

PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE

FOR

IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 2 – 1ST FUNDING CYCLE

FROM

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM

AUTHORIZED UNDER

PROPOSITION 50, CHAPTER 8

FINAL – MARCH 2006

PAGES 6, 32, 34, AND 40 UPDATED MAY 2006



California Department of Water Resources
Division of Planning and Local Assistance
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

California State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Financial Assistance
1001 I Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOPIC	PAGE #
I. INTRODUCTION.....	5
II. APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS	5
III. CONDITIONS FOR EXECUTION OF GRANT AGREEMENT	10
IV REQUIREMENTS FOR ATTACHMENTS	10
V APPLICATION SCORING PROCESS.....	19
VI. SCHEDULE	32

LIST OF EXHIBITS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
APPLICANT WORKSHOPS	4
FILL-ABLE TABLES	4
POINTS OF CONTACT	4
EXHIBIT A WORK PLAN.....	33
EXHIBIT B BUDGET	35
EXHIBIT C ECONOMIC ANALYSIS – WATER SUPPLY AND WATER QUALITY BENEFITS.....	38
EXHIBIT D OTHER EXPECTED BENEFITS.....	49
EXHIBIT E CALFED ROD CONSISTENCY	52
FORM 1 CALFED ROD CONSISTENCY	52

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 – FAAST CHECKLIST	7
TABLE 2 – SUMMARY OF ATTACHMENTS AND CORRESPONDING EXHIBITS	11
TABLE 3 – SCORING CRITERIA AND SCORING STANDARD	20
TABLE 4 - IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 2 PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PROCESS AND SCHEDULE 32	
TABLE B-1 – BUDGET (INSERT EITHER “SUMMARY BUDGET” OR INSERT THE NAME OF THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT).....	35
TABLE C-1 - DISCOUNT FACTORS	40
TABLE C-2 - UPDATE FACTORS	40
TABLE C-3 – ANNUAL COST OF PROPOSAL.....	42
TABLE C-4 - ANNUAL BENEFITS OF WATER SUPPLY AND WATER QUALITY BENEFITS (ALL BENEFITS SHOULD BE IN 2005 DOLLARS).....	45
TABLE C-5 - ANNUAL COSTS OF AVOIDED PROJECTS (ALL AVOIDED COSTS SHOULD BE IN 2005 DOLLARS)..	47
TABLE C-6 - ANNUAL BENEFITS OF OTHER WATER SUPPLY OR OTHER WATER QUALITY BENEFITS (IN 2005 DOLLARS)	48
TABLE D- 1 – OTHER EXPECTED BENEFITS (ALL BENEFITS SHOULD BE IN 2005 DOLLARS)	51

ACRONYMS USED IN THIS PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE

CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CWC	California Water Code
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FAAST	Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool
GWMP	Groundwater Management Plan
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
MB	Megabyte
MP	Monitoring Plan
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
PAEP	Project Assessment & Evaluation Plan
PIN	Proposal Identification Number
PSP	Proposal Solicitation Package
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
ROD	Record of Decision
Regional Water Board	Regional Water Quality Control Board
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan

FOREWORD

SUBMITTAL OF IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 2 PROPOSAL

This Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM), Implementation Grant Program Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) is for the second step of a two-step application process. On March 10, 2006, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the California State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) invited selected Implementation Grant, Step 1 applicants to submit an Implementation Grant, Step 2 Proposal. Submittal of Proposals in this second step is by invitation only. Selected applicants were notified via email on March 10, 2006 of their invitation to submit a Step 2 Proposal (Call Back List). This PSP contains the procedures for submitting Step 2 applications for grant funding and the detailed scoring criteria that augment the IRWM Grant Program Guidelines (Guidelines), November 2004.

Applicant Workshops

DWR and the State Water Board will be hosting three applicant workshops. The dates, times, and locations of the workshops are listed in Section VI, Schedule. At the workshops, staff will provide specific and detailed information regarding the Implementation Grants, Step 2 application process and will afford potential applicants the opportunity to have individual technical assistance sessions to discuss their Proposal and to receive feedback on their Step 1 Proposal. The applicant workshops will be the best opportunity for prospective applicants to get detailed, individualized technical assistance from DWR and the State Water Board and to make contacts with staff that can provide ongoing assistance. Prospective applicants are strongly encouraged to attend a convenient workshop.

To register for the applicant workshop and schedule a technical assistance session for a specific workshop, please contact: Mr. Joe Yun, DWR, at (916) 651-9222.

Fill-able Tables

Applicants are encouraged to use the fill-able excel spreadsheet versions of the various tables provided in this PSP which can be found at the following link:

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

Points of Contact

For questions about this PSP, please contact Mr. Joe Yun, DWR, at (916) 651-9222 (jyun@water.ca.gov) or Mr. Scott Couch, State Water Board, at (916) 341-5658 (scouch@waterboards.ca.gov).

For questions about the State Water Board's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST), please contact FAAST staff by phone at (866) 434-1083, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m.–5 p.m., or by email at faast_admin@waterboards.ca.gov.

For questions regarding the 2005 Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs), please contact:

San Joaquin District, Mr. Luis G Avila, (559) 230-3364, lgavila@water.ca.gov;
 Southern District, Mr. Sergio Fierro, (818) 543-4652, sergiof@water.ca.gov;
 Central District, Ms. Kim E Rosmaier, (916) 227-7584, krosmaie@water.ca.gov;
 Northern District, Mr. Gene Pixley, (530) 529-7392, pixley@water.ca.gov; or
 Headquarters, Mr. David Todd, (916) 651-7027, dtodd@water.ca.gov.

Prospective applicants for IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 2, should read this PSP and the entire IRWM Grant Program Guidelines. Specific attention should be paid to the Implementation Grants, Step 2 evaluation criteria (Guidelines Appendix C, Section C.3) to ensure that the submittal will meet the grant program requirements.

I. INTRODUCTION

Proposition 50, the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002, was passed by California voters in November 2002. This voter approved bond act amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add, among other provisions, § 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 State Water Board.

The Guidelines establish the process used to solicit applications, evaluate Proposals, and award grants under this Grant Program. The Guidelines are posted on both the DWR and the State Water Board websites at:

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

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

Approximately \$150 million is available for implementation grants during the first of two funding cycles. Each grant in this funding cycle is limited to a maximum of \$25 million.

This PSP is specifically for IRWM Implementation Grant, Step 2 applications. In Step 2, the Implementation Grant application must, at a minimum:

- ◆ Have received an invitation from DWR and the State Water Board to submit a Step 2 Proposal;
- ◆ Be submitted by eligible grant recipients (i.e., a public agency or nonprofit organization; see [Guidelines](#), Section III.A); and
- ◆ Include projects from one or more of the water management elements listed in the CWC § 79561 ([Guidelines](#), Section III.C).

DWR and the State Water Board staff will evaluate the IRWM Implementation Grant, Step 2 applications in accordance with the Guidelines and this PSP. This PSP requires applicants to provide specific information regarding their IRWM Plan and the projects in their proposal. Use of the word “proposal” in this PSP refers to the suite of projects presented in the application for grant funding. The purpose of the evaluation criteria is to evaluate each application against competing applications. While project-specific information is required in the application, specific projects will not be viewed individually in regards to funding. Applicants compete and are awarded funding on a proposal basis. However, DWR and the State Water Board reserve the right to refuse funding for specific projects that are not technically sound or ineligible for funding.

II. APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This section provides instructions for preparing and submitting an application. It is important that applicants follow the instructions to ensure that their application will address all of the required elements. Applicants are reminded that, once the application has been submitted to DWR and the State Water Board, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived.

Applicants must submit a complete application online using the FFAST. The on-line FFAST application for the Implementation Grant Program, Step 2 will be available no later than March 17, 2006 at the following secure link:

<https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov>.

Applicants are encouraged to review the FFAST User Manual and Frequently Asked Questions, also available at the above link for questions about completing the online application. **A complete application must be submitted no later than 5:00 p.m. on June 28, 2006.** A complete application consists of all the following items:

1. Electronic submittal of an application through the State Water Board's FFAST system (any attachment exceeding 10 megabytes (MB) in size cannot be uploaded to FFAST, see instructions below).
2. Three (3) hard copies (preferably double-sided) of Attachments 1-17 (as applicable) submitted to the State Water Board.
3. Three (3) hard copies (no electronic submittal) of most recent plans (half-scaled 11 x 17 tabloid) and specifications for each project.
4. A CD containing copies of the referenced material listed in Attachment 8, Scientific and Technical Merit.

All CDs and the cover page of any hard copy documents must be clearly labeled with the applicant name, proposal title, grant program name, and Proposal Identification Number (PIN) (assigned in FFAST). All portions of the application, FFAST submittal, CD, and hard copies must be received by the due date and hour. Late submittals will not be reviewed.

Portions of the Step 2 application will be submitted using FFAST. Only proposals from applicants that have received an invitation from DWR and the State Water Board to submit a Step 2 proposal will be accepted for review. For Step 2, the applicant enters information, answers questions, and adds attachments similar to the procedure using FFAST for Step 1. However, a new PIN will be assigned. When the applicant logs into FFAST using their existing user name and password, their Step 1 proposal will be available as read-only. If needed, responses to questions may be copied from the Step 1 proposal and pasted into a word processor, modified if necessary, then pasted into the Step 2 proposal. Similarly, attachments from a Step 1 proposal may be downloaded onto the applicant's computer, revised if needed, and resubmitted for the Step 2 proposal.

FFAST has a new search tool available to the public to view all proposals, including the attachments. The search tool is located at:

<https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/publicproposalssearch.asp>.

Those applicants working on a combined proposal may wish to create a new FFAST account that can be shared among the group and used to submit the Step 2 application. It is recommended to only open one proposal at a time. If an applicant has more than one FFAST account, it is also recommended to log into FFAST using one account at a time, and close the browser after logging out. If these recommendations are not followed it is possible that information might not be saved correctly.

File size for each attachment submitted via FFAST is limited to 10 MB. Acceptable file formats are: MS Word, MS Excel, MS Project, or PDF. PDF files should be generated, if possible, from the original application file rather than scanned hard copy. Any application attachments larger than 10 MB must be delivered to the State Water Board on a CD and received before the deadline. The address for mailing or hand delivery of hard copy and CD application components is:

Mr. Scott Couch
 State Water Resources Control Board
 Division of Financial Assistance
 1001 I Street, 16th floor
 Sacramento, CA 95814

The grant application in FFAST consists of eight sections outlined in [Table 1](#) – FFAST Checklist, which is provided as a guide for applicants to ensure that they have submitted the required information.

Table 1 – FAAST Checklist

Table 1 – FAAST Checklist	
1.	GENERAL INFORMATION <i>The following fields must be completed:</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Project Title</u> – Provide the title of the Proposal. If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Project Description</u> – Provide the PIN(s) for the Step 1 Proposal. Provide a brief abstract of the Proposal, such as a listing of individual project titles or types. The length of the Project Description is limited to 1,000 characters including spaces and returns. If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Grant Funds Requested</u> – Provide the amount of grant funds requested, in dollars, for the Proposal.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Local Cost Match</u> – “Local Cost Match” is the same as “Funding Match” in the Guidelines. Provide the Funding Match for the Proposal in dollars. A minimum Funding Match of 10% of the total cost of the Proposal is required for IRWM Implementation Grant unless a waiver or reduction of the funding match was requested in Step 1.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Total Budget</u> – Provide the total cost, in dollars, for the Proposal. This amount must agree with the total Proposal cost shown in Attachment 6.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Latitude/Longitude</u> – Enter the latitude/longitude coordinates of the approximate midpoint of the region in degrees using decimal format.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Watershed</u> – Provide the name of watershed the region covers. If the region covers multiple watersheds, list the primary watershed only. Do not enter “multiple”; see Item 7, Q2 below.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>County</u> – Provide the county in which the region is located. If the region covers multiple counties, select “Multiple Counties” from the drop down list. See Item 7, Q1 below.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Responsible Regional Water Board</u> – Provide the name of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) in which the region is located. If the region extends beyond one Regional Water Board boundary, select “Statewide” from the drop down list. If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.
2.	FUNDING PROGRAMS
<input type="checkbox"/>	Select the IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 2 Program. If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.
3.	PROJECT MANAGEMENT
<input type="checkbox"/>	Enter the applicant’s Federal Tax ID. Provide the name and contact information of the Project Manager from the applicant agency or organization that will be the day-to-day contact on this application. Provide the name and the contact information of the Project Director from the applicant agency or organization that will be the Authorized Representative from the applicant organization to submit the application and execute a funding agreement.
4.	LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION
<input type="checkbox"/>	Enter the State assembly, State senate, and U.S. congressional districts in which the region is located (use district numbers only, not the name of the Legislator). For regions that include more than one district, please enter each district. Look at tables provided in FAAST to assist with determining the appropriate districts.
5.	AGENCY CONTACTS
<input type="checkbox"/>	If the applicant has been collaborating with State and federal agencies (DWR, Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, etc.) in Proposal development, enter the agency name, agency contact first and last name, phone, and email address. This information is used to identify individuals who may have an understanding of a Proposal and in no way indicates an advantage or disadvantage in the ranking process.
6.	COOPERATING ENTITIES
<input type="checkbox"/>	Include the entities that have/will assist the applicant in Proposal development or implementation. Provide name(s) of cooperating entity(ies), role/contribution to Proposal, first and last name of entity contact, phone number, and email address.

Table 1 – FAAST Checklist

7.	<p>APPLICATION QUESTIONNAIRE</p> <p><i>The answers to these questions will be used in processing the application and determining eligibility and completeness.</i></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q1. Additional Information: For a region that encompasses multiple counties, list the name of each county.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q2. Additional Information: For a region that encompasses multiple watersheds, list the names of the watersheds other than the primary watershed.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q3. Additional Information: For a region that extends beyond more than one Regional Water Board boundary, list the name of each Regional Water Board.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q4. Step 1 Information: Enter the IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 1 FAAST PIN associated with this Proposal. Has the title of the Proposal changed from Step 1? Yes or No. If the answer is yes, please enter the Step 1 Proposal Title. If multiple proposals are being combined into one Step 2 proposal, provide all of the PINs and Step 1 Proposal Titles.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q5. IRWM Plan Adoption Date: Does the agency or organization have an adopted IRWM Plan or functional equivalent? Yes or No. If the answer is yes, please enter the IRWM Plan adoption date. If the answer is no, please enter the anticipated IRWM Plan adoption date.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q6. Eligibility: List the regional agency or regional water management group members that qualify as urban water suppliers and will receive funding from the proposed grant (Guidelines, Section III). If there are none, so indicate.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q7. Objectives: Briefly describe how the proposal helps achieve the objectives of the IRWM Plan.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q8. Changes from Step 1 to Step 2: Has the IRWM Plan or Proposal been altered since submitting the Step 1 grant application? Yes or No. If yes, the applicant must complete Attachment 14 – Changes from Step 1 to Step 2.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q9. Modification of River or Stream Channel: Does the Proposal include a project that will modify a river or stream channel? Yes or No. If yes, the applicant must complete Attachment 15 – Modification of River or Stream Channel.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q10. CALFED Record of Decision (ROD) Consistency: Does the Proposal assist in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals? Yes or No. If yes, the applicant must complete Attachment 16 – CALFED ROD Consistency.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q11. Letters of Support or Opposition: Are there any letters of support or opposition for the Proposal or individual projects contained within the Proposal? Yes or No. If yes, the applicant must complete Attachment 17 – Letters of Support or Opposition.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q12. Additional Information: Is the applicant or cooperating entity in default for any water rights permit requirements, including fee payment. Yes or No. If yes, please explain.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Q13. Additional Information: Does the Proposal contain projects that have potential implications with respect to conflict between water users, water rights disputes, and/or interregional water rights issues? Yes or No. If yes, please explain.</p>

Table 1 – FFAST Checklist

Attachment #	Attachment Title
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 1 Authorization and Eligibility Requirements
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 2 Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 3 Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 4 Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 5 Work Plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 6 Budget
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 7 Schedule
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 8 Scientific and Technical Merit
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 9 Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 10 Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 11 Other Expected Benefits
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 12 Program Preferences
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 13 Statewide Priorities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 14 Changes from Step 1 to Step 2 (If Applicable)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 15 Modification of River or Stream Channel (If Applicable)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 16 CALFED ROD Consistency (If Applicable)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 17 Letters of Support or Opposition (If Applicable)

FAAST allows an applicant to save an application in progress online and submit the application when the applicant has gathered and entered all requested information. **Applicants are strongly encouraged to review their complete application prior to executing the submit function in FFAST. Once an application has been submitted, no further modifications, additions, or deletions will be allowed.** After the application is submitted, an automated confirmation email will be sent to the applicant confirming the date and time of submission. **Applicants are strongly encouraged to avoid last minute submittals to allow time for FFAST staff assistance should any submittal problems occur.**

To print out a blank copy of the entire application:

1. Initiate a new application and fill out the following three fields on the first page: “Project Title”, “Project Description”, and “Responsible Regional Water Board.” Applicants can come back to edit these fields later.
2. Click on the “Save and Continue” button to initiate the application process.

3. Click on the “Preview/Submit Application” button and select the “Print” option from the browser “File” menu.

Non-Profit Organizations: If the applicant is a nonprofit organization, the applicant must use the organization name that is registered with the California Secretary of State: <http://kepler.ss.ca.gov/list.html>. If a different name was initially used, please see **FAAST User Manual**, Section V.A. (<https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov>) for instructions on changing the name.

Within FAAST, pull-down menus, text boxes, or multiple-choice selections will be used to receive answers to the questions. FAAST will allow applicants to type text or cut and paste information from other documents directly into a FAAST submittal screen.

When uploading an attachment in FAAST, the following attachment title naming convention must be used:

Att#_IG2_PIN_AttachmentName_#ofTotal#

Where:

- ◆ “Att#” is the attachment number;
- ◆ “IG2” for Implementation Grants, Step 2;
- ◆ “PIN” is the applicant’s 4-digit Step 2 PIN assigned by FAAST;
- ◆ “AttachmentName” is the name of the attachment as specified in Section IV – Requirements for Attachments; and
- ◆ “#ofTotal#” identifies the number of files that make up an attachment, where “#” is the number of a file and “Total#” is the total number of files submitted in the attachment.

For example, if Attachment 5 – Work Plan for applicant with PIN “1234” is made up of 3 files, the second file in the set would be named “Att5_IG2_1234_WorkPlan_2of3”.

FAAST tracks attachments by an attachment title, not by file name. The file name field in FAAST requires a computer path to the file location on the applicant’s computer. While not required, applicants should name their individual files on their computer the same as the attachment title to simplify personal file management. Do not use special characters such as dashes, asterisks, symbols, spaces, percentage signs, etc when naming individual files. Underscores are acceptable, as shown above. If an applicant needs help on FAAST, see the Foreword of this PSP for the appropriate contact information.

III. CONDITIONS FOR EXECUTION OF GRANT AGREEMENT

In the event that an applicant is selected for grant funding, the following conditions will need to be met prior to execution of a grant agreement:

- ◆ **Fiscal Statements:** The Grantee must submit copies of the most recent three years of audited financial statements, for each agency or organization proposed to receive grant funding for a selected Proposal. The submittal must also include: 1) balance sheets, statements of sources of income and uses of funds, a summary description of existing debts including bonds, and the most recent annual budget; 2) separate details for the water enterprise fund, if applicable to an agency or organization; 3) a list of all cash reserves, restricted and unrestricted, and any planned uses of those reserves; and 4) any loans required for project funding and a description of the repayment method of any such loans.
- ◆ **CEQA/NEPA:** Grantee must demonstrate that it has complied with all applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by submitting copies of the appropriate environmental documents.

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR ATTACHMENTS

Attachments 1 through 13 are required attachments for all IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 2 Proposals. Lack of any Attachments 1 through 13 will make the application incomplete, and it will not be reviewed or considered for funding

([Guidelines](#), Section V.E). In addition, applicants may need to submit one or more of Attachments 14 through 17. If the applicable additional attachment(s) is/are not provided, the application will be deemed incomplete and will not be reviewed or considered for funding. The Guidelines ([Guidelines](#), Appendix C, Sections C.3 and C.4) and this PSP must be followed in developing the attachments.

A discussion of each of these attachments is provided below and the Attachments and associated Exhibits are summarized in Table 2 – Summary of Attachments and Corresponding Exhibits.

Table 2 – Summary of Attachments and Corresponding Exhibits		
Attachment ¹	Exhibit ²	Comment
Attachment 1 – Authorization and Eligibility Requirements		Eligibility
Attachment 2 – Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards		Eligibility
Attachment 3 – Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption		Scored
Attachment 4 – Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards		Scored
Attachment 5 – Work Plan	A	Scored
Attachment 6 – Budget	B	Scored
Attachment 7 – Schedule		Scored
Attachment 8 – Scientific and Technical Merit		Scored
Attachment 9 – Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures		Scored
Attachment 10 – Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits	C	Scored
Attachment 11 – Other Expected Benefits	D	Scored
Attachment 12 – Program Preferences		Scored
Attachment 13 – Statewide Priorities		Scored
Attachment 14 – Changes from Step 1 to Step 2		If Applicable
Attachment 15 – Modification of River or Stream Channel		If Applicable
Attachment 16 – CALFED ROD Consistency	E	If Applicable
Attachment 17 – Letters of Support or Opposition		If Applicable

- 1) The attachment discussion below provides the applicant with general directions regarding the content of each attachment.
- 2) The exhibit discussion provides specific direction regarding what information is to be submitted in the associated attachment.

Attachment 1 Authorization and Eligibility Requirements

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Eligible” for this attachment. Attachment 1 is mandatory and consists of authorization and eligibility documentation including the Urban Water Management Planning Act Compliance and Groundwater Management Plan Compliance. In Attachment 1 please provide:

- ◆ Authorizing Documentation: The grantee must provide a resolution adopted by the grantee’s governing body designating an authorized representative to submit the application and execute an agreement with the State of California for an Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Grant. The following text box provides an example resolution.

The following is an example resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. _____

Resolved by the <Insert name of governing body, city council, organization, or other> of the <Insert name of agency, city council, organization, or other>, that application be made to the California Department of Water Resources and State Water Resources Control Board to obtain an Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Grant pursuant to the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Water Code Section 79560 et seq.), and to enter into an agreement to receive a grant for the: <Insert name of proposal>. The <Insert title – Presiding Officer, President, Agency Manager, or other officer> of the <Insert name of agency, city, county, organization, or other > is hereby authorized and directed to prepare the necessary data, conduct investigations, file such application, and execute a grant agreement with California Department of Water Resources or State Water Resources Control Board.

Passed and adopted at a meeting of the <Insert name of agency, city, county, organization, or other> on <Insert date>.

Authorized Original Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____

Clerk/Secretary: _____

- ◆ **Eligible Applicant Documentation:** Eligible applicants are public agencies, including cities, counties, districts, joint powers authorities, a state agency or department, or other political subdivisions of the State or non-profit organizations that are a California Corporation organized under Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the federal internal revenue code. The Grantee must provide a written statement containing the appropriate information outlined below:

- ◆ **Public Agencies**

1. Is the applicant a public agency as defined in the [Guidelines](#), Section III? Please explain.
2. What is the statutory or other legal authority under which the applicant was formed and is authorized to operate?
3. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State of California?
4. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.

- ◆ **Non-Profit Organizations**

1. Is the applicant a non-profit agency as defined in the [Guidelines](#), Section III? Please explain.
2. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State of California?
3. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.
4. Include a copy of the certificate of incorporation for the organization.

Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) – [Guidelines](#), Section III.B identified compliance with the Urban Water Management Act (Act) as an Eligibility Criterion. Urban water suppliers (Supplier) are required to file an UWMP at least once every five years, on or before December 31, in years ending in five and zero. The 2005 UWMPs were due by December 31, 2005 and will be reviewed by DWR staff on a continuous basis to determine whether or not the UWMPs are complete, i.e. in full compliance with the Act. DWR will provide the Supplier who prepared the UWMP with a review letter indicating whether the UWMP is complete or incomplete. For assistance see the Foreword of this PSP for the appropriate contact person.

Applicants and participating agencies that are urban water suppliers and which have projects that would receive funding through an IRWM Implementation grant must have their 2005 UWMP deemed complete by DWR, before DWR and the State Water Board approve the Step 2 Implementation grant awards (See Section VI – Schedule of the PSP). For UWMPs

that are deemed complete after the Step 2 application submittal date but prior to the approval of grant awards, an electronic copy of the DWR review letter must be emailed to Ms. Tracie Billington at tracieb@water.ca.gov upon receipt of that letter.

- ◆ If the Supplier adopted a 2005 UWMP by December 31, 2005, submitted it to DWR within thirty days of that date, and received a review letter stating the 2005 UWMP was complete (in compliance with the UWMP Act), include a copy of the review letter in Attachment 1.
- ◆ If the Supplier adopted a 2005 UWMP by December 31, 2005, submitted it to DWR within thirty days of that date, and received a review letter stating that the 2005 UWMP was incomplete (not in compliance with the UWMP Act), the applicant is encouraged to contact the DWR District representative who reviewed the UWMP for technical assistance (see the Foreword for the appropriate contact person) and to use the review letter to revise the 2005 UWMP for re-submittal. DWR will review the revised 2005 UWMP and issue another review letter.
- ◆ If the Supplier has submitted a 2005 UWMP, but DWR has yet to review it, please indicate in Attachment 1 when it was submitted to DWR.
- ◆ If the Supplier did not submit a 2005 UWMP by January 30, 2006, it must be submitted as soon as possible, so that DWR can review the 2005 UWMP and make a completeness determination. Indicate in Attachment 1 when the UWMP will be submitted to DWR.

Groundwater Management Plan Compliance – Guidelines, Section III.B identified Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) compliance as an Eligibility Criterion. For groundwater management and recharge projects and for projects with potential groundwater impacts, either positive or negative, the applicant or the participating agency responsible for such projects must provide in Attachment 1 the following, as applicable:

- ◆ If the Proposal does not contain a groundwater management or recharge project or none of the projects in the Proposal have a potential to impact groundwater, either positively or negative, so indicate, and include in Attachment 1 the justification for such a conclusion.
- ◆ Identification of projects in the Proposal that involve any groundwater management or groundwater recharge or may have either positive or negative groundwater impacts.
- ◆ The agency(ies) that will implement such project(s).
- ◆ The status of the applicable GWMP compliance option as described below:
 - ◆ The applicant or participating agency has prepared and implemented a GWMP that is in compliance with CWC § 10753.7.
 - ◆ The applicant or participating agency participates or consents to be subject to a GWMP, basin-wide management plan, or other IRWM program or plan that meets the requirements of CWC § 10753.7.
 - ◆ The applicant or participating agency conforms to the requirements of an adjudication of water rights in the subject groundwater basin.
 - ◆ The applicant or participating agency is in the process of revising the GWMP to be compliant with CWC § 10753. In which case, Attachment 1 must state the estimated date for adoption, which must be within 1 year of submittal of the Step 2 Implementation Grant application (i.e., before June 8, 2007).
- ◆ Copies of applicable GWMP.

For applicant's whose IRWM Plan has not changed from Step 1, the applicant has the option of either accepting its Step 1 score for the IRWM Plan portion of the score or submitting the information detailed below. If the applicant chooses to retain its Step 1 score do not provide the information detailed below. Instead provide separate Attachments 2, 3, and 4 stating that the applicant wishes to retain its Step 1 score. Also provide the Step 1 PIN.

Attachment 2 Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards

For the "AttachmentName", following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use "MinStd" for this attachment.

Document how the IRWM Plan meets each of the Minimum IRWM Plan Standards presented in the Guidelines and provide a reference to the page of the IRWM Plan where this is evident. To be eligible for funding, the applicant must document that its IRWM Plan meets the Minimum IRWM Plan Standards. This is a pass/fail criterion. Attachment 2 must be no more than 2 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

Attachment 3 Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption

For the "AttachmentName", following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use "IRWMPlan" for this attachment. Please submit your IRWM Plan and proof of adoption.

For applicants with an adopted IRWM Plan or functionally equivalent plans – submit an electronic copy of the adopted plan with proof of formal adoption (i.e. a signature page, with dates of signature) for all agencies and organizations approving the plan or other documentation that the plan has been adopted.

For applicants without an adopted IRWM Plan or functionally equivalent plans – submit an electronic copy of the most recent draft Plan or functionally equivalent plan in its most current state. If a Plan has not been adopted, then the applicant must also provide a detailed schedule showing the major steps and milestones needed to ensure that a Plan will be adopted no later than January 1, 2007.

Attachment 4 Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards

For the "AttachmentName", following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use "ConsisStand" for this attachment.

Using the requirements shown in Guidelines, Appendix A, document how the IRWM Plan addresses each standard listed. Structure Attachment 4 such that it has sub-sections that address each standard shown in the Guidelines, Appendix A., i.e. "A. Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group", "B. Region Description", etc. Within each sub-section document how the IRWM Plan meets each standard and provide a reference to the page(s) of the IRWM Plan where this is evident. The length of Attachment 4 must be limited to no more than 6 pages using a minimum 10-point type font.

The Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule, Attachments 5, 6, and 7, deal specifically with the Proposal and are used to evaluate whether the projects are implementable and the applicant's readiness to proceed. Attachment 5, 6, and 7 relate to one another and each should support the other. For example, if the work plan is detailed, the budget estimate should be equally detailed. Lump sum costs in the budget may indicate a work item that is less implementable. The detail and accuracy of the work plan and budget should support the readiness presented in the schedule. Work items that are not detailed or are unclear indicate to a reviewer that the items are not ready to proceed.

Attachment 5 Work Plan

For the "AttachmentName", following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use "WorkPlan" for this attachment. See Exhibit A of this PSP for detailed guidance on preparing this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 5; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

The work plan contains summary descriptions of all the projects constituting the Proposal and tasks (work items) necessary to complete each project in the Proposal. The work plan must be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that the

Proposal is ready for implementation. Work item submittals (e.g. deliverables) should be identified in the Work Plan. The Work Plan should identify linkages between and among projects that are critical to the success of the regional effort.

Attachment 6 Budget

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Budget” for this attachment. See Exhibit B for detailed guidance on preparation of this attachment.

For each project contained in the Proposal, provide detailed budget documentation supporting the costs shown in Table B-1, Budget. Table B-1 must be completed for each project in the Proposal and another form must be completed as a summary or roll-up budget for the entire Proposal. In addition, a detailed estimate of costs that supports the budget must be completed. For each budget category shown in Table B-1, there may be several work items and sub work items (e.g. tasks and sub-tasks). The work items and sub work items shown in the Work Plan, Attachment 5, and Schedule, Attachment 7, should agree with the information shown in Attachment 6.

Applicants must consider the relevant labor code compliance requirements and the applicability of prevailing wage laws in developing the budget (Guidelines, Section IV).

Attachment 7 Schedule

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Schedule” for this attachment.

Applicants must submit a schedule showing the sequence and timing of work items presented in the Proposal. The schedule must be consistent with the Work Plan and must show May 1, 2007, as the assumed effective date of the grant agreement. The schedule must show the start and end dates as well as milestones for each work item contained in the Work Plan and should be in a horizontal bar or Gantt chart format. An assumed end date of the grant agreement will not be established by DWR and the State Water Board, instead applicants must include a reasonable estimate of the end date, based on their Proposal including time for any final reports and invoicing.

Work items may overlap. Applicants should show any dependence on predecessors by showing links between work items. If the IRWM PLAN has not been adopted, also include in the schedule the remaining milestones and dates for plan adoption. The schedule does not need to include any post construction monitoring.

For Proposals utilizing a draft IRWM Plan, note any delays in the schedule to adopt the IRWM Plan, paying particular attention to whether the IRWM Plan will be adopted by January 1, 2007.

Attachment 8 Scientific and Technical Merit

Attachment 8, Scientific and Technical Merit is used to verify that appropriate background data gathering and studies have been performed in the development of the Proposal and to assess the Proposal’s ability to produce the benefits claimed. Applicants should note that the technical information provided in this Attachment will also be used in evaluating the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule (Attachments 5-7). Furthermore, applicants must provide detailed technical information enabling a reviewer to understand and verify benefits that are claimed in Attachment 10, Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits and Attachment 11, Other Expected Benefits. If the benefits claimed in Attachments 10 and 11 are not based on sound technical analysis, it may result in lower scores in Attachments 10 and 11. If the relevant supporting information requested for Attachment 10 is provided in other Attachments, then reference the exact location, including page numbers, where the information can be found.

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “SciTech” for this attachment. Attachment 8 must be no more than 20 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

This attachment describes the scientific and technical merit of the Proposal and includes an assessment of the: 1) technical adequacy of the data and analysis used in developing each project contained in the Proposal and 2) feasibility of each project. In Attachment 8, applicants must submit the following items:

- ◆ A discussion for each project in the proposal that lists and briefly describes the data and studies that have been collected and performed that support the projects’ site location, feasibility, and technical methods. Include references to the page locations of the studies or reports that support the claims made in this discussion. See [Section II](#) for instructions on submitting such studies, reports, or other reference materials.

- ◆ Discussion of any project data gaps and references to work items in the Work Plan that would fill the data gaps.

Attachment 9 Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Measures” for this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 9; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

This attachment presents the planned project monitoring, assessment, and performance measures that will demonstrate that the Proposal will meet its intended goals, achieve measurable outcomes, and provide value to the State of California. All grant recipients will be required to prepare a Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP) at the initiation of implementation to outline how they will assess and evaluate performance and report on Proposal achievements. The PAEP lays out an evaluation and assessment process based on Proposal goals and outcomes, drawing from the results of grant products and deliverables. The purpose of Attachment 9 is to provide a preview of the information that will be included in the PAEP.

For Attachment 9, applicants are required to submit Project Performance Measures Tables specific to their Proposal. Project Performance Measures Tables should include: project goals, desired outcomes, output indicators (measures to effectively track output), outcome indicators (measures to evaluate change that is a direct result of the work), measurement tools and methods, and targets (measurable targets that are feasible to meet during the life of the proposal). Additional guidance, including example Project Performance Measure Tables, can be found at the following State Water Board website:

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/paep.html>

A Project Performance Measures Table should be submitted for each project included in the Proposal. When multiple projects carry the same goals and outcomes, a combined table can be developed to cover those projects. The measurement parameters (metrics) should fit the performance evaluation needs of the Proposal. The metrics may include water quality measurements, measurement-based estimates of pollution load reductions, acres of habitat successfully restored, feet of stream channel stabilized, additional acre-feet of water supply, improved water supply reliability and flexibility, groundwater level measurements, stream flow measurements, improved flood control, or other quantitative measures or indicators.

If the applicant has a completed PAEP, Monitoring Plans (MP), or Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), those documents may be submitted with Attachment 9, as supporting documentation. DWR or the State Water Board must approve the PAEP, MP, and/or QAPP prior to initiation of any monitoring supported by grant funds.

Attachment 10 Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “WSWQBen” for this attachment. See Exhibit C for detailed guidance on the preparation of this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 10; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

This attachment deals with estimating and presenting the costs and benefits of water supply and water quality aspects of the Proposal. A qualitative analysis can be provided if it is not feasible to quantify the benefits and the applicant provides adequate justification. If possible, water supply and water quality benefits should be quantified either in economic terms or physical terms. The evaluation of water supply and water quality benefits is structured such that either water quality or water supply projects could achieve the highest score possible for this scoring criterion.

The information contained in Attachment 10 will be evaluated by DWR and the State Water Board against the Scoring Criterion and will be used for “comparative analysis” of one grant application against another grant application and not as a means for DWR and the State Water Board to select an individual project from within a Proposal for funding.

Attachment 11 Other Expected Benefits

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “OtherBen” for this attachment. See Exhibit D for detailed guidance on the preparation of this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 11; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

Benefits derived from the Proposal may extend beyond the water supply or water quality benefits described in Attachment 10 (see above). This attachment allows applicants to claim benefits other than water supply and water quality

benefits. Qualitative analysis is acceptable if it is not feasible to quantify the benefits and the applicant provides adequate justification.

Attachment 12 Program Preferences

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Preference” for this attachment. Attachment 12 must be no more than 10 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

Submit a discussion on how the Proposal assists in meeting the Program Preference(s) described in Guidelines, Section II.E. The discussion must identify the specific Program Preference(s) that the Proposal will meet; the certainty that the Proposal will meet the Program Preference(s); and the breadth and magnitude to which the Program Preference(s) will be met. Meeting the Program Preference(s) identified by the applicant will become a condition of the grant agreement in the event that the Proposal is awarded grant funding.

Attachment 13 Statewide Priorities

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Priority” for this attachment. Attachment 13 must be no more than 10 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

Submit a discussion on how the Proposal assists in meeting the Statewide Priority(ies) as described in Guidelines, Section II.F. Present the Statewide Priorities discussions separately. The discussion must identify the specific Statewide Priorities that the Proposal will meet; the certainty that the Proposal will meet the Statewide Priority(ies); and the breadth and magnitude to which the Statewide Priority(ies) will be met. Meeting the Statewide Priority(ies) identified by the applicant will become a condition of the grant agreement in the event that the Proposal is awarded grant funding.

Attachment 14 Changes from Step 1 to Step 2 (If Applicable)

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Changes” for this attachment. Attachment 14 is required if the IRWM PLAN or Proposal were changed from Step 1 to Step 2. Attachment 14 must be no more than 10 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font.

In Attachment 14, the applicant must clearly identify and discuss differences between the Step 1 and Step 2. In general, those differences must be limited to necessary modifications to improve the IRWM Plan or Proposal, changes needed to reduce the grant request to \$25 million, and changes to schedules that reflect revised information. The applicant must ensure that the changes to the IRWM Plan or Proposal maintain or improve the quality of the application. DWR and the State Water Board will make a determination of continued eligibility for an implementation grant.

As applicable, the application must detail changes to the following:

- ◆ Applicant – In the event the applicant has changed, please identify the Step 1 applicant name and the basis for the change.
- ◆ Consolidated Regions – In the event that regions, as presented in Step 1, have been consolidated in Step 2, please discuss how the separate IRWM Plans and Proposals that were evaluated in Step 1 were consolidated or coordinated to ensure effective water management for the consolidated region.
- ◆ Changes in Region Boundaries – If the region boundaries have changed since the Step 1 application, describe the changes and the reason for the changes. In addition, submit GIS files that describe the new regional boundary. The GIS files should be submitted together in a zip file. GIS files must include as a minimum those files with file extensions of “shp”, “shx”, “dbf”, and “prj.” The region boundaries will be used by DWR and the State Water Board to locate and display the IRWM regions that the various applicants have established. Please use the base layer found at the following link: <http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/grants/integregio.cfm> to check compatibility of coordinate system, datum, and projection.
- ◆ Disadvantaged Communities – Submit only information that is required to document the changes from the Step 1 application. This includes, but is not limited to, explanation, data, or calculation; however, there is no requirement to resubmit all data or calculations from Step 1. Supply enough information so that the reviewers can understand the changes and impacts of those changes in terms of disadvantaged communities.

Attachment 15 Modification of River or Stream Channel (If Applicable)

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “ChannelMod” for this attachment. There is no page limitation for Attachment 15; however, applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise.

Attachment 15 must be completed for any Proposal that includes a project that modifies a river or stream channel. The applicant must provide documentation that the environmental impacts resulting from such modification will be fully mitigated, considering all of the impacts of the modification and any mitigation, environmental enhancement, and environmental benefit resulting from the project. Also, the applicant should address whether, on balance, any environmental enhancement or benefit equals or exceeds any negative environmental impacts of the project. If DWR and the State Water Board determine that on-balance environmental impacts of such modifications will not be fully mitigated, the corresponding portion of the Proposal will not be eligible for grant funding ([Guidelines](#), Section IV.D).

Attachment 16 CALFED ROD Consistency (If Applicable)

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “CALFEDROD” for this attachment.

Attachment 16 must be completed for Proposals that assist in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals. Such Proposals must be consistent with the CALFED Programmatic ROD and must be implemented, to the maximum extent possible, through local and regional programs. Please complete Form 1 contained in [Exhibit E](#) of this PSP for each project within the Proposal that assists in meeting the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals ([Guidelines](#), Section IV.F).

Attachment 17 Letters of Support or Opposition (If Applicable)

For the “AttachmentName”, following the naming convention shown in [Section II](#) of this PSP, use “Letters” for this attachment.

Attachment 17 must be used to submit electronic copies of any letters of support for or opposition to the Proposal or individual projects contained within the Proposal. General letters of support or opposition will not be considered. Letters of support or opposition must clearly state how the implementation of the proposal/project will benefit or adversely impact the individual or entity providing the letter. Letters submitted later than the application due date either electronically or hard copy **will not** be considered by the technical reviewers. All letters should be addressed to:

Ms. Shahla Farahnak
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Financial Assistance
1001 I Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Ms. Tracie Billington
Department of Water Resources
Division of Planning and Local Assistance
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

V APPLICATION SCORING PROCESS

The entire review process is discussed in detail in Guidelines, Section V.G. Applications will first be screened for eligibility and completeness in accordance with Guidelines, Section V. Applications that are complete and eligible will be scored based on the evaluation criteria presented in Table 3 of this PSP. Table 3 consists of ranking criteria in three subject areas with the possible point assignments as follows:

- ◆ Adequacy of the IRWM Plan – 30 points
- ◆ Adequacy of the Proposal – 80 points
- ◆ Statewide Priorities – 30 points

Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with a 1 being “low” and a 5 being “high.” The score for each criterion will then be multiplied by the weighting factor shown in Table 3 of this PSP. Please note that the score of the IRWM Plan which had a maximum possible score of 60 points in Step1, will be reduced by one-half by dividing the final IRWM Plan score by 2. Possible scores range from a minimum score of 28 points to a maximum possible score of 140 points.

Where standard scoring criteria is applied points will be assigned for a criterion as follows:

- ◆ A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.
- ◆ A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale.
- ◆ A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and/or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.
- ◆ A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed.
- ◆ A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed or no documentation or rationale is presented.

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
Adequacy of IRWM Plan				
<p>Consistency with Minimum Standards <i>This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards</i></p>				Pass/Fail
<p>Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption <i>Formal adoption must be documented by a resolution or other written documentation officially accepting the Plan, with signatures and dates of signatures for the regional agency or all of the agencies and organizations involved in the Plan.</i></p>	1	1-5		<p>A score of 5 will be awarded if the applicant has a Plan that has been formally adopted by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The governing body of the regional agency authorized to develop the Plan and has responsibility for implementation of the Plan; or • The governing bodies of the agencies and organizations that participated in the development of the Plan and have responsibility for implementation of the Plan. <p>A score of 4 will be awarded for those applicants with a Plan in place, but where it can only be confirmed that a majority of the necessary participants have formally adopted the Plan.</p> <p>A score of 3 will be awarded for those applicants with a Plan in place, but where it can only be confirmed that less than half of necessary participants have formally adopted the Plan.</p> <p>A score of 2 will be awarded for those applicants with a Plan in place, but where documentation of adoption by any participants is not provided. A score of 2 will also be awarded to applicants that demonstrate a schedule for adoption of a Plan under development by January 1, 2007, and can demonstrate involvement of a majority of necessary participants.</p> <p>A score of 1 will be awarded for applicants that have not formally adopted a Plan, and do not have a schedule to adopt the Plan by the January 1, 2007 deadline.</p>

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
<p>Description of Region</p> <p><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></p> <p>Was a map or maps, with accompanying descriptive narrative, showing the region encompassed by the IRWM Plan provided?</p> <p>Did the map/maps include appropriate internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region?</p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan describe the current and future water resources of the region?</p> <p>Did the applicant explain why the region is an appropriate area for regional water management?</p> <p>Did the applicant describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region?</p> <p>Did the applicant describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon? Were important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries discussed?</p> <p>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>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Objectives</p> <p><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></p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan identify regional planning objectives and the manner in which they were determined?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region covered by the Plan?</p>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
<p>Water Management Strategies and Integration</p> <p><i>In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on how well the IRWM Plan integrates a wide range of water management strategies.</i></p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan describe the range of water management strategies that were considered to meet the objectives of the plan?</p> <p>Was a brief discussion of why a water management strategy was not applicable provided?</p> <p>Did the applicant discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives?</p> <p>Was a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies provided?</p>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Priorities and Schedule</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan has adequately described the priorities of the region.</i></p> <p>Was a presentation of regional priorities for implementation provided?</p> <p>Did the applicant identify short-term and long-term implementation priorities?</p> <p>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>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
<p>Implementation</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is implementable and implementation steps are well documented.</i></p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented?</p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan include timelines for active or planned projects?</p> <p>Did the applicant identify the entities responsible for project implementation?</p> <p>Were the linkages or interdependence between projects clearly identified?</p> <p>Was the economic and technical feasibility of projects demonstrated on a programmatic level?</p> <p>Was the current status of each element of the IRWM Plan presented?</p> <p>Was the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation discussed?</p>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Impacts and Regional Benefits</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan clearly and fully describes the impacts and regional benefits of the Plan.</i></p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan include an evaluation of potential negative impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from its implementation?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan include the advantages of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts?</p> <p>If applicable, does the IRWM Plan identify interregional benefits and impacts?</p> <p>If applicable, did the applicant describe the benefits to disadvantaged communities?</p> <p>Was an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources provided?</p>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Technical Analysis and Plan Performance</p> <p><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></p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in selection of water management strategies?</p> <p>Were data gaps identified?</p> <p>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>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
<p>Data Management</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan provides for management of data generated during plan development and implementation</i></p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public?</p> <p>Was a discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs provided?</p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan assess the state of existing monitoring efforts, both for water supply and water quality?</p> <p>If applicable, did the IRWM Plan discuss the integration of data into the State Water Board’s Surface Water Ambient Monitoring and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment Programs?</p>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Financing</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of projects.</i></p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for plan implementation?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects?</p>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is well coordinated with local planning and management efforts.</i></p> <p>Did the IRWM Plan discuss how the identified actions, projects, or studies relate to planning documents established by local agencies?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers?</p> <p>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?</p>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
<p>Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether development and implementation of the IRWM Plan includes stakeholder involvement through a collaborative regional process</i></p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan identify stakeholders and the process used for inclusion of stakeholders in development of the plan?</p> <p>Does the process include a discussion of how:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Stakeholders are identified, o They participate in planning and implementation efforts, and o They can influence decisions made regarding water management? <p>Did the IRWM Plan document public outreach activities specific to individual stakeholder groups?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Are partnerships developed during the planning process discussed?</p> <p>Did the application discuss environmental justice concerns?</p> <p>Did the application discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process?</p> <p>Were any possible obstacles to IRWM Plan implementation identified?</p> <p>Was coordination with State or federal agencies discussed?</p> <p>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>	1	1-5		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Sub-total for IRWM Plan</p>	0.5	6-30		For applicants who's IRWM Plan has not changed from Step 1 and the applicant has chosen to accepting its Step 1 score for the IRWM Plan portion of the score, use that score and apply the weighting factor.

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
Adequacy of Proposal				
<p>Work Plan</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the Proposal.</i></p> <p>Does the work plan contain an introduction that includes: a) goals and objectives of the proposal; b) a tabulated overview of projects which includes an abstract and project status; c) a map showing relative project locations; and d) a discussion of the synergies or linkages among projects?</p> <p>Are work items for each project of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented?</p> <p>Do the work items include appropriate work item submittals (i.e., quarterly and final reports, PAEP)?</p> <p>Do the work items collectively implement the Proposal?</p> <p>Does the Work Plan include a listing of permits and their status including CEQA compliance?</p> <p>Are the submitted plans and specifications consistency with the design tasks included in the Work Plan?</p>	3	3–15		Standard Scoring Criteria
<p>Budget</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the Proposal.</i></p> <p>Was a summary budget provided for the Proposal and detailed budgets provided for each project contained in the Proposal?</p> <p>Do the items shown in the budget generally agree with the work items shown in the Work Plan and Schedule?</p> <p>Are the detailed costs shown for each project reasonable?</p> <p>Are all the costs shown in the budget supported by documentation, if required, and is that documentation complete?</p>	1	1–5		<p>5 A score of 5 points will be awarded where the budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 6; the costs are reasonable, and all the budget categories of Exhibit B are thoroughly supported.</p> <p>4 A score of 4 points will be awarded where the budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 6 and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the budget categories of Exhibit B are not fully supported or lack detail.</p> <p>3 A score of 3 points will be awarded where the budgets for most of the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 6, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the budget categories described in Exhibit B.</p> <p>2 A score of 2 points will be awarded where the budgets for less than half the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 6, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking for all of the budget categories described in Exhibit B.</p> <p>1 A score of 1 will be awarded where there is no detailed budget information provided for any of the proposed projects.</p>

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard												
<p>Funding Match <i>Scoring will be based on the percent of funding match to the total proposal costs. The funding match percentage is presented in Exhibit B, Budget.</i></p> <p>Is the funding match at least 10% of the total cost of the Proposal, unless a reduction or waiver in the funding match has been submitted? – <i>This is a Pass/Fail criterion.</i></p> <p>What is the percentage of the funding match as compared to the total cost of the Proposal?</p>	1	1–5		<p>For applicants that have requested a funding match reduction or waiver assign a score of 3. For all other applicant use the funding match percentage calculated in Table B-1 to assign the score.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 358 1136 423">5</td> <td data-bbox="1136 358 2003 423">60% or greater</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 423 1136 488">4</td> <td data-bbox="1136 423 2003 488">45–59.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 488 1136 553">3</td> <td data-bbox="1136 488 2003 553">30–44.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 553 1136 618">2</td> <td data-bbox="1136 553 2003 618">20–29.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 618 1136 683">1</td> <td data-bbox="1136 618 2003 683">10.0–19.9 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 683 1136 805">Pass/ Fail</td> <td data-bbox="1136 683 2003 805"><10 – Proposal will not be reviewed and will not be considered for funding.</td> </tr> </table>	5	60% or greater	4	45–59.9%	3	30–44.9%	2	20–29.9%	1	10.0–19.9 %	Pass/ Fail	<10 – Proposal will not be reviewed and will not be considered for funding.
5	60% or greater															
4	45–59.9%															
3	30–44.9%															
2	20–29.9%															
1	10.0–19.9 %															
Pass/ Fail	<10 – Proposal will not be reviewed and will not be considered for funding.															
<p>Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the Proposal and on the readiness to proceed with the Proposal.</i></p> <p>Does the schedule correspond to the work items described in the Work Plan?</p> <p>Given the work item descriptions in Attachment 5, does the schedule seem reasonable?</p> <p>How many months occur between the assumed contract execution date and the start of construction for the earliest of the Proposal projects?</p>	1	1–5		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 805 1136 902">5</td> <td data-bbox="1136 805 2003 902">A score of 5 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of all elements of the Proposal by December 1, 2007.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 902 1136 1032">4</td> <td data-bbox="1136 902 2003 1032">A score of 4 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation one or more of the elements of the Proposal by December 1, 2007.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 1032 1136 1130">3</td> <td data-bbox="1136 1032 2003 1130">A score of 3 points will be awarded if the schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after December 1, 2007 but before June 1, 2008.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 1130 1136 1243">2</td> <td data-bbox="1136 1130 2003 1243">A score of 2 points will be awarded if the schedule is clearly not consistent, not reasonably achievable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after June 1, 2008 but before December 1, 2008.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1073 1243 1136 1390">1</td> <td data-bbox="1136 1243 2003 1390">A score of 1 point will be awarded if the schedule does not follow the work items presented in the work plan and budget, is clearly not reasonable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after December 1, 2008.</td> </tr> </table>	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of all elements of the Proposal by December 1, 2007.	4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation one or more of the elements of the Proposal by December 1, 2007.	3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after December 1, 2007 but before June 1, 2008.	2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the schedule is clearly not consistent, not reasonably achievable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after June 1, 2008 but before December 1, 2008.	1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the schedule does not follow the work items presented in the work plan and budget, is clearly not reasonable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after December 1, 2008.		
5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of all elements of the Proposal by December 1, 2007.															
4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation one or more of the elements of the Proposal by December 1, 2007.															
3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after December 1, 2007 but before June 1, 2008.															
2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the schedule is clearly not consistent, not reasonably achievable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after June 1, 2008 but before December 1, 2008.															
1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the schedule does not follow the work items presented in the work plan and budget, is clearly not reasonable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation after December 1, 2008.															

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
<p>Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on the Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits of the Proposal. The scores will be assigned relative to all other Proposals. Scoring is designed to not bias water supply and water quality projects with respect to each other.</i></p> <p>Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the costs and water supply and water quality benefits of the Proposal?</p> <p>Are the costs and water supply and water quality benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?</p>	3	3–15		<p>The minimum score for this criterion is 1 point. The remaining 4 points will be allocated based on: 1) the water supply and water quality benefits realized through implementation of the Proposal and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits. Points will be awarded based on a comparison of qualitative and quantitative information describing the water supply and water quality benefits of the Proposals. Proposals will be scored as follows: 1) high levels of water supply or water quality benefits will receive 3 to 4 points; 2) average levels of water supply or water quality benefits will receive 2 to 3 points; and 3) low levels of water supply or water quality benefits will receive 1 point). The initial score will then be adjusted qualitatively based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. Unsubstantiated or poor quality analysis or documentation can result in the score being reduced by up to 4 points, provided that the final score is not less than the minimum score of 1.</p>
<p>Other Expected Benefits</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on the certainty that the Proposal will provide the benefits claimed, as well as the magnitude and breadth of the Other Expected Benefits.</i></p> <p>Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the Other Expected Benefits of the Proposal?</p> <p>Are the Other Expected Benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?</p>	2	2–10		<p>The minimum score for this criterion is 1 point. The remaining 4 points will be allocated based on: 1) the benefits realized through implementation of the Proposal and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits. Points will be awarded based on a comparison of qualitative and quantitative information describing the benefits of the Proposals. Proposals will be grouped by the reviewers on the basis of physical quantification in Proposals with: 1) high levels of Other Expected Benefits will receive 3 to 4 points, 2) average levels of Other Expected Benefits will receive 2 to 3 points and 3) low levels of Other Expected Benefits will receive 1 point. The initial score will then be adjusted qualitatively based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. Unsubstantiated or poor quality analysis or documentation can result in the score being reduced by up to 4 points, provided that the final score is not less than the minimum score of 1. Proposals that do not have Other Expected Benefits will receive the minimum score of 1 point.</p>

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard
<p>Program Preferences</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal will implement one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program Preferences (See Guidelines, Section II.E). Proposals that demonstrate significant, dedicated, and well-defined projects that meet multiple Program Preferences will be considered more favorably than Proposals that demonstrate a significant potential to meet a single Program Preference or demonstrate a low degree of commitment or certainty to meeting Program Preferences</i></p> <p>Does the Proposal include projects that implement Program Preferences? Did the applicant demonstrate a high degree of certainty that the Proposal will implement the Program Preferences? Did the applicant document the magnitude and breadth of Program Preferences that the Proposal will meet?</p>	1	1-5	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the Proposal will implement multiple Program Preferences, demonstrates a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.
			4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes project(s) that implement a single Program Preference, demonstrate a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved, and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.
			3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes project(s) that implement multiple Program Preferences, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.
			2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes project(s) that implement a single Program Preference, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.
			1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the Proposal does not address any Program Preference or the Program Preferences are highly unlikely to be implemented.
Sub-total Adequacy of Proposal	1	16-80		

Table 3 – Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standard

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard										
Statewide Priorities														
<p>Statewide Priorities</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on the magnitude and breadth of Statewide Priorities addressed by the proposal, the degree of certainty that the proposal will address the Statewide Priorities, and the degree to which this information is documented in the proposal.</i></p> <p>Does the Proposal include projects that address Statewide Priorities?</p> <p>Did the applicant demonstrate a high degree of certainty that the Proposal will address the Statewide Priorities?</p> <p>Did the applicant adequately document and support the Statewide Priorities that the Proposal will meet?</p>	6	6-30		<p>In applying the scoring standard below, the reviewers will give consideration to whether the Proposal addresses Statewide Priorities at a statewide or large-regional basis versus on a local basis.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1136 483 2003 1157"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1136 483 1136 646" style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td data-bbox="1136 508 2003 646">A score of 5 points will be awarded if the proposal fully addresses statewide priorities, demonstrates a significant degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, demonstrates a high magnitude and significance of Statewide Priorities that the proposal will meet, and is thoroughly documented.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1136 646 1136 776" style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td data-bbox="1136 670 2003 776">A score of 4 points will be awarded if the Proposal addresses Statewide Priorities, demonstrates some degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, demonstrates a moderate magnitude and significance of Stateside Priorities that the proposal will meet and is thoroughly documented.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1136 776 1136 873" style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td data-bbox="1136 800 2003 873">A score of 3 points will be awarded if the Proposal less than fully addresses Statewide Priorities, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1136 873 1136 995" style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td data-bbox="1136 898 2003 995">A score of 2 points will be awarded if the Proposal marginally addresses Statewide Priorities or demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Statewide Priority claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1136 995 1136 1157" style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td data-bbox="1136 1052 2003 1157">A score of 1 point will be awarded if the Proposal does not address any Statewide Priorities or the Statewide Priorities are highly unlikely to be addressed.</td> </tr> </table>	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the proposal fully addresses statewide priorities, demonstrates a significant degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, demonstrates a high magnitude and significance of Statewide Priorities that the proposal will meet, and is thoroughly documented.	4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the Proposal addresses Statewide Priorities, demonstrates some degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, demonstrates a moderate magnitude and significance of Stateside Priorities that the proposal will meet and is thoroughly documented.	3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the Proposal less than fully addresses Statewide Priorities, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation.	2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the Proposal marginally addresses Statewide Priorities or demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Statewide Priority claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation.	1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the Proposal does not address any Statewide Priorities or the Statewide Priorities are highly unlikely to be addressed.
5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the proposal fully addresses statewide priorities, demonstrates a significant degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, demonstrates a high magnitude and significance of Statewide Priorities that the proposal will meet, and is thoroughly documented.													
4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the Proposal addresses Statewide Priorities, demonstrates some degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, demonstrates a moderate magnitude and significance of Stateside Priorities that the proposal will meet and is thoroughly documented.													
3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the Proposal less than fully addresses Statewide Priorities, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Statewide Priorities claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation.													
2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the Proposal marginally addresses Statewide Priorities or demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Statewide Priority claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation.													
1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the Proposal does not address any Statewide Priorities or the Statewide Priorities are highly unlikely to be addressed.													
Sub-total Statewide Priorities	1	6-30												
Total Range of Points Possible	28	– 140												

VI. SCHEDULE

The schedule below shows the program timeline for the Implementation Grants, Step 2 PSP process through final approval Implementation Grants, Step 2 grant awards. Some of the events listed in this schedule are tentative (shown as *italics*) and changes may be required. Any updates to the schedule will be posted on both the DWR and the State Water Board web sites. Updates may also be advertised through fliers, email announcements, and news releases. Parties not already on the mailing list that wish to receive updates on the IRWM Grant Program should email contact information to:

dfa_grants@waterboards.ca.gov

Table 4 - IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 2 Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule	
Milestone or Activity	Schedule
<p>IRWM Implementation Grant Applicant Workshops</p> <p>California Towers Building 3737 Main Street, Suites 204 and 205 (Magnolia and Victoria Rooms) Riverside, CA 92501</p> <p>Department of Water Resources Bonderson Building Hearing Room 901 P Street Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Department of Water Resources San Luis Field Division Office Administration Building, Conference Room 31770 Gonzaga Road Gustine, CA 95322</p> <p>NOTE: Located between the O'Neill Forebay and the San Luis Dam, west of Santa Nella off of Highway 152. Please be prepared to provide valid photo identification at the Security Gate.</p>	<p>March 20 and 21, 2006 10:00 a.m.</p> <p>March 23 and 24, 2006 10:00 a.m.</p> <p>March 29, 2006 10:00 a.m.</p>
<p>Implementation Grants, Step 2 applications must be submitted through FFAST to the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. Applications submitted after 5:00 p.m. on the due date will not be reviewed or considered for funding.</p>	<p><u>June 28, 2006</u></p>
<p>Public meeting to discuss initial funding recommendations</p>	<p><i>November 2006</i></p>
<p>DWR and the State Water Board approval of final grant awards</p>	<p><i>December 2006 – January 2007</i></p>

EXHIBIT A

WORK PLAN

This exhibit provides guidance for presenting, in Attachment 5, the Work Plan for the Proposal.

Attachment 5, Work Plan, should consist of two parts: an introduction and work items. Based on the goals and objectives of the Proposal, a description of all work that will be necessary to complete the Proposal must be included in this attachment. The Work Plan must include a summary of the entire Proposal as well as details for each project within the Proposal. Any supporting documentation necessary to substantiate work already completed should be submitted as appendices to Attachment 5.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction should provide information about the Proposal and shall include, but not be limited to the following items:

- ◆ A presentation of the Goals and Objective of the Proposal.
- ◆ A description of how the Proposal is consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan.
- ◆ A table of specific projects in the Proposal, including, an abstract of each project, the current status of each project in terms of percent completion of design, the priority of those projects, and implementing agencies.
- ◆ A description of synergies or linkages between projects that result in added value, or require coordinated implementation or operation.
- ◆ A map showing the location of project(s) contained in the Proposal and also showing the regional boundaries.
- ◆ A description of the work that has been completed or is expected to be completed prior to May 1, 2007, the assumed contract execution date. For example, if CEQA/NEPA and other environmental compliance efforts have been completed discuss the environmental determination made by the lead agency and the documents that were filed.

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 project elements 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 Proposal must be discussed.

WORK ITEMS

Work items are specific activities that will be performed to implement each project of the Proposal. The work items descriptions will be used as the scope of work in the grant agreement if the Proposal is selected for funding. The work item detail must be sufficient to demonstrate a high expectation of successful implementation and must allow the reviewer to fully understand the work to be performed in order to evaluate the adequacy of the Proposal. Additionally, the work items must provide sufficient detail to justify the project and Proposal cost estimates. Work items listed in the Work Plan should be consistent with those used in Attachment 6, Budget and Attachment 7, Schedule.

The work item section must contain the following items:

- ◆ For each project contained in the Proposal, include a description of work to be performed under each work item. The description should include as much detail as possible and explain all work necessary to complete each project and, collectively, the Proposal.
- ◆ Procedures by which the applicant will coordinate with its partner agencies and organizations that may receive funding from the grant including any contracts, MOUs, and other formal agreements.

- ◆ Detailed maps that show, at a minimum, the location of activities or facilities of the project(s), the groundwater basins and surface water bodies that will be affected including modifications to any river or stream channel; the water resources that will be affected; disadvantaged communities within the region; and proposed monitoring locations.
- ◆ A discussion of standards, such as construction standards, health and safety standards, laboratory analysis, or accepted classifications methods that will be used in implementation.
- ◆ Development of PAEPs, MPs, and QAPPs for the Proposal.
- ◆ A discussion of the status of acquisition of land or rights-of-way, if applicable.
- ◆ A discussion of the merits of the building materials or computational methods that were or will be used for project development, such as use of specific grades of building materials or use of specific, tested, and established models (or software). Also discuss the status of project design and bid solicitation efforts.
- ◆ Identification of all necessary permits and the status of securing such permit.
- ◆ A discussion of the status of preparation and completion of requirements to comply with the CEQA, NEPA, and other environmental laws. If environmental compliance efforts have not been completed, include a plan for environmental compliance. Discuss the status of environmental mitigation or enhancement actions.
- ◆ If a GWMP must be prepared, work items to complete the GWMP.
- ◆ A description of submittals to the granting agency for assessing progress and accomplishments, such as quarterly and final reports.
- ◆ Any other work items that may be applicable to describe implementation of the projects but are not listed above.

Additionally, the most recent plans and specifications should be referenced, including page or sheet numbers, in the Work Plan and copies of the plans and specifications must be submitted, as detailed in Section II – Application Instruction, as part of the application.

EXHIBIT B BUDGET

Table B-1 must be completed for each project in the Proposal and another Table B-1 must be completed as a summary (roll-up) budget for the entire Proposal. The Summary Budget Table B-1 must be clearly marked as such. Although the applicant should complete Row (j) for each individual project, the Minimum Funding Match requirement applies to the costs of the overall Proposal. Therefore, the 10 % minimum Funding Match must be met or exceeded on the Summary Budget Table B-1; the percent funding match from that table only will be used for the Funding Match Scoring Criterion shown in Table 3 of this PSP.

Table B-1 – Budget (Insert either “Summary Budget” or Insert the name of the individual project)					
Proposal Title: _____					
Project Title: _____					
Budget Category	Other State Funds ¹⁾	Non-State Share (Funding Match)	Requested Grant Funding	Total	% Funding Match
(a) Direct Project Administration Costs					
(b) Land Purchase/Easement					
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation					
(d) Construction/Implementation					
(e) Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement					
(f) Construction Administration					
(g) Other Costs					
(h) Construction/Implementation Contingency					
(i) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)					
(j) Calculation of Funding Match % (Used in Funding Match Scoring Criterion) <i>Optional for individual component projects.</i>					
Sources of Funds for Non-State Share (Funding Match) and Other State Funds		<i>Use as much space as required to show the source of the Non-State Share and Other State Funds</i>			

1) “Other State Funds” may be presented in Table B-1 to demonstrate the full funding picture for the Proposal and, if presented, must be included in the total costs of the Proposal, which will be used to determine the percentage for the Funding Match Scoring Criterion.

For each of the categories shown in the Table B-1 above, the applicant must provide supplemental detailed costs for each project as follows:

Row (a) Direct Project Administration Costs

Detail shall include hourly wage paid by discipline; number of hours to be expended for administration; and costs shown for equipment, supplies, or travel, with back-up data provided. Travel proposed to be reimbursed by the grant must be at or below the rates allowed for unrepresented State employees. If project administrative costs are shown as a percentage of a cost, include both: a) the total on which the project administration is based (i.e., total project costs, total construction cost, etc.) and b) how the percentage was determined (i.e., flat rate, based on prior experience, etc.). This budget category includes all such costs for the grant recipient and any partner agencies or organizations.

Applicants are encouraged to limit administrative costs proposed to be reimbursed by the grant to less than 5% of the total Proposal costs. Such administrative expenses are the necessary costs incidentally but directly related to the Proposal.

Row (b) Land Purchase/Easement

Detail shall distinguish whether the cost is for purchase of land or an easement to use the land. If land purchase is to be included in the funding match, include whether it is a proposed acquisition or whether the land is already owned by the applicant or partner agency/organization. If the land is already owned by the applicant or partner agency/organization, indicate when the land was purchased and the purchase price. The purchase price for that portion of the land that will be dedicated to the Proposal may, in certain circumstances, be included as funding match.

Row (c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation

Detail shall include hourly wage paid by discipline, number of hours, and the total cost for the particular item (i.e., 60% design, final design [See below for discussion of design stages], engineering field investigations, preparation of CEQA documentation, PAEP preparation etc.). If any contingency amounts are used in the estimate, provide an explanation for the rationale used to determine the contingency percentage.

Row (d) Construction/Implementation

Provide a cost estimate commensurate with the design stage that is being submitted for the project. For example, if the applicant states that the design for a particular project is at the 60% design stage, then a cost estimate with appropriate detail based on that design stage must be included (See below for guidance on design stages). The estimate should include the quantity of materials used, unit cost, number of units, and, if possible, should have separate costs for labor, equipment, and materials. Do not show any construction/implementation contingency costs in this category. They will be shown in Construction/Implementation Contingency category. For any implementation costs, show as much detail as required to support the implementation costs shown.

Row (e) Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement

This item includes an estimate of all environmental compliance, mitigation, and enhancement costs. The estimate of costs for this work should be provided in the same format as shown for Construction/Implementation.

Row (f) Construction Administration

The costs to administer and manage construction of the project must be presented. Provide a discussion of the method used to determine this cost. If a percentage of construction costs is used here, indicate the percentage used. If the estimate will be based on expected hours of effort, list the hours, by discipline, unit cost, equipment costs, and total cost.

Row (g) Other Costs

Include detail for any legal services costs required to support the project. Include the costs for licenses and permits. Include any costs of monitoring and assessment required during the construction/initial implementation of the project and may include preparation of the necessary PAEPs, MPs, or QAPPs. Do not include any monitoring and assessment costs for efforts required after project construction is complete.

Row (h) Construction/Implementation Contingency

Normally these costs include costs to handle unknown conditions encountered during construction or implementation of the project and may cover items that are not yet shown in the design. Specify the percentage used for this cost, and provide a reason for using the percentage used. Include only those contingency costs for construction/implementation efforts here. All other contingency costs should be included in the appropriate cost category.

Row (i) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (h) for each column)

Sum each of the columns as shown in Table B-1 to determine the grand total of costs for each project. Provide a separate table that summarizes, or rolls-up, the costs for each project in the Proposal. From this summary sheet use the grand total from the “Non-state Share (Funding Match)” column, and use this cost to include in Table 1 – FAAST

Checklist, under the box entitled “Local Cost Match”. Use the grand total from the “State Share (Grant Funding)” column, and use this cost to include in Table 1, under the box entitled “Grant Funds Requested.” Finally, use the grand total from the “Total” column, and use this cost to include in Table 1, under the box entitled “Total Budget.”

Row (j) Calculation of Funding Match %

DWR and the State Water Board will use the calculations of the Funding Match percentage from the Summary Budget Table B-1 as the basis of the score for the Funding Match Criterion.

For purposes of this PSP, the following design stages are provided to assist applicants in determining their design percentage for projects under design:

- ◆ **10% (Conceptual) Design** – The 10% design shows project siting and the layout of major facilities. No specifications are provided. Design analysis has been started and is nearing completion. Background geologic, seismic literature research has been performed. A listing of project objectives, environmental or infrastructure constraints is provided.
- ◆ **30 % (Concept) Design** – The 30% design shows project siting and all project appurtenances. Some detail is provided for each of the disciplines (such as civil, structural, mechanical, and geology). Design analysis should be complete at this stage. A rough listing of specifications required for the project is provided. Preliminary Geologic and Foundation Studies have been performed.
- ◆ **60% Design** – The 60% design is the same as for the 30% design submittal, with more details provided for each design discipline, including electrical, and traffic control, if applicable. Standard details and outline specifications, including the front end and technical portion, are provided. Foundation studies completed, lab testing performed, structural analysis and/or modeling performed, permitting underway.
- ◆ **90% (Pre-final) Design** – The 90% design is the final, un-stamped, submittal. Complete plans and specifications are prepared, and a detailed itemized cost estimate is included.
- ◆ **100% (Final) Design** – The 100% design is the design package that will be advertised for project award for construction/implementation of project. The package consists of the complete, signed, and “As-Advertised” plans and specifications.

EXHIBIT C

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS – WATER SUPPLY AND WATER QUALITY BENEFITS

This exhibit provides methods and formats for estimating and presenting, in Attachment 10, the costs and the water supply and water quality Benefits of the Proposal.

The Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits may include, but are not limited to, the following benefit types:

◆ Water Supply

- ◆ Avoided water supply purchases, including those for environmental purposes;
- ◆ Avoided water supply projects;
- ◆ Avoided water shortage costs;
- ◆ Avoided operations and maintenance costs; and
- ◆ Water revenue from sales to another purveyor or third party.

◆ Water Quality

- ◆ Water quality improvements related to protecting, restoring, or enhancing beneficial uses;
- ◆ Water quality improvements for impaired water bodies and sensitive habitats;
- ◆ Avoided water quality projects costs;
- ◆ Avoided water treatment costs;
- ◆ Avoided wastewater treatment costs; and
- ◆ Water quality improvements related to providing water supplies (if not already captured as a water supply benefit).

At a minimum, all applications must provide a narrative description of the expected water supply or water quality benefits of the Proposal. If possible, each such benefit should be quantified and presented in physical or economic terms, using existing information or reasonable effort. If benefits cannot be quantified, explain why and justify. Applicants may use the tables contained in this Exhibit to present the water supply or water quality benefits of the Proposal, or may use other formats if desired. Excel spreadsheet versions of following tables can be found at the links listed in the Foreword of this PSP.

Each applicant must provide the following information:

- ◆ Narrative description of the Proposal's economic costs.
- ◆ Cost details for the entire Proposal using Table C-3 and the information in Table B-1.
- ◆ Narrative description of all of the Proposal's expected water supply and water quality benefits, including those achieved by restoring, protecting, or enhancing beneficial uses, particularly those on impaired water bodies (See "Water Quality Benefits" below), which shall address the following items:
 - ◆ Estimates of without-Proposal conditions; e.g. existing water quality or current and future water supplies and demand.

- ◆ Estimates of with-Proposal conditions; e.g. improvements in water quality or new water supplies made available to meet demand.
 - ◆ Description of methods used to estimate without- and with-Proposal conditions.
 - ◆ Description of the distribution of local, regional, and statewide benefits.
 - ◆ Identification of beneficiaries.
 - ◆ When the benefits will be received.
 - ◆ Uncertainty of the benefits.
 - ◆ Description of any adverse effects.
- ◆ Narrative discussion that describes, qualifies, and supports the values entered in the tables.
 - ◆ If possible, quantified estimates of physical and economic benefits using Tables C-4, C-5, and C-6, as applicable. Table C-4 is used to present physical and economic benefits. Table C-5 is used for the benefits in an avoided cost of future projects. Table C-6 is used if the benefit is estimated in some other way (i.e., not using a unit monetary value or an avoided cost).
 - ◆ Documentation to support information presented in the Proposal. Applicants may provide requested information for each project to help document the Proposal, including sing tables C-3 through C-6 on a project basis. However, the evaluation score will be determined based on the information provided for the Proposal in its entirety.
 - ◆ If the Proposal includes a suite of projects, describe the relationship of each project to the overall Proposal costs and to the overall water supply and water quality benefits of the entire Proposal.

Applicants should take necessary care to provide realistic and supportable cost and benefits analyses. Other studies or documents used to support cost and benefit estimates should be clearly referenced. See Section II for instructions on submitted studies, documents, or other reference materials.

PROPOSAL COSTS

This section provides guidance for describing all costs that will be incurred to implement and operate the Proposal and to achieve benefits from the Proposal. This includes costs funded by local, State, and federal agencies, non-profit organizations, and other entities. All costs, both initial investments and operational costs, associated with the Proposal necessary to accomplish full implementation of the Proposal and achievement of the stated benefits, must be included. All costs must be clearly documented to allow a reviewer to assess the accuracy and reasonableness of the analysis. If the reviewers find that some Proposal costs are not included in the analysis, a lower score will result. Applicants must use the following guidelines and assumptions in an economic analysis for the Proposal:

- ◆ *Consistency* – The economic analysis must be completed for the entire Proposal and must be consistent with other data and information provided in the Proposal.
- ◆ *With-Proposal and Without-Proposal Comparison* – The economic analysis should be based on a comparison of expected conditions with- and without-Proposal over the period of analysis.
- ◆ *Period of Analysis* – The economic analysis will be based on a Proposal life cycle specified by the applicant which shall include the construction period and operational life.
- ◆ *Economic Cost* – Any costs associated with the Proposal, regardless of who bears the cost and regardless of the funding source is considered an economic cost. Opportunity costs should be included, but sunk costs should be excluded.
- ◆ *Sunk Costs*– Sunk costs are costs spent in the past that have no salvage value; therefore, they cannot be recovered and should not be counted.

- ◆ *Opportunity Costs* – Opportunity cost is the benefit that a resource could provide in the without-Proposal condition and should be counted. For example, land already purchased for use in a project could be used for other purposes; therefore, a reasonable estimate of the market value of that land should be included as a cost. Note that any expenditure paid for an asset before the passage of Proposition 50, November 5, 2004, cannot be included in Table B-1 presented in Attachment 6, because it is not eligible for reimbursement. However, the current value of the asset should be included here as an economic cost.
- ◆ *Discount Rate* – Because costs and benefits are evaluated over the life of the Proposal, they must be discounted to reflect the value of money over time. All applicants must use a 6% discount rate. Table C-1 provides the discount factors that must be used.

Table C-1 - Discount Factors									
Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor	Year	Discount Factor
2006	1.06	2016	1.90	2026	3.40	2036	6.09	2046	10.90
2007	1.12	2017	2.01	2027	3.60	2037	6.45	2047	11.56
2008	1.19	2018	2.13	2028	3.82	2038	6.84	2048	12.25
2009	1.26	2019	2.26	2029	4.05	2039	7.25	2049	12.99
2010	1.34	2020	2.40	2030	4.29	2040	7.69	2050	13.76
2011	1.42	2021	2.54	2031	4.55	2041	8.15	2051	14.59
2012	1.50	2022	2.69	2032	4.82	2042	8.64	2052	15.47
2013	1.59	2023	2.85	2033	5.11	2043	9.15	2053	16.39
2014	1.69	2024	3.03	2034	5.42	2044	9.70	2054	17.38
2015	1.79	2025	3.21	2035	5.74	2045	10.29	2055	18.42

- ◆ *Dollar Value Base Year* – All costs and benefits will be expressed in 2005 dollars. When using economic data from past years, costs should be escalated to account for inflation. The update factors shown in Table C-2 can be used to update economic data to 2005 dollars. If the applicant needs to update costs from years preceding 2000, please see the Foreword of the PSP for the appropriate contact person. Other, more specific indices (such as the Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index) can be used if justified by the applicant.

Table C-2 - Update Factors	
Year	Update Factor
2000	1.12
2001	1.09
2002	1.07
2003	1.05
2004	1.03

Table C-3

The Proposal costs presented in this section must be consistent with Table B-1 presented in Attachment 6 (Exhibit B) of the grant application. Table C-3 may augment initial costs from Table B-1 if there are costs, such as opportunity costs, that are not eligible for reimbursement under this grant program. Note that cost savings realized as a result of the Proposal should be included as a benefit and not subtracted from the costs. To complete Table C-3, the applicant should use the following steps:

- ◆ Modify the number of rows to match the estimated Proposal life, i.e. how long are the projects intended to operate and provide benefits.

- ◆ Columns (a) through (g): Enter costs for each applicable cost category in each year of the Proposal's lifecycle. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure, not the first year of operation.
- ◆ Column (h): Enter the sum of all costs for the year (Columns (a) through (g)).
- ◆ Column (i): These are the discount factors provided in Table C-1.
- ◆ Column (j): Enter the result of dividing Column (h) by the discount factor in Column (i) for each year (each row).
- ◆ Bottom of Column (j): Total Present Value of Discounted Costs: Enter the sum of the Column (j) entries in the last row at the bottom of the table. This is the total present value of all costs discounted at 6%.
- ◆ Comment Box: Enter any sources and references; include page numbers, supporting the numbers used in this table.

Table C-3 – Annual Cost of Proposal
(All costs should be in 2005 Dollars)

Table C-3 – Annual Cost of Proposal (All costs should be in 2005 Dollars)										
	Initial Costs		Operations and Maintenance Costs						Discounting Calculations	
YEAR	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
	Capital and Other Initial Costs from Table B-1	Capital and Other Initial Costs Not Included in Table B-1	Admin	Operation	Maintenance	Replacement	Other	Total Costs (a+b+...g)	Discount Factor	Discounted Costs (h÷i)
2006									1.06	
2007									1.12	
2008									1.19	
...									...	
...									...	
...									...	
Proposal Life									...	
Total Present Value of Discounted Costs (Sum of Column (j))										
Comment Box										

PROPOSAL BENEFITS

This section provides guidance for displaying and describing the physical and economic water supply and water quality benefits of the Proposal.

Benefits Analysis

At a minimum, each water supply or water quality benefit must be described. If possible, each benefit should be quantified in physical terms. For each water supply or water quality physical benefit, the applicant should determine if a monetary value could be placed on each unit of benefit. For benefits that could not be quantified in physical terms, the applicant should still determine if an estimate of economic benefits is possible. In particular, avoided costs of other projects may be counted as a benefit even if the benefit cannot be physically quantified. A description of economic benefits should be provided even if monetary value cannot be quantified. The applicant must describe how economic benefits for the water supply or water quality benefits were calculated to allow the reviewers to assess the accuracy and reasonableness of the analysis. For benefits that can be quantified in dollars, applicants should present results in 2005 dollars. The applicant must avoid double-counting economic benefits.

The applicant should provide a description of economic factors that may affect or qualify the amount of economic benefits to be realized. The application should also include a discussion of any uncertainty about the future that might affect the level of benefits received.

Water Quality Benefits for Impaired Water Bodies and Sensitive Habitats:

One of the IRWM Grant Program Preferences (Guidelines, Section II.E) is to eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired water bodies and sensitive habitats. Impaired water bodies are identified by the State Water Board and also referred to as “303(d) listed impaired water bodies.” The 303(d) impaired water body list is posted on the State Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html.

Proposals that restore, enhance, or protect beneficial uses of water consistent with the Regional Water Board’s Basin Plans for each of the nine regions in the state may provide significant water quality benefits. However, it may be difficult in some instances to quantify benefits. To capture and characterize benefits from these projects, the applicant should specifically address where and how the water quality benefits will be achieved in the water body; what significant water quality improvements will be achieved; and the beneficial uses of that water body. For such water quality benefits, applicants should provide the information shown below to allow reviewers to assess the benefits claimed in the Proposal.

- ◆ Number of downstream water bodies affected.
- ◆ Water body names and water volumes.
- ◆ The fraction of each water body affected by the Proposal (if possible).
- ◆ Beneficial uses identified for the water bodies affected by the Proposal.
- ◆ Pollutants present in the affected water body.
- ◆ Concentrations of each pollutant in the affected water body.
- ◆ Sources of the pollutants.
- ◆ Beneficial use activities affected by each pollutant.
- ◆ The total load reduction of pollutants in the affected water body. Benefits determination for Proposals that, once implemented, lead to load reductions in impaired water bodies must focus on the expected load reductions.
- ◆ The change in pollutant concentrations in the affected water body.

- ◆ The change in the beneficial-use activity for the affected portion of the water body.
- ◆ Any other aspects of the Proposal that have a reasonable probability of affecting significant improvements in water quality – restoring beneficial uses.

Table C-4

Table C-4 should be used to present *Physically Quantifiable Benefits*, whether they are quantifiable in either physical or economic terms. To present only physically quantified benefits, then the applicant should complete Columns (b) through (d) of Table C-4. If the applicant also wishes to claim economic benefits based on unit dollar value, then also complete columns (e) through (i). To complete Table C-4, the applicant should use the following steps:

- ◆ Format a table that will display the various water supply and water quality benefits that are claimed in the Proposal. For each individual benefit, repeat a full block of row for each year of the project lifecycle, including the column headings.
- ◆ Identify the benefit and measure (e.g., units) of that benefit in the boxes provided. This must be completed for each benefit claimed.
- ◆ Once the table has been appropriately formatted, the applicant should provide the following information for each year of the Proposals life:
 - ◆ Column (b): identify the level (units) of the water supply or water quality benefit for the without-Proposal condition.
 - ◆ Column (c): identify the level (units) of the water supply or water quality benefit for the with-Proposal condition.
 - ◆ Column (d): enter the result of subtracting Column (b) from Column (c) to determine the change in the water supply or water quality resource resulting from the Proposal.
 - ◆ Columns (e) through (i): complete these columns only if the applicant has identified a monetary value for the benefit.
 - ◆ Column (e): enter the per unit monetary value for the benefit claimed.
 - ◆ Column (f): enter the result of multiplying the value in Column (d) by the value in Column (e).
 - ◆ Column (g): enter the sum of the individual “Annual \$ Values” listed in Column (f) for each benefit claimed. For example, if the Proposal has monetary values for water supply benefits and two different types of water quality benefits, the sum of the three values would be entered into Column (g).
 - ◆ Column (h): these are the discount factors provided in Table C-1.
 - ◆ Column (i): enter the result of dividing each value in Column (g) by the discount factor in Column (h).
 - ◆ Column (i) Bottom of the Table: enter the total of all Column (i) values in the “Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits” row
 - ◆ Comment Box: enter any sources and references, including page numbers, supporting the numbers used in this table.

Table C-4 - Annual Benefits of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits (All benefits should be in 2005 dollars)								
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
YEAR	Benefit: _____ <i>Replicate columns and headers for full range of year rows for each benefit.</i>			<i>Complete these columns if claiming economic benefits based on dollar value.</i>				
	Measure of Benefit: _____ (Identify units for each water supply or water quality benefit to be measured)			Complete these 2 columns if claiming \$ Value for the Benefit		Discounting Calculations for Economic Benefits (If claiming \$ Value for the Benefit)		
	Without Proposal	With Proposal	Change Resulting from Proposal (c - b)	Unit \$ Value	Annual \$ Value (d x e)	Total Benefits (Sum of Annual \$ Value for each benefit)	Discount Factor	Discounted Benefits (g ÷ h)
2006							1.06	
2007							1.12	
2008							1.19	
...							...	
...							...	
...							...	
Proposal Life							...	
Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits Based on Unit Value (Sum of the values in Column (i) for all Benefits shown in Table)								
Comment Box								

Table C-5

Table C-5 should be used if the applicant wishes to present *Benefits from Avoided Costs of Future Projects*. This type of benefit applies to the extent to which the Proposal will cause other water supply or water quality projects to be avoided, delayed, or scaled down. This table should also be used to present the avoided cost of water shortages or the avoided cost of future operations, such as treatment costs. To claim this type of benefit, the applicant should provide documentation that the avoided cost would actually be incurred in the absence of the Proposal. To estimate a benefit from avoided costs of future projects, shortages, or operations complete Table C-5. While this is a benefit, the estimate will require a cost estimate for the avoided project. Estimates from existing studies, updated to 2005 dollars, can be used to complete Table C-5. The applicant should show that those cost estimates are reasonably comparable to the standards and procedures described in the cost section of this exhibit.

Below, the project(s) that would be avoided because of the Proposal are called alternative(s). Note that a precise quantification of physical benefits is not required to claim costs of alternative(s) as a benefit; however, the alternative(s) should provide approximately the same types and levels of benefits as the Proposal. An applicant should compare the amount and timing of physical benefits from the Proposal with the alternative to make sure they are comparable. If an alternative provides a physical benefit larger than that of the Proposal, the applicant must make adjustments to the alternative to make it similar to the Proposal. Without an adjustment, only a portion of the cost of the alternative can be claimed as a measure of benefit. If the alternative provides an amount of physical benefit smaller than that of the Proposal, an additional benefit might be claimed (see Table C-5, 2nd to last row – “% Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal”). If the alternative provides physical benefits at times (e.g. year types or season) different from those of the Proposal, additional adjustments may be needed or the alternative may simply not be a reasonable alternative to the Proposal. If the alternative would delay action until a future time within the planning horizon, enter

the delayed costs when they are avoided as a benefit, and enter them again as a cost at the time they would be paid with the Proposal.

To complete Table C-5, the applicant must:

- ◆ Format a table that will display all alternatives that apply by copying Columns (b) through (e) of Table C-5 for each individual alternative.
- ◆ Describe the alternative in the box provided. This must be completed for each alternative.
- ◆ Once the table has been appropriately formatted, the applicant should provide the following information for each year of the alternative life:
 - ◆ Column (b): enter capital costs for each year of the alternative life. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure of any cost, not the first year of operation.
 - ◆ Column (c): enter replacement costs for each year of the alternative life. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure of any cost, not the first year of operation.
 - ◆ Column (d): enter O&M costs for each year of the alternative. Enter costs beginning in the first year of expenditure of any cost, not the first year of operation.
 - ◆ Column (e): enter the sum of costs contained in Columns (b), (c), and (d).
 - ◆ Column (f): enter the sum of “Total Cost Avoided for Individual Alternatives” for each alternative.
 - ◆ Column (g): these are the discount factors provided in Table C-1.
 - ◆ Column (h): enter the result of dividing the value in Column (f) by the number provided in Column (g) for each year (each row).
- ◆ Bottom of Column (h): to represent the net present value of all costs discounted at 6% and to take into account the percentage of the alternative claimed, do the following:
 - ◆ Enter the sum of all values in Column (h) in the row marked “Total Present Value of Discounted Costs.” This represents the net present value of all costs discounted at 6%.
 - ◆ In the next row, enter the “% Claimed by Proposal.” This is the percentage of the cost of the alternative that the applicant is claiming for the Proposal. If claiming the entire cost, enter 100%.
 - ◆ In the final row labeled “Total Present Value of Discounted Costs Claimed by Proposal,” enter the result of multiplying the “Total Present Value of Discounted Costs by the % Annual Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal.”
- ◆ Comment box: enter any sources and references, including page numbers, supporting the numbers used in this table.

Table C-5 - Annual Costs of Avoided Projects (All avoided costs should be in 2005 dollars)							
(a)	Costs				Discounting Calculations		
	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
YEAR	Alternative (Avoided Project Name): _____ <i>Replicate this column block with headers for each avoided alternative</i>				Total Cost Avoided for All Alternatives (Sum of Total Cost Avoided for Individual Alternatives)	Discount Factor	Discounted Costs (f) ÷ (g)
	Avoided Capital Costs	Avoided Replacement Costs	Avoided Operations and Maintenance Costs	Total Cost Avoided for Individual Alternatives (b) + (c) + (d)			
2006						1.06	
2007						1.12	
2008						1.19	
...						...	
...						...	
...						...	
Proposal Life						...	
Total Present Value of Discounted Costs (Sum of Column (h))							
% Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal							
Total Present Value of Discounted Avoided Project Costs Claimed by Proposal (Total Present Value of Discounted Costs x % Avoided Cost Claimed by Proposal)							
Comment Box							

Table C-6

Table C-6 should be used if the applicant wishes to present *Other Water Supply or Water Quality Benefits*. Other Water Supply or Other Water Quality Benefits are those benefits that do not meet the criteria for Physically Quantifiable Benefits or Benefits from Avoided Costs of Future Projects. Because there is less tabular information for these benefits, it is important to provide sufficient documentation or narrative information to support the benefit estimates. To complete Table C-6, applicants should use the following steps:

- ◆ Column (b) top: identify the type of Other Water Supply or Other Water Quality benefit claimed. If multiple benefits are anticipated, additional blocks of rows may be added (including headers) to Table C-6 to document each benefit.
- ◆ Column (b) middle: describe the benefit in qualitative terms and the basis for associated monetary value of the benefits over the life of the Proposal.
- ◆ Column (b) bottom: enter the dollar value of the monetary benefit claimed for each year.
- ◆ Column (c): these are the discount factors provided in Table C-1.
- ◆ Column (d): enter the result of dividing each value in Column (b) by the discount factor in Column (c).

- ◆ Column (d) Bottom: enter the total of all Column (d) values in the “Total Present Value of Discounted Other Benefits” Row (last row).
- ◆ Comment Box: provide citations and qualitative information to support the benefit claimed. Enter any sources or references, including page numbers, supporting the number used in this table.

Table C-6 - Annual Benefits of Other Water Supply or Other Water Quality Benefits (In 2005 Dollars)			
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
YEAR	Type of Benefit Claimed: _____ <i>Replicate headers and rows for each benefit type</i>	Discount Factor	Discounted Benefits (b ÷ c)
	Describe the Benefit Claimed: _____		
	Annual Benefit (\$)		
2006		1.06	
2007		1.12	
2008		1.19	
...		...	
...		...	
...		...	
Proposal Life		...	
Total Present Value of Discounted Other Benefits (Sum of the values in Column (d))			
Comment Box:			

EXHIBIT D

OTHER EXPECTED BENEFITS

This exhibit provides methods and formats for estimating and presenting, in Attachment 11, the Other Expected Benefits of the Proposal.

All Proposals that have Other Expected Benefits must describe those benefits in Attachment 11. If the Proposal does not have Other Expected Benefits; then simply state so in Attachment 11. For Proposals with Other Expected Benefits, applicants must describe such benefits. If possible, each such benefit should also be quantified and presented in physical or economic terms. If not possible to quantify the benefits, please include an explanation and justification of why it cannot be done. In addition to Table D-1 below, the applicant should provide the following items:

- ◆ Narrative discussion of the estimates of without-project physical conditions.
- ◆ Narrative discussion of the estimates of with-project physical conditions.
- ◆ Description of methods used to estimate without- and with-project conditions.
- ◆ Description of the distribution of local, regional, and statewide benefits.
- ◆ Identification of beneficiaries.
- ◆ When the benefits will be received.
- ◆ Uncertainty of the benefits.
- ◆ Description of any adverse effects.

Applicants should attempt to make descriptions as clean, detailed, and quantitative as possible using existing information or reasonable effort. Computer models can be used to provide quantitative analyses of benefits but such detailed analysis is not required. For presenting analysis clear, concise tables and narrative descriptions are preferred.

The Other Expected Benefits may include, but are not limited to, the following benefit types:

- ◆ **Ecosystem Restoration** – Ecosystem restoration includes habitat restoration, ecosystem improvements and preservation, and fish and wildlife enhancement. If a Habitat Evaluation Procedure has been performed, enter information from that analysis. A Habitat Evaluation Procedure for ecosystem restoration is preferred but not required. For ecosystem restoration analysis, applicants may count benefits from both restoration and preservation of high-quality existing habitat. The ecosystem benefits analysis should take into account both structural and functional elements of the ecosystem being protected or restored. Without- and with-project conditions for ecosystem restoration could include the acreage of habitat, the quality of that habitat, and the special-status species considered in the analysis.
- ◆ **Flood Control** – For flood control benefits, the applicant should document historical flood damage and projected with-project flood risk. If the physical system has changed significantly since the last flood, without-project flood damage should also be estimated. Estimates may be determined through the use of computer software packages with the help of maps and information from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, local flood control agencies, and others.
- ◆ **Recreation and Public Access** – Recreation and public access benefits should be documented on a with- and without-project basis. With- and without-project conditions could include the types and quality of recreational activities, visitor days, and unit day values.
- ◆ **Power Cost Savings and Production** – Power cost savings and power production benefits should be based on market value of power. Document the quantity and the unit value of the power saved or produced. Include

information on when the savings or production would occur (time of year, time of day), change in capacity, or other factors that influence the cost savings or production benefit.

- ◆ Other – If the Proposal has benefits not already accounted for, please describe them in detail. Some benefits, such as in-stream flow, may be difficult to categorize. In such cases, the applicant should attempt to place it in the most appropriate category or categories, or describe it as an “Other” benefit.

Table D-1

An Excel spreadsheet version of Table D-1 can be found at the links listed in the Foreword of this PSP. Table D-1 should be used to present *Other Expected Benefits*, whether they are quantifiable in either physical or economic terms. To present only physically quantified benefits, then the applicant should complete Columns (b) through (d) of Table D-1. If the applicant also wants to claim economic benefits based on unit dollar value, then also complete columns (e) through (i). To complete Table D-1, the applicant should use the following steps:

- ◆ Format a table that will display the various other expected benefits that are claimed in the Proposal. For each individual benefit, repeat a full block of rows, including column headings and the Proposal expected life.
- ◆ Identify the benefit and measure (e.g., units) of that benefit in the boxes provided. This must be completed for each benefit claimed.
- ◆ Once the table has been appropriately formatted, the applicant should provide the following information for each year of the Proposals life:
 - ◆ Column (b): identify the level (units) of the other expected benefit for the without-Proposal condition.
 - ◆ Column (c): identify the level (units) of the other expected benefit for the with-Proposal condition.
 - ◆ Column (d): enter the result of subtracting Column (b) from Column (c) to determine the change in the resource conditions resulting from the Proposal.
 - ◆ Columns (e) through (i): complete these columns only if the applicant has identified a monetary value for the benefit.
 - ◆ Column (e): enter the per unit monetary value for the benefit claimed.
 - ◆ Column (f): enter the result of multiplying the value in Column (d) by the value in Column (e).
 - ◆ Column (g): enter the sum of the individual “Annual \$ Values” listed in Column (f) for each benefit claimed.
 - ◆ Column (h): these are the discount factors provided in Exhibit C, Table C-1.
 - ◆ Column (i): enter the result of dividing each value in Column (g) by the discount factor in Column (h).
 - ◆ Column (i) Bottom of the Table: enter the total of all Column (i) values in the “Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits” row.
 - ◆ Comment Box: enter any sources and references, including page numbers, supporting the numbers used in Table D-1.

Table D- 1 – Other Expected Benefits (All benefits should be in 2005 dollars)								
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
YEAR	Benefit: _____ <i>Replicate columns and headers for full range of year rows for each benefit.</i>			<i>Complete these columns if claiming economic benefits based on dollar value.</i>				
	Measure of Benefit: _____ (Identify units for each Other Expected Benefit to be measured)			Complete these 2 columns if claiming \$ Value for the Benefit		Discounting Calculations for Economic Benefits (If claiming \$ Value for the Benefit)		
	Without Proposal	With Proposal	Change Resulting from Proposal (c - b)	Unit \$ Value	Annual \$ Value (d x e)	Total Benefits (Sum of Annual \$ Value for each benefit)	Discount Factor	Discounted Benefits (g ÷ h)
2006							1.06	
2007							1.12	
2008							1.19	
...							...	
...							...	
...							...	
Proposal Life							...	
Total Present Value of Discounted Benefits Based on Unit Value (Sum of the values in Column (i) for all Benefits shown in Table)								
Comment Box								

EXHIBIT E

CALFED ROD CONSISTENCY

The Bay-Delta Region and CALFED Solution Area are described in the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Final Programmatic EIS/EIR, Chapter 1.3 Program Description, available on the California Bay-Delta Authority website at:

http://www.calwater.ca.gov/CALFEDDocuments/Final_EIS_EIR.shtml

Complete the following form for each project within the Proposal that assists in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals, is consistent with the CALFED Programmatic ROD, and can be implemented, to the maximum extent possible, through local and regional programs.

FORM 1

CALFED ROD CONSISTENCY

<Insert Project Title> is located in (check appropriate box):

- Sacramento–San Joaquin Bay-Delta Region or
- The CALFED Solution Area.

<Insert Project Title> will assist in meeting the following CALFED Bay-Delta Program Goals (Objectives) (select one or more goals, as appropriate):

- Provide good water quality for all beneficial uses;
- Improve and increase aquatic and terrestrial habitats and improve ecological functions in the Bay–Delta to support sustainable populations of diverse and valuable plant and animal species;
- Reduce the mismatch between Bay–Delta water supplies and current and projected beneficial uses dependent on the Bay–Delta system; or
- Reduce the risk to land use and associated economic activities, water supply, infrastructure, and the ecosystem from catastrophic breaching of Delta levees.

Include with Form 1 the following items:

- ◆ A description of how the Proposal assists in meeting one or more of the goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program;
- ◆ A description of how the project will be consistent with the CALFED ROD.
- ◆ A description of how the project will, to the maximum extent possible, be implemented through local and regional program.