\$515,300	Conduct minimum of 25 rapid appraisals including contribution to Quantifiable Objectives (\$15,500 a site). Applicant work with DWR and CBDA in developing the QO appraisal protocol. Local share 33% or \$127,800.
4133	9	Glenn Colusa Irrigation District	Regulating Reservoir Feasibility	\$51,400	\$257,000	\$308,400	\$257,000	\$51,400	\$308,400	Fully fund
4102	10	University of California, Davis	Updating Crop Coefficients Information to Improve Crop Water Estimation	\$90,900	\$298,058	\$388,958	\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
4158	11	San Joaquin County Resources Conservation District	Expanded Mobile Irrigation Lab and Irrigation Workshops in Spanish	\$974,100	\$865,000	\$1,839,100	\$60,000	\$67,560	\$127,560	Fund 40 evaluations at \$1,000 ea, 10 Spanish workshops at \$1,500 ea, \$5,000 admin, \$60,000 total.
4166	12	Anderson-cottonwood Irrigation District	Churn Creek Lateral Improvement	\$5,000	\$144,000	\$149,000	\$144,000	\$5,000	\$149,000	Fully fund

Table 6 Funding Recommendation - Agricultural
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4021	13	Deer Creek Irrigation District	Deer Creek Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Program Long-Term Ssystem Improvements Feasibility Investigation	\$0	\$368,332	\$368,332
4022	14	Orland Unit Water Users Association	Orland Project Regulating Reservoir Feasibility Investigation	\$8,000	\$168,153	\$176,153
4170	15	Biggs-West Gridley Water District	Regional Water Measurement Program	\$73,500	\$270,459	\$343,959
4126	16	Reclamation District 108	Reclamation/BWMP Cooperative Water Measurement Study	\$20,500	\$458,500	\$479,000
4095	17	Yolo County Resource Conservation District	Yolo/Colusa Mobile Water Lab : Integrating Water Quality into On-Farm Irrigation Water Management Improvements	\$58,320	\$414,085	\$472,405
4096	18	Agricultural Water Management Council	Agricultural Water Management Informational Resources Directory	\$0	\$62,680	\$62,680
4101	19	University of California, Davis	California Irrigation Management Information System Phase II	\$0	\$3,587,859	\$3,587,859
4113	20	California State University, Fresno	Optimizing a Tailwater Return System to Improve Water Quality	\$102,219	\$1,027,779	\$1,129,998
4162	21	Reclamation District 108	Sacramento River BWMP Sub-Basni-Level Water ManagementProgram Demonstration Project	\$20,500	\$444,700	\$465,200
				\$3,738,697	\$14,342,487	\$18,081,184

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project cost	Comments
\$288,180	\$0	\$288,180	Eliminate outreach funding (\$13,776) as it is included in Applicant's Section A project, reduce project management to \$30,000. Fund for a total of \$288,180.
\$168,153	\$8,000	\$176,153	Approve three step funding agreement. Feasibility study, near final design (\$37,418) & environmental work (\$17,714) should be done as part of three step project agreement.
\$50,000	\$27,000	\$77,000	Fund Tasks 1- Define Study region at \$3,880, Task 2 - Development of Water Balance for \$25,360, part of Task 3 Development of a consolidated meassurement plan \$13,120. Plus \$7,640 for report & project management. Total of \$50,000. Applicant share will be \$27,000.
\$318,803	\$161,000	\$479,803	Fund Task 1 through 8 with State share of \$318,803. Applicant to find other source of funding to complete project.
\$100,500	\$14,000	\$114,500	Do 60 evaluations for \$1500 each, \$1500 for workshop and \$9,000 for admin, total of \$100,500. Coordinate with Ag Waiver Monitoring Programs.
\$62,680	\$0	\$62,680	Fully fund
\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
\$200,193	\$244,700	\$444,893	Fund at \$200,193 for meter installation(\$187,000 for install/\$13,000 for admin).. Applicant cost share data collection. Local share increased to \$244,700.
\$4,223,942	\$1,568,465	\$5,792,407	

Table 7 Funding Recommendation - Urban
Implementation Projects (Section A)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4014	1	Contra Costa Water District	High Efficiency Toilet and Urinal Replacement Program	\$647,446	\$647,446	\$1,314,892
4110	2	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	Multi-Family UFL Toilet Direct - Install Program	\$2,436,659	\$1,710,000	\$4,146,659
4131	3	Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC)	Industrial Process Water Use Reduction Program	\$414,208	\$404,801	\$819,009
4172	4	Los Angeles, City of	Cooling Tower Conductivity Controller Replacement Program	\$675,000	\$350,000	\$1,025,000
4139	5	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Rebate Program for Cooling Tower Conductivity Controllers	\$3,780,187	\$2,183,036	\$5,963,223
4134	6	Los Angeles, City of	Los Angeles City Park Irrigation Efficiency Program	\$778,970	\$362,000	\$1,140,970
4156	7	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Urban Water Agency One-Stop Rebate Program	\$4,328,080	\$3,573,322	\$7,901,402
4173	8	West Sacramento, City of	Parks Irrigation Retrofit	\$0	\$324,551	\$324,551
4091	9	El Dorado Irrigation District	EID CII/Multi-Family Landscape Sub-Metering and ET Controller Installation Project	\$84,201	\$83,098	\$167,299
4025	10	Sacramento, City of	Park Irrigation Infrastructure Improvements	\$200,000	\$1,053,661	\$1,253,661
4081	11	San Benito County Water District	Water Softener Rebate Program	\$305,560	\$300,000	\$605,560
4029	12	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Residential High Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$6,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$11,000,000
4033	13	Pittsburg, City of	Innovative Irrigation Saving Our Delta "I2SOD"	\$277,984	\$409,487	\$687,472

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Cost	Comments
\$647,446	\$647,446	\$1,294,892	Fully fund
\$1,650,133	\$2,436,659	\$4,086,792	Fully fund
\$404,801	\$414,208	\$819,009	Fully fund
\$350,000	\$675,000	\$1,025,000	Fully fund
\$349,714	\$606,000	\$955,714	Limit admin costs to less than 20%. Rebate for 200 and 20% admin costs, limit grant to \$349,714.
\$362,000	\$778,970	\$1,140,970	Fully fund
\$1,250,000	\$1,441,000	\$2,691,000	Administrative costs are excessive. DWR staff to negotiate administration costs of less than 20%. Take into consideration similar rebate programs to determine rebate amount.
\$0	\$0	\$0	Do not fund. No Urban Water Management Plan.
\$83,098	\$84,201	\$167,299	Fully fund
\$754,000	\$143,000	\$897,000	Limit \$10,000 for monitoring/assessment and report writing. Limit of \$428,620 for Group 2 part of the proposal for a total of \$754,000. Applicant's proposed local share is prorated.
\$300,000	\$305,560	\$605,560	Fully fund
\$1,660,000	\$1,992,000	\$3,652,000	Applicant claims Locally cost effective, but application data and economist evaluation indicates the application not locally cost effective. Moved to locally not cost effective. Limit grant to two third, two years of the program at \$1,660,000. Applicant cost share shall be \$1,992,000.
\$0	\$0	\$0	Applicant claims locally cost effective. Applicant doesn't make a compelling case that the project will have broad transferable benefits or accelerates implementation. Recommend do not fund.

Table 7 Funding Recommendation - Urban
Implementation Projects (Section A)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4071	14	Port Hueneme, City of	Citywide Meter Retrofit and System Audit Program	\$2,789,093	\$1,360,800	\$4,149,893
4005	15	Cathedral City, City of	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$54,450	\$36,900	\$91,350
4073	16	Newhall County Water District (NCWD)	Residential ET Controller Rebate Program(No UWMP)	\$149,459	\$71,874	\$221,330
4064	17	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	California Friendly Communities	\$547,725	\$1,500,000	\$2,047,725
4142	18	Los Angeles, City of	Large Landscape "Smart Irrigation" Program	\$374,840	\$367,500	\$742,340
4067	19	Metropolitan Water district of Southern California	High-Efficiency Toilet Rebate Program	\$4,200,000	\$5,000,000	\$9,200,000
4031	20	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	Residential Water Use Audits Program	\$627,103	\$773,279	\$1,400,382
4039	21	Richgrove Community Services District	Richgrove Water Meter Retrofit Program	\$0	\$119,683	\$119,683
4080	22	West Basin Municipal Water District	West Basin Municipal Water District Restroom Retrofit Project	\$889,100	\$884,500	\$1,773,600
4127	23	Electric and Gas Industries Association (EGIA)	Regional Resource - Efficient Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$8,143,560	\$5,742,675	\$13,886,235
4042	24	Los Angeles County Waterworks Districts	Commercial, Industrial, Institutional Water Use Audits and Dedicated Landscape Meter Installation Program	\$245,484	\$329,776	\$575,260
4069	25	Friars Village Homeowners' Association	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$64,220	\$46,870	\$111,090
				\$38,013,329	\$32,635,259	\$70,668,586

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Cost	Comments
\$345,324	\$728,983	\$1,074,307	Fund one year of project, 1,733 meters. Locally cost effective, fund at 25% or \$345,324.
\$36,900	\$54,450	\$91,350	Fully fund
\$0	\$0	\$0	Do not fund. No Urban Water Management Plan.
\$423,150	\$154,000	\$577,150	Fund multi-family portion of project, 1,650 valves
\$183,750	\$187,420	\$371,170	Fund at 50 percent.
\$1,000,000	\$840,000	\$1,840,000	Limit to \$1,000,000 and limit program to 10,000 ULFTs. Was found to be not locally cost effective.
\$386,640	\$313,000	\$699,640	10% of district customers instead of 20%. Project does not meet Disadvantaged Community criteria.
\$119,683	\$0	\$119,683	Fully fund
\$294,834	\$294,834	\$589,668	Fund one year only, 383 restrooms.
\$1,914,225	\$2,714,000	\$4,628,225	Fund one year only, 28,000 rebates.
\$108,681	\$326,046	\$434,727	Fund program, 1,788 audits. Applicant claims Locally Cost Effective. Project is LCE. Locally cost effective, fund at 25%=\$108,681. Project does not meet Disadvantaged Community criteria.
\$46,870	\$64,220	\$111,090	Fully fund
\$12,671,249	\$15,200,997	\$27,872,246	

Table 8 Funding Recommendation - Urban
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4109	1	California Urban Water Conservation Council	California WaterStar Initiative: Water Efficiency Product Rating and Labeling	\$350,000	\$700,000	\$1,050,000
4086	2	Alameda Point Collaborative	Water Efficient Landscaping	\$0	\$792,000	\$792,000
4054	3	Irvine Ranch Water District	Statewide Study of Water Use Efficiency	\$235,000	\$761,668	\$996,668
4132	4	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Urban Water Efficiency Technical Assistance Program	\$603,584	\$1,911,349	\$2,514,933
4112	5	South Yuba River Citizens League	"The Great Water Mystery" School Assemblies and School Water Audit	\$161,380	\$155,150	\$316,530
4017	6	Irvine Ranch Water District	Rotary Nozzle Retrofit Study	\$60,166	\$71,819	\$131,985
4085	7	Alameda Point Collaborative	Ploughshares Demonstration Garden	\$0	\$193,460	\$193,460
4136	8	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Smart From the Start	\$65,583	\$314,250	\$379,833
4174	9	University of California Regents - Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory	Determining Waste of Water and Energy in Residential Hot Water Distribution Systems	\$935,000	\$935,000	\$1,870,000
4114	10	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Online/Web-Based Irrigation Efficiency Training	\$155,000	\$155,000	\$310,000
4083	11	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Water Efficiency Demonstration Garden	\$240,865	\$730,000	\$970,865
4020	12	Central Basin Municipal Water District	Commercial Landscape Wireless Valve End Use Management Research Project	\$414,667	\$492,155	\$906,822
4036	13	Clovis Botanical Garden Committee	Clovis Botanical Garden Expansion	\$904,147	\$1,773,079	\$2,677,226
4141	14	East Bay Municipal Utility District	New Business Plan Review Program For Water Use Efficiency	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000
4118	15	Efficiency Partnership	Flex Your Power at the Tap	\$23,543,726	\$3,450,000	\$26,995,231
4049	16	The Regents of the University of California, division of Agriculture and Natural Resources /UCCE San Bernardino County	Conserving Water and Improving Plant Health in Large Southern California Landscapes	\$119,622	\$390,026	\$509,648
4157	17	Pacific Institutet for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security	Development of a Water Use Efficiency Implementation Cost and Cost Effectiveness Model	\$0	\$142,385	\$142,385

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Project Cost	Comments
\$217,000	\$108,600	\$325,600	Approve tasks 1 through 3 at 67% state share, limit admin costs to 20%. Fund for a total of \$217,000.
\$308,000	\$0	\$308,000	Fund irrigation system only, not plant design or materials (eligible cost only). Applicant to pay for ineligible costs.
\$761,668	\$235,000	\$996,668	Fully fund
\$506,913	\$159,664	\$666,577	Eliminate all category 1 tasks except on-call grants for the cooperator (T. C.) time; eliminate committee, standards, codes tasks; second category except electronic meetings; support PBMP of the next category; support monitoring and assessment, limit admin to 20% and state share at 66%. Fund for a total of \$506,913.
\$51,717	\$53,718	\$105,435	Fund one year of school assemblies and water audits. Applicant'd share was prorated.
\$71,819	\$60,166	\$131,985	Fully fund
\$193,460	\$0	\$193,460	Fully fund.
\$104,496	\$21,583	\$126,079	Fund "New Home Construction Standards" component only.
\$500,000	\$543,725	\$1,043,725	Fund new houses study (eliminate 40 existing houses study for \$682,550), reduce meetings and deliverable and other costs, for state share of \$500,000.
\$77,500	\$77,500	\$155,000	Fund 1 residential series class & 2 class from the professional course.
\$146,000	\$48,173	\$194,173	Fund one acre demo garden for \$146,000.
\$164,052	\$138,000	\$302,052	Fund one year, 45 controllers
\$72,362	\$24,603	\$96,965	Fund exhibits, grading, paths, irrigation system, monitoring, and assessment. No plant materials funded.
\$50,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	Fund portion of Guidebook cost.
\$38,551	\$5,560	\$44,111	Fund Market research, focus groups, public opinion survey, e-Newswire, Website, Database, Translation Contractors.
\$130,009	\$39,668	\$169,677	Fund Year One - irrigation scheduling and best mangement practices training.
\$142,385	\$0	\$142,385	Approve requested fund. Include DWR, CBDA, SWRCB, and USBR to participate in the Public Advisory Committee

Table 8 Funding Recommendation - Urban
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted							Proposal as Recommended			
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs	Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Project Cost	Comments
4111	18	California State University, Fresno Foundation	Irrigation System Audits by Students	\$0	\$318,783	\$318,783	\$159,392	\$0	\$159,392	Fund project at 50% level.
4143	19	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Multi-Family Submeter Pilot Study	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000	Fully fund
4119	20	Stockton East Water Dist	Children Museum WUE	\$6,000	\$54,000	\$60,000	\$54,000	\$6,000	\$60,000	Fully fund
4057	21	San Diego, city of	Recirculating Hot Water Systems: Residential Survey and Feasibility Study	\$0	\$30,100	\$30,100	\$30,100	\$54,000	\$84,100	Fully fund
4034	22	University of California, Davis	Improvement in CIMIS California Statewide Potential Evapotranspiration Maps	\$0	\$400,770	\$400,770	\$214,919	\$0	\$214,919	Fund at reduced level. DWR negotiate project tasks. Refinement of the current GOES model: specially to provide more reliable data delivery, development of the new satellite techniques to improve temperature and wind speed interpolations and incorporation of a type of MODIS land cover data.
4151	23	Water Education Foundation	Project Wet (Urban Focus)	\$0	\$406,969	\$406,969	\$79,599	\$0	\$79,599	Fund Project Wet for approximately 80,000 students.
				\$28,094,740	\$14,477,963	\$42,574,208	\$4,223,942	\$1,775,960	\$5,999,902	

**Table 9 - Prop 50 Submitted and Funded Proposals
 by CALFED Region**

Ag Proposals				
CALFED Region	Proposals Submitted	Funding Requested	Proposals Recommended	Funding Recommended
Bay Area	2	\$1,436,389	1	\$118,590
Sacramento Valley	27	\$24,666,285	13	\$5,261,278
San Joaquin Valley	16	\$9,906,459	9	\$4,578,400
Southern California	2	\$1,775,296	0	\$0
Statewide	15	\$10,207,822	4	\$1,279,523
Total	62	\$47,992,251	27	\$11,237,791

Urban Proposals				
CALFED Region	Proposals Submitted	Funding Requested	Proposals Recommended	Funding Recommended
Bay Area	19	\$12,361,454	9	\$3,851,516
Sacramento Valley	14	\$23,251,992	3	\$888,815
San Joaquin Valley	9	\$5,818,071	4	\$405,437
Southern California	46	\$31,313,862	19	\$7,726,563
Statewide	18	\$20,692,035	10	\$4,022,860
Total	106	\$93,437,414	45	\$16,895,191

Total Proposals	168	\$141,429,665	72	\$28,132,982
------------------------	------------	----------------------	-----------	---------------------



650 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.445.5511 FAX 916.445.7297
<http://calwater.ca.gov>

Agenda Item: 14B
Meeting Date: June 8, 2005

RESOLUTION 05-06-02

**RECOMMENDING TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES THAT IT PROCEED WITH THE
AWARD OF WATER USE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM GRANTS**

WHEREAS, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Proposition 50 Water Use Efficiency Grant Program is intended to provide funding for projects that will contribute toward meeting CALFED Program water use efficiency and CALFED cross-program goals and objectives; and

WHEREAS, the selection process for these grants gave focused attention to the goal of assisting local water management agencies to implement local water use efficiency projects resulting in direct and indirect benefit to the CALFED Bay-Delta system; and

WHEREAS, the grants chosen through the selection process will provide funding for proposals that are consistent with the goal of attaining advancements in water use efficiency by funding research and development projects; and

WHEREAS, the DWR Water Use Efficiency Grant Program will advance the verification of water use efficiency grant program performance; and

WHEREAS, the Authority recommended that DWR proceed with its final Proposition 50 Water Use Efficiency Proposal Solicitation Package in October 2004.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the California Bay-Delta Authority recommends to the Department of Water Resources that it approve award of grants to the projects identified in Attachments 1-4.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned Assistant to the California Bay-Delta Authority does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the Authority held on June 8, 2005.

Dated: _____

Olene Chard
Assistant to the California Bay-Delta Authority

Proposal as Submitted							Proposal as Recommended				
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs	Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Costs	Comments	
4129	1	Lost Hills Water District	7N Canal Lining	\$61,440	\$245,760	\$307,200	\$245,760	\$61,440	\$307,200	Approve requested fund.	
4130	2	Lost Hills Water District	4 Canal Lining	\$186,380	\$559,140	\$745,520	\$559,140	\$186,380	\$745,520	Approve requested fund.	
4163	3	Amador Water Agency	Canal to Main line	\$11,584,384	\$3,447,897	\$15,032,281	\$0	\$0	\$0	Do no fund. No Urban Water Management Plan.	
4008	4	Western Canal Water District	Replacement AND Automation of Elevation Control Structure 875	\$314,786	\$104,929	\$419,714	\$104,929	\$314,786	\$419,715	Fully fund	
4038	5	Patterson Irrigation	Decision Support for Implementation and Evaluation of Agricultural Water Reuse Best Management Practices to Improve District-Level Irrigation Efficiency	\$647,000	\$1,053,000	\$1,700,000	\$775,000	\$725,000	\$1,500,000	Approve \$775,000 to fund tasks 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 of the project. Excessive cost were also reduced. Local share to complete project \$725,000.	
4128	6	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Yolo County Flow Monitoring Network	\$327,144	\$272,000	\$599,144	\$272,000	\$327,144	\$599,144	Fully funded	
4161	7	Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District	Canal Modernization	\$200,000	\$10,900,000	\$11,100,000	\$1,775,266	\$40,000	\$1,815,266	Approve total of \$1,775,266 to do scaled down project in a three-phase contract. Applicant to complete and submit project environmental review including verification of water balance to demonstrate CALFED water use efficiency benefit in phase 1, complete and submit final project design in phase 2. Total project costs for phase 1 and 2 not to exceed \$775,266. Applicant implement portions of the project for \$1,000,000. Total state share \$1,775,266. Any unused funds from phase 1 and 2 to be used in phase 3. Cost details to be negotiated with the applicant. Include monitoring and verification to demonstrate its benefits. Results may be used to justify future phase of project. Applicant's proposed local share is prorated to \$40,000.	
4168	8	Modesto Irrigation District	Ditch Pipeline Replacement	\$529,000	\$500,000	\$1,029,400	\$500,000	\$529,000	\$1,029,000	Fully fund	
4013	9	Deer Creek Irrigation District	Deer Creek Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Program Near-Term System Improvements Project	\$0	\$1,230,218	\$1,230,218	\$1,154,254	\$0	\$1,154,254	Fund at \$1,154,254. Reductions include monitoring and assessment (\$46,545) task is funded under applicant's Section B application already, and management cost reduced by \$30,000 for a total reduction of \$75,964.	
4164	10	Stevinson Water District	Lateral Canal Piping	\$107,200	\$896,000	\$1,003,200	\$896,000	\$107,200	\$1,003,200	Approve requested fund. Applicant's share is \$107,200.	
4090	11	South Feather Water and Power Agency	Canal Seepage Reduction Program	\$66,200	\$315,480	\$381,680	\$0	\$0	\$0	Do not fund. This implementation project depends on the applicant's Section B project (4056) which was not funded.	
4116	12	Oakdale Irrigation District	Tailwater Recovery Program	\$1,377,750	\$731,500	\$2,109,250	\$731,500	\$1,377,750	\$2,109,250	Fully fund	
				\$15,401,284	\$20,255,924	\$35,657,607	\$7,013,849	\$3,668,700	\$10,682,549		

Funding Recommendation - Agricultural
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4032	1	University of California, Davis	Monitoring Wetting Front Advance Rate for Irrigation Management in Flood Irrigated Alfalfa Production Systems	\$0	\$296,015	\$296,015
4089	2	Regent of the University of California	Benefits and Costs of Deficit Irrigation in Alfalfa	\$0	\$981,984	\$981,984
4070	3	University of California, Davis	Water Use Efficiency in Sacramento Valley Rice Cultivation	\$58,508	\$681,294	\$739,802
4063	4	California State University, Monterey Bay - Foundation	Characterizing Spatiotemporal Variations in Canopy Density, Soils, Climate, and Vineyard Water Balances to Derive Spatially-Explicit Irrigation Strategies: Developing of the VITicultural Information System (VITIS)	\$0	\$399,701	\$399,701
4115	5	University of California, Davis	California Regulated Deficit Irrigation Program and Remote Sensing to Quantify Evapotranspiration	\$1,453,600	\$1,432,398	\$2,885,998
4015	6	United States Department of Agriculture	Improved Water Use Efficiency for Vegetables Grown in the San Joaquin Valley	\$372,150	\$372,150	\$744,300
4046	7	University of California, Davis	Ground-Based Remote Sensing Technology for Improved Agricultural Water Use Efficiency In Furrow Irrigation systems	\$0	\$462,340	\$462,340
4047	8	California Poly Technic State University Foundation	Technology Transfer to Irrigation Districts	\$450,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,800,000
4133	9	Glenn Colusa Irrigation District	Regulating Reservoir Feasibility	\$51,400	\$257,000	\$308,400
4102	10	University of California, Davis	Updating Crop Coefficients Information to Improve Crop Water Estimation	\$90,900	\$298,058	\$388,958
4158	11	San Joaquin County Resources Conservation District	Expanded Mobile Irrigation Lab and Irrigation Workshops in Spanish	\$974,100	\$865,000	\$1,839,100
4166	12	Anderson-cottonwood Irrigation District	Churn Creek Lateral Improvement	\$5,000	\$144,000	\$149,000

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project cost	Comments
\$197,343	\$0	\$197,343	Complete proposed work in two years at 2/3 proposed budget
\$632,000	\$0	\$632,000	Reduce crop loss payment to \$120,000 for the two year program. Fund field assistants at 50% time, Do not fund Eddy covariance equipment. Fund for a total of \$632,000.
\$428,000	\$39,005	\$467,005	Eliminate third year of the project, may apply in future. Applicant may compare pesticide application loads vs cultural practices.
\$118,590	\$0	\$118,590	Fund verification of VISM model using vinyard ground data and remote sensing. Do not fund meterological work. No funding for one of the investigators, students; supplies reduced to \$19,000, travel reduced to \$2,000.
\$563,000	\$563,000	\$1,126,000	6 sites to include 2 almond, 1 pistachio, 1 citrus, and 2 winegrapes. Almonds include one SJV valley site and one Sacramento Valley site. Applicant use montiring and verification to measure ET under RDI. No remote sensing project to be funded in this cycle.
\$248,000	\$260,000	\$508,000	Fund project for two years. Local share for two years is \$260,000.
\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
\$387,500	\$127,800	\$515,300	Conduct minimum of 25 rapid appraisals including contribution to Quantifiable Objectives (\$15,500 a site). Applicant work with DWR and CBDA in developing the QO appraisal protocol. Local share 33% or \$127,800.
\$257,000	\$51,400	\$308,400	Fully fund
\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
\$60,000	\$67,560	\$127,560	Fund 40 evaluations at \$1,000 ea, 10 Spanish workshops at \$1,500 ea, \$5,000 admin, \$60,000 total.
\$144,000	\$5,000	\$149,000	Fully fund

Funding Recommendation - Agricultural
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4021	13	Deer Creek Irrigation District	Deer Creek Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Program Long-Term Ssystem Improvements Feasibility Investigation	\$0	\$368,332	\$368,332
4022	14	Orland Unit Water Users Association	Orland Project Regulating Reservoir Feasibility Investigation	\$8,000	\$168,153	\$176,153
4170	15	Biggs-West Gridley Water District	Regional Water Measurement Program	\$73,500	\$270,459	\$343,959
4126	16	Reclamation District 108	Reclamation/BWMP Cooperative Water Measurement Study	\$20,500	\$458,500	\$479,000
4095	17	Yolo County Resource Conservation District	Yolo/Colusa Mobile Water Lab : Integrating Water Quality into On-Farm Irrigation Water Management Improvements	\$58,320	\$414,085	\$472,405
4096	18	Agricultural Water Management Council	Agricultural Water Management Informational Resources Directory	\$0	\$62,680	\$62,680
4101	19	University of California, Davis	California Irrigation Management Information System Phase II	\$0	\$3,587,859	\$3,587,859
4113	20	California State University, Fresno	Optimizing a Tailwater Return System to Improve Water Quality	\$102,219	\$1,027,779	\$1,129,998
4162	21	Reclamation District 108	Sacramento River BWMP Sub-Basni-Level Water ManagementProgram Demonstration Project	\$20,500	\$444,700	\$465,200
				\$3,738,697	\$14,342,487	\$18,081,184

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project cost	Comments
\$288,180	\$0	\$288,180	Eliminate outreach funding (\$13,776) as it is included in Applicant's Section A project, reduce project management to \$30,000. Fund for a total of \$288,180.
\$168,153	\$8,000	\$176,153	Approve three step funding agreement. Feasibility study, near final design (\$37,418) & environmental work (\$17,714) should be done as part of three step project agreement.
\$50,000	\$27,000	\$77,000	Fund Tasks 1- Define Study region at \$3,880, Task 2 - Development of Water Balance for \$25,360, part of Task 3 Development of a consolidated meassurement plan \$13,120. Plus \$7,640 for report & project management. Total of \$50,000. Applicant share will be \$27,000.
\$318,803	\$161,000	\$479,803	Fund Task 1 through 8 with State share of \$318,803. Applicant to find other source of funding to complete project.
\$100,500	\$14,000	\$114,500	Do 60 evaluations for \$1500 each, \$1500 for workshop and \$9,000 for admin, total of \$100,500. Coordinate with Ag Waiver Monitoring Programs.
\$62,680	\$0	\$62,680	Fully fund
\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
\$0	\$0	\$0	No more research projects funded.
\$200,193	\$244,700	\$444,893	Fund at \$200,193 for meter installation(\$187,000 for install/\$13,000 for admin).. Applicant cost share data collection. Local share increased to \$244,700.
\$4,223,942	\$1,568,465	\$5,792,407	

Funding Recommendation - Urban
Implementation Projects (Section A)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4014	1	Contra Costa Water District	High Efficiency Toilet and Urinal Replacement Program	\$647,446	\$647,446	\$1,314,892
4110	2	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	Multi-Family UFL Toilet Direct - Install Program	\$2,436,659	\$1,710,000	\$4,146,659
4131	3	Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC)	Industrial Process Water Use Reduction Program	\$414,208	\$404,801	\$819,009
4172	4	Los Angeles, City of	Cooling Tower Conductivity Controller Replacement Program	\$675,000	\$350,000	\$1,025,000
4139	5	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Rebate Program for Cooling Tower Conductivity Controllers	\$3,780,187	\$2,183,036	\$5,963,223
4134	6	Los Angeles, City of	Los Angeles City Park Irrigation Efficiency Program	\$778,970	\$362,000	\$1,140,970
4156	7	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Urban Water Agency One-Stop Rebate Program	\$4,328,080	\$3,573,322	\$7,901,402
4173	8	West Sacramento, City of	Parks Irrigation Retrofit	\$0	\$324,551	\$324,551
4091	9	El Dorado Irrigation District	EID CII/Multi-Family Landscape Sub-Metering and ET Controller Installation Project	\$84,201	\$83,098	\$167,299
4025	10	Sacramento, City of	Park Irrigation Infrastructure Improvements	\$200,000	\$1,053,661	\$1,253,661
4081	11	San Benito County Water District	Water Softener Rebate Program	\$305,560	\$300,000	\$605,560
4029	12	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Residential High Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$6,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$11,000,000
4033	13	Pittsburg, City of	Innovative Irrigation Saving Our Delta "I2SOD"	\$277,984	\$409,487	\$687,472

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Cost	Comments
\$647,446	\$647,446	\$1,294,892	Fully fund
\$1,650,133	\$2,436,659	\$4,086,792	Fully fund
\$404,801	\$414,208	\$819,009	Fully fund
\$350,000	\$675,000	\$1,025,000	Fully fund
\$349,714	\$606,000	\$955,714	Limit admin costs to less than 20%. Rebate for 200 and 20% admin costs, limit grant to \$349,714.
\$362,000	\$778,970	\$1,140,970	Fully fund
\$1,250,000	\$1,441,000	\$2,691,000	Administrative costs are excessive. DWR staff to negotiate administration costs of less than 20%. Take into consideration similar rebate programs to determine rebate amount.
\$0	\$0	\$0	Do not fund. No Urban Water Management Plan.
\$83,098	\$84,201	\$167,299	Fully fund
\$754,000	\$143,000	\$897,000	Limit \$10,000 for monitoring/assessment and report writing. Limit of \$428,620 for Group 2 part of the proposal for a total of \$754,000. Applicant's proposed local share is prorated.
\$300,000	\$305,560	\$605,560	Fully fund
\$1,660,000	\$1,992,000	\$3,652,000	Applicant claims Locally cost effective, but application data and economist evaluation indicates the application not locally cost effective. Moved to locally not cost effective. Limit grant to two third, two years of the program at \$1,660,000. Applicant cost share shall be \$1,992,000.
\$0	\$0	\$0	Applicant claims locally cost effective. Applicant doesn't make a compelling case that the project will have broad transferable benefits or accelerates implementation. Recommend do not fund.

Funding Recommendation - Urban
Implementation Projects (Section A)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4071	14	Port Hueneme, City of	Citywide Meter Retrofit and System Audit Program	\$2,789,093	\$1,360,800	\$4,149,893
4005	15	Cathedral City, City of	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$54,450	\$36,900	\$91,350
4073	16	Newhall County Water District (NCWD)	Residential ET Controller Rebate Program(No UWMP)	\$149,459	\$71,874	\$221,330
4064	17	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	California Friendly Communities	\$547,725	\$1,500,000	\$2,047,725
4142	18	Los Angeles, City of	Large Landscape "Smart Irrigation" Program	\$374,840	\$367,500	\$742,340
4067	19	Metropolitan Water district of Southern California	High-Efficiency Toilet Rebate Program	\$4,200,000	\$5,000,000	\$9,200,000
4031	20	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	Residential Water Use Audits Program	\$627,103	\$773,279	\$1,400,382
4039	21	Richgrove Community Services District	Richgrove Water Meter Retrofit Program	\$0	\$119,683	\$119,683
4080	22	West Basin Municipal Water District	West Basin Municipal Water District Restroom Retrofit Project	\$889,100	\$884,500	\$1,773,600
4127	23	Electric and Gas Industries Association (EGIA)	Regional Resource - Efficient Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$8,143,560	\$5,742,675	\$13,886,235
4042	24	Los Angeles County Waterworks Districts	Commercial, Industrial, Institutional Water Use Audits and Dedicated Landscape Meter Installation Program	\$245,484	\$329,776	\$575,260
4069	25	Friars Village Homeowners' Association	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$64,220	\$46,870	\$111,090
				\$38,013,329	\$32,635,259	\$70,668,586

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Cost	Comments
\$345,324	\$728,983	\$1,074,307	Fund one year of project, 1,733 meters. Locally cost effective, fund at 25% or \$345,324.
\$36,900	\$54,450	\$91,350	Fully fund
\$0	\$0	\$0	Do not fund. No Urban Water Management Plan.
\$423,150	\$154,000	\$577,150	Fund multi-family portion of project, 1,650 valves
\$183,750	\$187,420	\$371,170	Fund at 50 percent.
\$1,000,000	\$840,000	\$1,840,000	Limit to \$1,000,000 and limit program to 10,000 ULFTs. Was found to be not locally cost effective.
\$386,640	\$313,000	\$699,640	10% of district customers instead of 20%. Project does not meet Disadvantaged Community criteria.
\$119,683	\$0	\$119,683	Fully fund
\$294,834	\$294,834	\$589,668	Fund one year only, 383 restrooms.
\$1,914,225	\$2,714,000	\$4,628,225	Fund one year only, 28,000 rebates.
\$108,681	\$326,046	\$434,727	Fund program, 1,788 audits. Applicant claims Locally Cost Effective. Project is LCE. Locally cost effective, fund at 25%=\$108,681. Project does not meet Disadvantaged Community criteria.
\$46,870	\$64,220	\$111,090	Fully fund
\$12,671,249	\$15,200,997	\$27,872,246	

Funding Recommendation - Urban
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4109	1	California Urban Water Conservation Council	California WaterStar Initiative: Water Efficiency Product Rating and Labeling	\$350,000	\$700,000	\$1,050,000
4086	2	Alameda Point Collaborative	Water Efficient Landscaping	\$0	\$792,000	\$792,000
4054	3	Irvine Ranch Water District	Statewide Study of Water Use Efficiency	\$235,000	\$761,668	\$996,668
4132	4	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Urban Water Efficiency Technical Assistance Program	\$603,584	\$1,911,349	\$2,514,933
4112	5	South Yuba River Citizens League	"The Great Water Mystery" School Assemblies and School Water Audit	\$161,380	\$155,150	\$316,530
4017	6	Irvine Ranch Water District	Rotary Nozzle Retrofit Study	\$60,166	\$71,819	\$131,985
4085	7	Alameda Point Collaborative	Ploughshares Demonstration Garden	\$0	\$193,460	\$193,460
4136	8	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Smart From the Start	\$65,583	\$314,250	\$379,833
4174	9	University of California Regents - Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory	Determining Waste of Water and Energy in Residential Hot Water Distribution Systems	\$935,000	\$935,000	\$1,870,000
4114	10	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Online/Web-Based Irrigation Efficiency Training	\$155,000	\$155,000	\$310,000
4083	11	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Water Efficiency Demonstration Garden	\$240,865	\$730,000	\$970,865
4020	12	Central Basin Municipal Water District	Commercial Landscape Wireless Valve End Use Management Research Project	\$414,667	\$492,155	\$906,822
4036	13	Clovis Botanical Garden Committee	Clovis Botanical Garden Expansion	\$904,147	\$1,773,079	\$2,677,226
4141	14	East Bay Municipal Utility District	New Business Plan Review Program For Water Use Efficiency	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000
4118	15	Efficiency Partnership	Flex Your Power at the Tap	\$23,543,726	\$3,450,000	\$26,995,231
4049	16	The Regents of the University of California, division of Agriculture and Natural Resources /UCCE San Bernardino County	Conserving Water and Improving Plant Health in Large Southern California Landscapes	\$119,622	\$390,026	\$509,648
4157	17	Pacific Institutet for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security	Development of a Water Use Efficiency Implementation Cost and Cost Effectiveness Model	\$0	\$142,385	\$142,385

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Project Cost	Comments
\$217,000	\$108,600	\$325,600	Approve tasks 1 through 3 at 67% state share, limit admin costs to 20%. Fund for a total of \$217,000.
\$308,000	\$0	\$308,000	Fund irrigation system only, not plant design or materials (eligible cost only). Applicant to pay for ineligible costs.
\$761,668	\$235,000	\$996,668	Fully fund
\$506,913	\$159,664	\$666,577	Eliminate all category 1 tasks except on-call grants for the cooperator (T. C.) time; eliminate committee, standards, codes tasks; second category except electronic meetings; support PBMP of the next category; support monitoring and assessment, limit admin to 20% and state share at 66%. Fund for a total of \$506,913.
\$51,717	\$53,718	\$105,435	Fund one year of school assemblies and water audits. Applicant'd share was prorated.
\$71,819	\$60,166	\$131,985	Fully fund
\$193,460	\$0	\$193,460	Fully fund.
\$104,496	\$21,583	\$126,079	Fund "New Home Construction Standards" component only.
\$500,000	\$543,725	\$1,043,725	Fund new houses study (eliminate 40 existing houses study for \$682,550), reduce meetings and deliverable and other costs, for state share of \$500,000.
\$77,500	\$77,500	\$155,000	Fund 1 residential series class & 2 class from the professional course.
\$146,000	\$48,173	\$194,173	Fund one acre demo garden for \$146,000.
\$164,052	\$138,000	\$302,052	Fund one year, 45 controllers
\$72,362	\$24,603	\$96,965	Fund exhibits, grading, paths, irrigation system, monitoring, and assessment. No plant materials funded.
\$50,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	Fund portion of Guidebook cost.
\$38,551	\$5,560	\$44,111	Fund Market research, focus groups, public opinion survey, e-Newswire, Website, Database, Translation Contractors.
\$130,009	\$39,668	\$169,677	Fund Year One - irrigation scheduling and best mangement practices training.
\$142,385	\$0	\$142,385	Approve requested fund. Include DWR, CBDA, SWRCB, and USBR to participate in the Public Advisory Committee

Funding Recommendation - Urban
Research and Development Projects (Section B)

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4111	18	California State University, Fresno Foundation	Irrigation System Audits by Students	\$0	\$318,783	\$318,783
4143	19	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Multi-Family Submeter Pilot Study	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000
4119	20	Stockton East Water Dist	Children Museum WUE	\$6,000	\$54,000	\$60,000
4057	21	San Diego, city of	Recirculating Hot Water Systems: Residential Survey and Feasibility Study	\$0	\$30,100	\$30,100
4034	22	University of California, Davis	Improvement in CIMIS California Statewide Potential Evapotranspiration Maps	\$0	\$400,770	\$400,770
4151	23	Water Education Foundation	Project Wet (Urban Focus)	\$0	\$406,969	\$406,969
				\$28,094,740	\$14,477,963	\$42,574,208

Proposal as Recommended			
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Project Cost	Comments
\$159,392	\$0	\$159,392	Fund project at 50% level.
\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000	Fully fund
\$54,000	\$6,000	\$60,000	Fully fund
\$30,100	\$54,000	\$84,100	Fully fund
\$214,919	\$0	\$214,919	Fund at reduced level. DWR negotiate project tasks. Refinement of the current GOES model: specially to provide more reliable data delivery, development of the new satellite techniques to improve temperature and wind speed interpolations and incorporation of a type of MODIS land cover data.
\$79,599	\$0	\$79,599	Fund Project Wet for approximately 80,000 students.
\$4,223,942	\$1,775,960	\$5,999,902	