

SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

www.bayareairwmp.org

Monday, September 24, 2018, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m.

Contra Costa Water District, 2411 Bisso Lane, Concord, CA; Delta Conference Room

Conference Call Dial-in: 515-604-9996; Access Code: 555505

Meeting Objectives:

- Receive update on status of IRWM Prop 84 grant rounds
- Review approach to Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement funds
- Discuss DAC and Tribal Participation in the CC
- Discuss approach to Prop 1 Implementation

Agenda:

1:00 – 1:05	Welcome and Introductions	Chair
1:05 – 1:25	Status on Prop 84 Rounds 1 - 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on status of Round 1• Update on status of Round 2, Drought Round 3, and 2015 Round 4• AQPI update	J. Bradt J. Muller J. Spaulding
1:25 – 2:00	Approach to Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Funds <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on contracts• Update on outreach partner work plans and needs assessment• Update on Tribal outreach	B. Schwartz S. Norris
2:00 – 2:15	Discussion of DAC and Tribal Participation in the Coordinating Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Webinar update and outreach partner cc participation	Chair
2:15 – 2:25	Discussion of Approach to Prop 1 Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss call for projects	B. Mendenhall
2:25 – 2:30	Announcements and Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Action items from meeting• AB 2060 and AB 2064• Future meeting times and locations	Chair

Attachments:

1. August 27, 2018 CC Meeting Summary
2. Summary update on IRWM grant rounds
3. AQPI update
4. DACTIP Subcontractor status update
5. DACTIP September 21 workshop agenda
6. Functional area representatives
7. IRWM Roundtable of Regions 2014 Survey on regional planning efforts
8. Draft Prop 1 Implementation project request form (to be sent under separate cover)
9. Schedule of future CC meetings

SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
August 27, 2018
Location: EBMUD, 375 11th Street, Oakland, CA

1. Roll Call – Appointed Functional Area Representatives Present

Water Supply- Water Quality	Wastewater- Recycled Water	Flood Protection- Stormwater	Watershed	Disadvantaged Communities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Seedall, CCWD (by phone) • Steve Ritchie, Chair, SFPUC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheryl Munoz, SFPUC representing BACWA (by phone) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD (by phone) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh Bradt, SFEP (by phone) 	

Others Present:

Leonard Ash, ACWD
Taylor Chang, SFPUC
Pat Costello, City of Napa
Maddie Duda, EJCW
Paul Gilbert-Snyder, EBMUD
Jennifer Krebs, representing SCWA
James Muller, SFEP
Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
Britton Schwartz, EJCW
Jake Spaulding, SCWA

By Phone:

Jessica Arm, DWR
Abby Carevic, DWR
Maggie Dutton, CCWD
Nahal Ghoghaie, EJCW
Robyn Navarra, Zone 7
Sherri Norris, CIEA
Meetra Richard, SCVWD
Alex Tavizon, CIEA

1. Status of Round 1, Round 2, Drought Round, 2015 Round 4

For Prop 84 Round 1, Josh Bradt gave an update. Project 21 San Pablo Stormwater Spine is experiencing permitting problems with the City of Oakland. Coordination with EBMUD is happening to turn off the

water main. SFEP was hoping for notice to proceed construction by July 30, but construction is delayed. Mr. Bradt is keeping Jessica Arm informed.

Regarding the rest of Round 1, SFEP is putting together invoice 20 to submit to DWR. SFEP is also reviewing completed project closure reports and working with conservation project managers and to get missing deliverables from conservation projects that were completed already. Mr. Bradt is working with Ms. Arm to close the round out and identify elements of the final contract modification to reflect the changes in deliverables expected and budget for remaining work.

James Muller gave an update on Prop 84 Round 2: Q14 invoices were submitted to DWR on July 31. Project 7 Oakland Sasual Creek Restoration retention payment is expected in early September. Amendment 5 (extending the grant term through 2020 and reallocated funds from Project 13) was executed.

Round 2 Project 18 Upper York Creek Dam Removal is moving forward. Natasha Dunn has been tracking progress on a weekly basis. It is still listed as project with significant concerns, but will consider removing from the list in the future. The project is on track to start construction in 2019 and must be completed by the end of the grant term on December 31, 2020.

Round 2 Project 10 Bayfront Canal appears to be moving forward. The project was facing a significant hurdle of not being included in the CEQA for the Phase 2 Salt Ponds project. Moving forward, the Bayfront Canal project will create their own action to be included in Salt ponds CEQA and Biological Opinion.

For Round 3, Q10 invoices were approved on August 6 and payment is expected in mid-October. Q11 invoices are under review by SFEP. no amendments pending. Want to extend grant term through 2020. SFEP is planning a site visit to SFPUC's Lower Cherry Aqueduct project in late 2018/early 2019.

For Round 4, Q7 invoices are under review and will be submitted to DWR on August 31. Q6 payment is expected in early September. SFEP conducted a site visit to Project 6 San Francisquito Creek on August 9.

Jake Spaulding provided an update on AQPI. Invoice 6 is under review at SCWA and will be submitted to DWR this week. Expenses are tracking within the budget and progress is in line with amendment 1 schedule. A permanent X-Band radar will be installed in Santa Clara in November or December 2018. Another permanent X-Band radar will be installed in Sonoma in December 2018 or January 2019. A temporary radar is planned for the East Bay in January 2019. There are also discussions to install a temporary radar in San Francisco. There will be another meeting with East Bay entities on September 18. The bigger project update meeting is being re-scheduled for October.

2. Approach to Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Funds

Britton Schwartz provided an update. Britton included update on status of contracts with sub-contractors. There are a few remaining that aren't in contract yet. The projects that don't have contracts yet are fiscally sponsored and so are taking longer to execute. At the next CC meeting, Ms. Schwartz will present their updated work plan and comprehensive 3 year budget.

EJCW will be submitting Q4 invoices this month, and have turned around sub-contractor invoices quickly due to still being within the advanced payment window.

Maddie Duda has met individually with the outreach partners and created a list of trainings that the partners are interested in. She is now creating a schedule of trainings for the outreach partners. Some partners have started on the needs assessment work and most will be starting on their needs assessments this month and next month.

Ms. Duda raised questions she has heard from the partners. If they want projects that will be ready for funding by the Implementation round, what's the scale they should be planning for? Will there be competition for funding? Should projects be considering consolidating with other projects?

There was a comment that in the Implementation round, there will be a certain allocated amount in Round 1 that must go to DAC projects. Regarding combining DAC projects, there was a comment that it depends on the region's overall grant application. In the past, the group has received 50-60 applications, and does not fund all of them. It may make sense to combine DAC projects so the grant application doesn't include too many projects. The group learned from Prop 84 that it is important to consider the grant administration costs associated with managing several projects. Projects should consider bundling under a single local project sponsor, as water conservation projects under Prop 84 Round 2 did.

Sherri Norris has been telling Tribal groups to bundle projects together if possible. She has also told projects that this is a competitive process, but they shouldn't be discouraged from applying for funding.

It was commented that the Bay Area has been successful at getting projects because careful thought has been put into ensuring the application is written responsively to the PSP.

It was commented that projects should look at the group's Prop 1 scoring criteria once it's set and think about the tradeoffs of administrative burden and grant funding.

It was asked that in order to build partnerships, are there organizations with higher administrative capacity to act as a sponsor for smaller groups. This would help achieve one of the goals of the DAC round, which is to develop stronger relationships between grassroots community leaders and local governments and water providers.

Mark Seedall asked when the group will hear back from the outreach partners on results. EJCW responded that they have just got partners into contract in the past couple months, and can provide a more detailed report at the next meeting. It was also mentioned that the outreach partners themselves

should come to the CC meetings and present their work. There was discussion about having presentations at the December 3 CC meeting.

It was requested that EJCW develop a table/spreadsheet similar to the one SFEP uses to track the project status for Prop 84 Rounds 2 through 4.

Ms. Norris provided an update on Tribal outreach. She has a new Tribal coordinator Alex Tavizon. They have had 3 meetings with Tribal representatives from the Bay Area. They have learned that Tribes are working through land trusts to have access to and build a cultural connection to the land. The plan is to have 4-6 partners established between now and end of September.

Abby Carevic introduced herself as DWR's new Tribal Liaison. She announced that Tribes that were affected by the fires should contact DWR if assistance is needed.

Action Items:

- Ms. Arm will provide the contact information for the DWR staff working on Prop 1 Implementation.
- The Coordinating Committee will discuss the need for limiting the number of projects included in the grant application for Prop 1 Implementation.
- EJCW will provide an update on the work plans of the outreach partners at the next meeting.
- EJCW will work with the outreach partners that are ready to have presentations of their work at the December 3 CC meeting.
- EJCW will develop a partner status spreadsheet similar to the one SFEP uses to track the project status for Prop 84 Rounds 2 through 4.
- Ms. Schwartz will present EJCW's updated work plan and comprehensive 3 year budget at the next meeting.
- Ms. Norris will research more into how Tribes are partnering with land trusts in an urban environment.
- Ms. Norris will coordinate with EJCW on the needs assessment for Tribes to ensure the assessments can be comparative.

3. Status on Plan Update

Michelle Novotny continues to work on the updates as she outlined in the table presented at June's CC meeting. She will coordinate with CIEA on the updates.

Ms. Duda, Jennifer Krebs, Leonard Ash, Ms. Norris, and James Muller volunteered to review the draft updates once they're complete. The goal is to have the draft updates ready for review by the October 22 CC meeting.

4. Discuss DAC and Tribal Participation in the Coordinating Committee

Included in the meeting packet are the pages from the 2013 Plan about the CC's governance structure.

Ms. Norris commented that she is working on understanding how Tribes see themselves participating in governance structure. Tribes want confirmation that they can't be left out in the future, as has historically happened. North Coast IRWM has a governance structure for Tribes that could be adopted to fit the Bay Area.

It was commented that there is a difference between participating as a voting representative versus participating to participate. Anyone can call in to the meetings and be part of the process. The goal is for the IRWM process to be inclusive. There's another discussion to be had on what percentage of voting members are allocated to DACs and Tribes. DACs have historically not participated, so there's a need to have them in the voting structure regardless of what they're working on. There was a question about whether this needs to be addressed before the PSP and before projects get selected.

There has been discussion about including DACs and Tribes within the function areas as separate boxes or under each box in the functional areas. Currently, there is a designated DAC box as a functional area, but this is subject to change with discussion. There was a comment that the separate box doesn't create integration of DACs.

Ms. Carevic commented that SB 18 requires Tribes be consulted when any general plan gets adopted.

There was discussion about incorporating DACs from a sub-regional perspective because it's easier to think about distinct geographic areas. It has been the group's primary funding principle to balance the allocation of grant funding within the four sub-regions based on size and population.

Paul Gilbert-Snyder commented that too much emphasis is being placed on the governance structure. Decisions happen here at the CC meetings. Governance structure is meant to help the group when there are problems, but ultimately groups need to be at the table in order to be included.

Action Items:

- Taylor Chang will distribute the table that outlines the elected functional area representatives for the next meeting.
- Ms. Norris will show the Tribes the functional area and sub-regional concepts to see how they see themselves fitting into the existing governance structure.

5. Discussion of Approach to Prop 1 Implementation

The Process and Planning (PnP) subcommittee reported that the draft project scoring criteria spreadsheet was included in the meeting packet. Items highlighted in yellow are new criteria. There are notes included items that need to be checked with the PSP once it's released. Factor 16 grants experience is new. It was included because projects that have previous grants experience will probably

make grant administration for the round easier and a point should be given to reward people for that. CASGEM was removed from grant criteria, but it was noted that CASGEM is included in the 2016 Prop 1 Guidelines so it should be added back.

Also included in the meeting packet was the Prop 84 scoring spreadsheet to provide context for how ranking and scoring has happened in the past.

There was a question about whether projects have to be included in the Plan or consistent with the Plan prior to receiving funding.

The PnP is developing a 1 page call for projects.

Action Items:

- The PnP will check with DWR on whether projects must be included in the Plan or consistent with the Plan prior to receiving funding.
- The PnP will include a note on the draft scoring criteria Factor 16 (grants experience) to exempt DACs to avoid putting them at a disadvantage.
- The PnP will revise the draft scoring criteria to include CASGEM.
- The PnP will develop the call for projects form and distribute to the CC for feedback at the next meeting.

6. Announcements

Ms. Chang made an announcement for Brenda Buxton because Ms. Buxton couldn't attend the meeting. The Conservancy has \$2,730 leftover in accumulated interest from the funds they held for the previous agreement. Is there a CC approved IRWM expense that the funds can be used for such as contractor expenses related to the new website and database? The group discussed and wants the Conservancy to hold the funds until they are needed to pay for a consultant to put together the grant application for the Implementation round.

The next CC meeting is on September 24 at Contra Costa Water District (Delta Conference Room).

KEY

Project entirely closed out except for ongoing Post-Performance Reports
 Project with significant concerns

Critical Milestone achieved since last meeting.

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600010575 - Round 2 Quarterly Status: Q15 documents were submitted on 9/16/2018 by LPS's and are under review by SFEF Payments: Project 07 retention payment expected in September Amendments: 5 Amendments have been approved by DWR for this round Site Visits: Project 15 was visited this quarter to get an on site update and to discuss grant administrator Grant Term: December 31, 2020	Project Breakdown Complete: 10 Underway: 6 (5 over 50%) Sig. Concerns: 2 Withdrawn: 1	Funds (as of Q14) Total Grant: \$17,495,000 Total Match: \$10,991,473.34 Grant Funds Spent: \$13,816,948.07 (79%) Match Funds Documented: \$7,133,073.98 (64.9%)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Project # and Title	Project Sponsor	Construction Implementation Status	Project Completion Site Visit Date	Engineer's Cert of Completion Rcvd (Y/N)	Submission Date for Final Invoice	Project Completion Report Status	Retention Requested (Y/N)	Retention Paid (Y/N)	Post-Performance Report # Submitted	Anticipated Date Retention Release Invoice Issued to DWR: Amendment 5 Grant Term Extension
01_Bay Area Regional Water Conservation & Education Program	Solano County Water Agency	95%	Not Scheduled	N/A	Mar-19	Draft #1 March 2019	N	N	None to Date	Jul-19
02_East Bayshore Recycled Water Project Phase 1A (Emeryville)	EBMUD	Complete	Nov-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
03_Lagunitas Creek Watershed Sediment Reduction & Managments	Marin Municipal WD	Complete	Nov-17	N	Nov-18	Awaiting draft #3	N	N	#1	Nov/Dec 2018
04_Marin/Sonoma Conserving our Watersheds, Agricult BMPs	Marin RCD	99%	Nov-17	Y	Dec-18	Draft #1 September 2018	N	N	None to Date	May-18
05_Napa Milliken Creek Flood Damage Reduction & Fish Passage Barrier Removal	County of Napa	Complete	Feb-18	Y	Submitted	Draft #3 under review	N	N	None to Date	Nov/Dec 2018
06_5th St. East & McGill Road Recycled Water	Sonoma Valley Cnty San Dist.	Complete	Nov-17	Y	Submitted	Awaiting final draft	N	N	None to Date	Aug/Sept 2018
07_Oakland Sausal Creek Restoration	City of Oakland Pub. Wks.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	N	#1	July/August 2018
08_Pescadero Water Supply & Sustainability	County of San Mateo	85%	None to Date	N	Jul-18	Draft #1 December 2018	N	N	None to Date	May-19
09_Petaluma Flood Reduction, Water & Habitat Quality for Capri Cree	City of Petaluma	92%	Feb-18	N	Sep-18	Draft #1 December 2018	N	N	None to Date	Sep-19
10_Bayfront Canal/Atherton Channel Flood Improve & Habitat Restore	Redwood City	15%	None to Date	Jun-20	Sep-20	Draft #1 July 2020	N	N	None to Date	Dec-20
11_Regional Groundwater Storage & Recovery Phase 1A	SFPUC	Complete	Jun-17	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
12_Richmond Breuner Marsh Restoration	East Bay Regional Park Dist.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Final approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
13_Infrastructure Upgrades for Water Supply & Quality	Roseview Heights Mutual Water	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
14_SF Bay Climate Change Pilot Projects	SFEP & Oro Loma San Dist	97%	Apr-17	Y	Dec-18	Upload to DWR in December 2018	N	N	None to Date	Apr-19
15_SF Airport Reclaimed Water Facility	SFO/City of San Francisco	50%	None to Date	N	Sep-18	Draft #1 August 2019	N	N	None to Date	Feb-20
16_San Jose Green Streets & Alleys Demonstration	City of San Jose	Complete	None to Date	Y	Sep-18	Draft #1 under review	N	N	None to Date	Mar-19
17_San Pablo Rheem Creek Wetlands Restoration	Contra Costa Water Dist.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
18_Upper York Creek Dam Removal & Ecosystem Restoration	City of St Helena	0%	None to Date	N	Jun-20	Draft #1 March 2020	N	N	None to Date	Dec-20
19_Students & Teachers Restoring a Watershed (North & East Bays)	Point Blue Conservation	Complete	Feb-18	N/A	Oct-18	Draft #1 December 2018	N	N	None to Date	Jul-19
20_Grant Administration	ABAG	73%	N/A	N/A	Oct-20	Draft August 2020	N	N	N/A	Dec-20

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600010883 - Round 3 (Drought Round) Quarterly Status: Q11 (April 2018 - June 2018) submittals are under review and will be submitted September 30, 2018 Payments: Q10 is expected in mid-October Amendments: SFEP is working with the SM RCD to process an amendment to extend the grant. Exact dates TBD. Site Visits: Visited San Mateo RCD to visits sites currently under construction and to discuss grant administration. Grant Term: May 1, 2019	Project Breakdown Complete: 4 Underway: 6 (all over 50%) Sig. Concerns: 0 Withdrawn: 0	Funds (as of Q10) Total Grant: \$32,178,423 Total Match: \$25,121,180.72 Grant Funds Spent: \$26,615,932.32 (82.7%) Match Funds Documented: \$24,955,620.47 (99.3%)
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Project # and Title	Project Sponsor	Construction Implementation Status	Project Completion Site Visit Date	Engineer's Cert of Completion Rcvd (Y/N)	Submission Date for Final Invoice	Project Completion Report Status	Retention Requested (Y/N)	Retention Paid (Y/N)	Post-Performance Report # Submitted	Anticipated Date Retention Release Invoice Issued to DWR
01_Lower Cherry Aqueduct Emergency Rehabilitation	SFPUC	70%	None to Date	May-19	Jan-19	draft #1 March 2019	N	N	None to Date	Jul-19
02_Zone 7 Water Drought Preparedness	Zone 7	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
03_Los Carneros Water Dist. & Milliken Sarco-Tulocay Recycled Water	Napa Sanitation District	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
04_Sunnyvale Continuous Recycled Water Production & Wolfe Rd Pipe	Santa Clara Valley WD	85%	May-18	N	Submitted	draft #1 December 2018	N	N	None to Date	Apr-19
05_DERWA Phase 3 Recycled Water Expansion	DSRSanDist/EBMUD	Complete	May-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
06_Calistoga Recycled Water Storage Facility	City of Calistoga	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
07_Drought Relief for South Coast San Mateo County	San Mateo RCD	83%	Jun-17	Feb-20	May-20	draft #1 February 2020	N	N	None to Date	Sep-20
08_Stinson Beach Water Supply & Drought Preparedness	Sinson Beach County WD	99%	None to Date	Sep-18	Submitted	draft #3 September 2018	N	N	None to Date	Apr-19
09_Bay Area Regional Drought Relief Conservation Program	StopWaste	99%	None to Date	N/A	Sep-18	draft #1 November 2018	N	N	None to Date	Apr-19
10_WaterSMART Irrigation with AMI/AMR	Marin Municipal WD	97%	None to Date	N/A	Sep-19	draft #1 September 2018	N	N	None to Date	Mar-19
11_Grant Administration	ABAG	75%	N/A	N/A	Sep-19	draft #1 June 2019	N	N	N/A	Oct-19

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600011486 - Round 4 Quarterly Status: Q7 (March 2018 - May 2018) was submitted to DWR on August 31, 2018. Responses to comments have been submitted and are under review Payments: Q6 (December 2017 - February 2018) is expected in early September Amendments: None Pending Site Visits: Visited project 06 - San Francisquito on August 09 Grant Term: December 31, 2020	Project Breakdown Complete: 0 Underway: 7 (2 over 50%) Sig. Concerns: 0 Withdrawn: 1		Funds (as of Q6) Total Grant: \$21,469,025 Total Match: \$22,395,709 Grant Funds Spent: \$2,661,825.39 (12.4%) Match Funds Documented: \$0 (0%)
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Project # and Title	Project Sponsor	Construction Implementation Status	Project Completion Site Visit Date	Engineer's Cert of Completion Rcvd (Y/N)	Submission Date for Final Invoice	Project Completion Report Status	Retention Requested (Y/N)	Retention Paid (Y/N)	Post-Performance Report # Submitted	Anticipated Date Retention Release Invoice Issued to DWR
01_Grant Administration	ABAG	32%	N/A	N/A	Jun-21	Jun-21	N	N	N/A	Aug-21
02_Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit	Santa Clara Valley WD	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
03_Marin 2020 Turf Replacement	Marin Municipal WD	17%	None to Date	N/A	Sep-19	draft #1 September 2019	N	N	None to Date	Apr-20
04_East Palo Alto Groundwater Supply	City of East Palo Alto	80%	Aug-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	draft #1 August 2018	N	N	None to Date	Mar-19
05_Coastal San Mateo County Drought Relief Phase II	San Mateo RCD	46%	None to Date	Apr-19	Jun-19	draft #1 March 2019	N	N	None to Date	Jan-19
06_SFQuito Creek Flood Damage Reduction & Ecosystem Restore Phase 2	SFQuito Creek JPA	75%	None to Date	May-19	May-19	draft #1 May 2019	N	N	None to Date	Dec-19
07_Mt View Shoreline Portion of SBSRPR	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	Dec-19	Feb-20	draft #1 February 2020	N	N	None to Date	Sep-20
08_Eden Landing Portion of SBSRPR	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	Dec-20	Oct-20	draft #1 October 2020	N	N	None to Date	May-21
09_Novato Creek Flood Protection and Habitat Enhancement	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	Dec-20	Dec-20	draft #1 December 2020	N	N	None to Date	Jul-21

AQPI Update

Reporting, Invoices & Payments

- Report/Invoice #6 is still in review at Sonoma Water. It was held up while a discrepancy at NOAA was fixed. It should be submitted to DWR next week.

Budget/Schedule

- Expenses are tracking within the Budget and progress is in line with amendment 1 schedule

Other Developments

- Estimated Installation date for permanent SCVWD X-Band Radar – Nov/Dec 2018
- Estimated Installation date for permanent SCWA X-Band Radar – Dec 2018/Jan 2019
- Temporary X-Band Radar planned for East Bay Region – Target installation Jan 2019
- Temporary X-Band Radar planned for SF Region – Target installation Jan/Feb 2019
- Investigating deploying a C-Band at a temporary site next winter to ensure the data starts flowing – CSU has a unit that could be deployed at no additional cost to the project
- Project update meeting being planned for October/November
- AQPI partners presented at Governor Brown's Global Climate Summit event, Bay Planning Coalition's Energy & Water Nexus Summit, CalOES Region II Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee, and the Bay-Delta Science Conference



DACIP Outreach Partner Subcontractor Contract Status Updates:

1. The Watershed Project/ SFEP (Richmond)
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$79,980 - approved
 - c. Contract – signed 6/28/18

2. Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$67,463 - approved
 - c. Contract – signed 6/27/18

3. Resilient Communities Initiative
 - a. Work plan - Pending
 - b. Budget - \$32,223 - Pending
 - c. Contract - 9/28/18 estimated signing date

4. Ronald V. Dellums Institute
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$52,998 - Pending
 - c. Contract - 9/28/18 estimated signing date

5. Shore Up Marin
 - a. Work plan - Pending
 - b. Budget - \$54,956
 - c. Contract – 9/28/18 estimated signing date

6. Sonoma Ecology Center and Daily Acts
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$50,050 - Approved
 - c. Contract – signed 7/12/2018

7. Marin County Community Development Agency
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$49,075 - Approved
 - c. Contract – signed 8/7/18

8. Keep Coyote Creek Beautiful
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$71,778 Approved
 - c. Contract – signed 7/31/18

9. Friends of Sausal Creek
 - a. Work plan - Pending (incorporating changes necessary for Needs Assessment coordination)
 - b. Budget - \$42,311 - Approved
 - c. Contract – signed 8/20/18

10. City of Hayward
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$50,000 - Approved
 - c. Contract – signed 7/31/18

11. All Positives Possible (South Vallejo)
 - a. Work plan - Pending
 - b. Budget - \$63,790 - pending
 - c. Contract – signed 8/1/18

12. Contra Costa Resource Conservation District
 - a. Work plan - Pending
 - b. Budget - \$64,999 (\$43,333 for Pittsburg/Antioch, \$21,666 for Bay Point)
 - c. Contract - 9/28/18 estimated signing date (contract is final, awaiting CCRCD Board approval)

13. Nuestra Casa
 - a. Work plan - Approved
 - b. Budget - \$40,685 – Updated after Needs Assessment coordination meeting
 - c. Contract – signed 9/7/18

14. Youth United for Community Action
 - a. Work plan - Pending
 - b. Budget - \$34,950 - Pending
 - c. Contract – Pending

15. California Indian Environmental Alliance (CIEA)
 - a. Work plan – Pending
 - b. Budget - \$497,000 (12 month contract plus pre-contract work) – Pending
 - c. Contract – Pending (under review by CIEA board)



BA DACTI Program Coordination Workshop

Date: Friday, September 21st, 2018

Time: 11am - 1pm

Location: Join via Google Hangouts (see calendar invitation)

Resources:

Presentation Slides and Notes can be found in the Workshop Google Folder - <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1hKRdcxsXtCTnTgFQBq0aCNUzaGdvprbg>

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11:00-11:05 am | Introduction and Review of Workshop Objectives - Nahal |
| 11:05-11:35 am | Engagement with the BA IRWM Coordinating Committee - Nahal |
| 11:35 am-12:30 pm | Communications Strategy and Outreach Materials - Nahal <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Existing materials- Support- Internal program site (e.g. Coordinator's Corner) |
| | ***** 5 minute break ***** |
| 12:35-12:50 pm | CIEA's Tribal Engagement Process - Sherri Norris <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Coordination with CIEA's Tribal Outreach Process |
| 12:50-1:00 pm | Announcements - Round Robin led by EJCW |

**Bay Area IRWMP
Functional Area Representation**

Name	Functional Area	Agency	Functional Area Body
Steve Ritchie	Chair/Water supply-Water quality	SFPUC	
Melanie Richardson	Vice-chair	SCVWD	
Brian Mendenhall	Flood protection-Stormwater	SCVWD	BAFPAA
Mark Boucher	Flood protection-Stormwater	CCCFCWCD	BAFPAA
Carol Mahoney	Flood protection-Stormwater	Zone 7	BAFPAA
Cheryl Munoz	Wastewater- Recycled water	SFPUC	BACWA
Linda Hu	Wastewater- Recycled water	EBMUD	BACWA
Dave Williams	Wastewater- Recycled water	BACWA	BACWA
Mark Seedall	Water supply-Water quality	CCWD	BAWAC
Brad Sherwood	Water supply-Water quality	SCWA	BAWAC
Brenda Buxton	Watershed	State Coastal Conservancy	BAWN
Judy Kelly	Watershed	NBWA	BAWN
Josh Bradt	Watershed	SFEP	BAWN



Integrated Regional Water Management 2014 Survey

This is the third survey conducted by the IRWM Roundtable of Regions. The first survey was conducted in 2008 and was intended to gather information from IRWM regions throughout the State regarding their IRWM planning efforts. A second survey was taken in 2011 with the purpose of obtaining feedback from IRWM regions regarding the cost of and process for preparing applications for IRWM grant funding, although there were general questions as well. This third survey is intended to investigate the overall effectiveness of the IRWM program and identify any related data trends over the three surveys. References to specific regions and funding areas have been removed to provide anonymity in the responses.

Table of Contents

Section 1 - Participating Regions.....	1
Section 2 – IRWM Grant Process	2
2014 IRWM Drought Grant Application Process	2
General Questions related to the Grant Application Process	11
Regional Perspective on Grant Administration	20
Section 3 – General IRWM Questions, Assuming Continued Grant Program Structure.....	25
Section 4 – IRWM Long-Term Program Sustainability, Possibly Without Continued Grant Funding	35
Section 5 – Other Feedback	45
Section 6 – Results Comparison.....	47

Section 1 - Participating Regions

- American River Basin
- Antelope Valley
- Anza Borrego Desert
- East Contra Costa
- Greater Los Angeles County Region
- Inyo-Mono
- Kings Basin Water Authority
- Lahontan Basins
- Madera Region
- Mojave
- North Coast
- Northern Sacramento Valley IRWM
- Pajaro River Watershed
- Poso Creek IRWM
- San Diego
- San Francisco Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Group
- San Luis Obispo County IRWM Region
- Santa Ana Watershed
- Santa Barbara County IRWM
- Santa Cruz IRWM Region
- South Orange County Watershed Management Area
- Tuolumne-Stanislaus
- Upper Santa Clara River
- Upper Santa Margarita Watershed IRWM Region
- Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County
- Yosemite-Mariposa
- Yuba County

Section 2 – IRWM Grant Process

2014 IRWM Drought Grant Application Process Questions

1. Did your region apply for a 2014 IRWM Drought Grant in 2014?

Yes: 23

No: 4

a. If not, why not?

- DWR has made it clear they will not fund our group
- Having both the retention on the back end of the grant and the in-kind required on the front end of the grant puts the grantee or the Fiscal Agent in a complete financial bind.
- IRWMP was not complete, not Prop. 84 compliant
- n/a – Although we did have several Project Sponsors unwilling or unable to pay their portion of the grant application costs, placing the burden of application development costs on the Grant Lead Agency.
- No one wanted to apply for the funding because no one wanted to be the Grantee or the Fiscal Agent because dealing with DWR invoicing and reporting is too cumbersome and frustrating.
- The % of funding distribution throughout the state was not to our areas advantage. The cost benefit or the return on investment (cost of writing the grant) was not in our favor.
- The main reason we did not apply is that we did not think that we would be competitive in terms of addressing significant drought impacts, compared to other areas of the state.

b. Was the cost to apply a factor in deciding not to apply?

Yes: 4

No: 1

2. For regions that applied for a 2014 IRWM Drought Grant,

a. How many projects were in the grant application?

Average: 5.3

b. What was total amount of the grant request?

Average: \$10,539,431

c. Did you include the cost of grant administration in your grant request?

Yes: 21

No: 2

- i. If so, what percent? 9%
- d. What was the total cost to prepare your application?
- Average: \$101,518
- e. What were application preparation costs per project?
- Average: \$24,105
- f. Did you have a consultant prepare the application?
- Yes: 20
No: 2
- g. What percent of the application cost was for:
- i. Consultants? Average of 74%
- ii. Staff time? Average of 15%
- iii. In-kind or project proponent time? Average of 13%
- h. How was the application funded, i.e., all project proponents shared the cost based on an agreed upon formula, agencies shared the costs, funded by a Regional Water Management Group/JPA, other?
- 3 RWMG agencies paid for it
 - Agencies shared the costs
 - Agreed upon formula based on the grant amount requested
 - All project proponents contributed based on agreed upon formula
 - All project proponents shared costs based upon agreed upon formula (DACs had set \$2,100 fee each, the remaining proponents shared the preparation costs proportionally to the amount each was requesting as a percentage of the total (including subsidizing the DACs).
 - All project proponents shared the cost based on an agreed upon formula
 - All project proponents shared the cost by agreed formula.
 - An agricultural district who is a member of the RWMG provided a fixed amount of funding to complete the application, the DACs involved did not have funding available, but, contributed in-kind and some consulting time in support of the project development. The application cost was based on an estimate of the level of effort and the available funds at the time.
 - Cost share by applicant
 - County had a consultant on a fixed 1 year contract; Fiscal agent used county match funds for staff time
 - Each project proponent paid an equal share
 - Participating agencies shared the cost evenly. Because of the need to move quickly in developing the application, we chose to keep the funding model simple.

- Project proponents paid all costs of application. Grant administrator signed contract with each proponent to administer & finance application process.
 - Shared cost among potential grantees
 - Since the inception of the program, substantial matching funds and allocation of staff resources have been provided by the water agency. The water agency has led the planning and funding application elements of the planning process, and has contracted with a consultant to support these efforts.
 - The 3 project proponents funded the submittal
 - The application was funded by splitting the consultant's application preparation fee equally among the 14 project proponents as agreed.
 - The application was funded by the entities (project proponents) applying for the grant
 - The consultant was funded by the RWMG.
 - Three projects (one being grant administration) have agreed to pay their share of the grant application – agreements to be developed. One project opted to provide in-kind services, thereby limiting consultant costs associated with their project. See 2.i. for the fifth project.
 - We pushed a lot of it onto the project proponents.
- i. If NGOs and DACs contributed to the cost of the application, did they pay an equal share, was their contribution reduced, or did they participate by in-kind efforts?
- All project proponents including NGOs and DACs contribute in-kind application development costs.
 - An equal share
 - In-kind
 - NGOs and DACs did not request drought relief projects in this round of funding. In the past, they have only contributed if they had the capacity to do so.
 - NGOs equally contributed to the cost of the application. DACs did not contribute to the cost.
 - No NGO's, DAC's paid their share.
 - One DAC project was included and the agency was unwilling/ unable to pay for its portion of the application costs.
 - Participated by in-kind efforts (as all project sponsors did) and paid a significantly reduced share of cost to have the consultant prepare the app.
 - The DACs participated through in-kind and consultant time paid for by the DAC. The DACs were unable to commit the level of effort and funds necessary to compete with well-funded IRWM groups within the Funding Area.
 - They contributed funds. No DAC projects included.
 - They paid an equal share
 - Yes
- j. Did you include the cost of preparing the application as a funding match in your grant application?

Yes: 8

Sometimes: 2

No: 12

- k. What percent of your request was for DAC projects? Average of 31%
- l. Please indicate the number of project proponents that fit into each organization type below:
- i. Large agency: Average = 3.1
 - ii. Smaller agency: Average = 2.7
 - iii. Disadvantaged Community: Average = 1.7
 - iv. Non-profit or environmental entity: Average = 0.7
 - v. Other: Average = 1.0
- m. Please provide feedback on the implementation grant application process. Rate each of the following on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being best. Notes and comments would be appreciated.
- i. Grant Review and Tracking System (GRanTS): Average = 3.5
 - Could be slow
 - Grant review was timely and given the expedited review schedule, the review approach was thorough and effective.
 - GRanTS only allowed 5 uploads for Tech justification but because back-up was required, this became a challenge if there was a lot of docs and they were large
 - It works well to have an online sharing site with DWR grant staff; however, it's challenging to use as the Grantee cannot delete posted items. Grantees can only view a limited number of submittals per "page" making it hard to see what deliverables are missing (some projects have 40+ deliverables).
 - Some quirks in the process
 - System seems to have been improved since prior grant cycles – we did not experience any technical issues and the time that it took to upload the documents was relatively quick (compared to previous experiences).
 - The GRanT system allowed for a maximum of 5 documents to be uploaded for each section. If this number could be increased or the system allow an unlimited number of uploads per section that would be a big improvement for regional applications that include more than 5 projects.
 - The GRanT system technical support was accessible and helpful.
 - The system still has glitches ... always some uncertainty if an edit was saved or if a document was successfully uploaded. The project TAB system is not user friendly in that the user has no control of the organization of the project portfolio.
 - There have been glitches signing in and adding people to upload materials, but overall it works reasonably well
 - What is asked for in Grants did not match the PSP. Grants is very finicky and commonly has trouble with files even less than 50MB
 - When is DWR going to finish developing it?

ii. Clarity of Guidelines: Average = 3.6

- Always room for improvement, but overall very clear
- Documents are well written... but the mere fact that we need individual guidelines and PSP document for each round lends itself to some confusion as to where information can be found.
- Guidelines are onerous and leave certain issues nebulous, i.e., the CASGEM requirements for the Drought Solicitation Round
- Guidelines were clear and concise – we had no issues interpreting or using the Guidelines.
- How \$ were to be distributed that was ACTUALLY used was not clear (e.g. how \$ were to go first to highest drought risk regions etc)
- The Guidelines are generally clear; the region appreciates DWR's willingness to answer questions and provide presentations to the region about the IRWM program and Guideline changes
- Too vague
- Too voluminous. It would be good to start fresh and simplify (using lessons learned from past rounds of Prop 84) for the Prop 1 water bond funding. Right now, I find that many of our stakeholders only read parts of the document, or find rules ambiguous.

iii. Clarity of PSP: Average = 3.3

- Always room for improvement, but overall very clear
- Documents are well written... but the mere fact that we need individual guidelines and PSP document for each round lends itself to some confusion as to where information can be found.
- Fairly clear, except related to deadlines and relationship of the eligibility criteria. It is very important that everyone be informed of the date that each eligibility criteria is required to be met by and what precisely is required to justify that the criteria is met, with notification provided in a formal, consistent and timely manner.
- How the applications were scored was not very clear
- Rating is based on lack of additional/specific criteria used to rank grant awards upfront. It wasn't until DWR held the public comment meeting that DWR shared the ranking system they used to award grants. Even though the region received its full grant request, having the information in the beginning would have enabled the Region to receive higher, if not total score for each criteria.
- The PSPs are generally clear and DWR staff is accessible, willing to answer questions and is supportive. The region appreciates the efforts DWR has made to streamline the IRWM grant process, where possible.
- Too vague
- We found it helpful and useful that this PSP had additional information about scoring beyond what was provided in previous PSPs, including a scoring rubric (Table 9) that DWR used to score the grant applications.
- We were concerned that that the PSP didn't provide any information about the table that ranked the funding areas by "drought impact." This table, which was not made public until after the draft funding awards were announced, should have been included in the PSP as a critical piece of information for RWMGs throughout the state.

- While the information in Table 9 was appreciated and helped us to better-understand DWR's scoring process, there is room to improve the PSP and provide additional information to applicants to understand the way in which DWR applies the scoring criteria. For example, for scoring criterion #13, "is the level of technical analysis reasonable considering the size of the project and the type of physical benefit claimed," it is not clear how DWR assessed the "reasonableness" of the technical analysis for each project. In future grant applications, we would appreciate additional information in the PSP about the way in which DWR will apply the scoring criteria to help guide development of grant applications.
- With information in both PSP and Guidelines (which includes IRWM plan requirements) necessary to complete the grant application, it was necessary to be intimate with BOTH documents for very specific minute detail.

iv. Amount of detail required in application: Average = 3.2

- Although the process was streamlined, in order to develop an adequate application, significant work was still required.
- Better than previous, but could be streamlined even more
- Project justification was not much less effort than prior years (e.g. not requiring monetized benefits did not significantly reduce effort); also the requirement to actually provide the tech refs for the justification seemed over kill. Did DWR actually review these?
- Similar to other applications
- The amount of detail required in the application, especially related to technical feasibility, may be difficult for projects from small, economically disadvantaged communities and could be a deterrent to their participation in the IRWM process. Projects from economically disadvantaged communities generally face insufficient in-house technical resources and often lack the funds necessary to retain professional expertise to develop and determine best project alternatives. Projects from and benefitting disadvantaged communities may lack the detail and supporting documentation required by DWR to determine the basis for a project. In terms of scoring and funding equity, this requirement is structured such that the technical justification documentation provided from large entities would have a clear competitive advantage over projects from small, rural disadvantaged communities.
- The detail required in the application is redundant.
- Too much detail required... grants are very broad in scope and this lends to the State trying to capture every possible dimension of projects and their impacts/benefits on everything imaginable...
- We greatly appreciate that DWR did not require economic analysis in this grant application and instead required applicants to quantify project benefits (provide a technical analysis of each project). However, the way in which DWR evaluated the technical analysis is not entirely clear. Our application's score on the quantification of physical benefits suggests that we did not provide the amount of detail that DWR was looking for. Without knowing what DWR was looking for with regards to the technical analysis (lack of clarity in the PSP), it is difficult to assess the amount of detail that was required in the application.

v. Overall cost to apply: Average = 2.2

- Expensive
- In general the State grants have become more onerous and expensive to prepare... believe this is a tremendous waste of money that could be redirected toward actual project implementation.
- It is prohibitively costly for smaller agencies, rural agencies and DACs to participate and it is too reliant on consultant experts
- The cost to apply for this round of funding was comparable to past rounds of IRWM funding, which is largely recognized as being expensive.
- Too expensive. It inhibits participation by smaller agencies/ projects, OR requires another agency to cover costs of those smaller agencies.

vi. Responsiveness of DWR staff providing technical assistance: Average = 3.8

- Did not use much, relied on internal “institutional knowledge”
- DWR staff difficult to reach
- DWR staff has been responsive in answering technical questions.
- DWR staff was very expeditious in responding to questions during this round of funding – we found that questions submitted to the established grant-related email address were answered within a week or so, which was very helpful. However, the responses provided by DWR did not seem to be consistent with the scoring of the applications. For example, DWR released formal responses to frequently asked questions on July 7th – this document indicated that for the technical analysis, applicants should upload supporting documents that were used to quantify project-related benefits with specific page references, presumably so DWR could verify the technical accuracy of benefits claimed. After receiving this input from DWR, we spent a substantial amount of time ensuring that all quantified benefits had supporting references and that all supporting documents were compiled and uploaded to the GRanTS system. Despite this level of documentation, our applicant scored very low for the “reasonableness” of technical information, indicating that our documentation for the technical analysis was not sufficient to support claimed benefits, despite the fact that we very closely followed guidance provided by DWR.
- DWR will provide technical assistance at times, but they have been unclear when directly asked, not timely in response or provided responses open to interpretation rather than definitive
- Excellent
- We’ve not received details on the process for engaging technical assistance, but that would be a wonderful resource for DACs and nonprofit organizations.

vii. DWR workshops: Average = 3.3

- Did not use much, listened in
- Information presented is too broad... much of what is presented could be provided on the DWR website as a report or presentation... focus of meeting should be Q&A sessions

- Informative overall information; accessible through internet conferencing options. The workshop formats that allow applicants to talk directly with DWR staff are especially helpful.
 - More detail and thoughts on what they're looking for and how will evaluate would be useful
 - The DWR workshops, while helpful, did not fully explain the way in which applications would be scored – for reasons stated previously, it would be very helpful if DWR focused workshops on explaining how scoring will occur so that applicants can focus time and effort on preparing applications in a manner that is consistent with DWR's scoring process.
 - The financial assistance branch workshops are generally very helpful and informative. Other workshops, such as stakeholder engagement and some of the strategic plan workshops, don't seem to add much value to IRWM.
 - The workshops on the PSP and guideline have been useful, however, the stakeholder outreach workshops while seemingly good at the time were not worthwhile for the participants. For example, the Draft document, *Review of IRWM Planning in California*, which was largely based on these workshops was completely not reflective of the content discussed or shared, the information about many plans was inaccurate and it was woefully out of date document.
 - This one wasn't as clear as others
- n. Please provide input on the level of effort required for each of the following major application attachments. Rate each on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest level of effort.
- i. Authorization and Eligibility Requirements: Average = 5.3
- CASGEM requirements were significant and difficult
 - Straight-forward and consistent with previous applications. Only new information pertained to the CASGEM compliance.
 - This section is time consuming particularly when multiple projects are in the grant submittal. There is a great deal of effort in working with multiple parties in identifying, clarifying and organizing all of the various eligibility requirements for each agency/project.
- ii. Drought Impacts: Average = 6.6
- Additional level of effort was required to prepare this attachment due to strict page limits.
 - Knowing that this section played heavily in scoring resulted in significant effort and fine tuning. Page limitation and font size definition helped.
- iii. Project Justification: Average = 8.3
- The large majority of time was spent preparing this portion of the application; as such, would like to have additional information about how this attachment was scored.

- This section continues to be burdensome and unnecessary in order to prove out projects with detailed benefit description, technical analysis and cost effectiveness analysis.

iv. Work Summary: Average = 7.0

- Straightforward and consistent with previous applications. As with past applications, the way in which DWR requires work summaries to be structured is reasonable for construction-focused projects but not for other types of projects (such as conservation programs and rebate programs). Would be helpful to be able to adjust work summary in accordance with different project types.
- With a multiple project grant submittal, there is a lot of variability in the types of projects and the stage of completion, making this section time consuming and a detailed effort. Page limit and font style helped

v. Budget Summary: Average = 6.2

- Straightforward and consistent with previous applications. As with past applications, the way in which DWR requires work summaries to be structured is reasonable for construction-focused projects but not for other types of projects (such as conservation programs and rebate programs). Would be helpful to be able to adjust work summary in accordance with different project types.
- The budget is pretty straight forward... again; however with a multiple project grant submittal there is a lot of variability in the types of projects and the stage of completion. Page limit and font style definition helped.

vi. Schedule: Average = 5.9

- Straightforward and consistent with previous applications. As with past applications, the way in which DWR requires work summaries to be structured is reasonable for construction-focused projects but not for other types of projects (such as conservation programs and rebate programs). Would be helpful to be able to adjust work summary in accordance with different project types.
- The problem with the schedules is the format... and it has always been a little unclear regarding the level of detail required... also the cookie cutter format required by the State does not apply to each project.

vii. Program Preferences: Average = 6.0

- Not too difficult but page limitation helped.
- Straightforward and consistent with previous applications. We greatly appreciate that DWR took our comments into consideration with regard to scoring the "Human Right to Water" criterion.

viii. DAC Assistance: Average = 5.6

- Ridiculous that each Prop 84 administering agency has different ways of determining if a project benefits a DAC
- Straightforward and consistent with previous applications. We continue to request that DWR expand its definition of DAC projects beyond those that provide direct benefits to drinking water supplies for DACs given that DAC issues in our Region pertain largely to urban DACs that already receive drinking water from municipalities.

General Questions related to the Grant Application Process

3. If you could provide DWR and/or the legislature with comments on the grant application process, what would you say? How would you improve the process?

- “drought” projects put the IRWMP in a box where the most needed water projects may not score well so alternate “drought” projects were chosen. Many of the region’s projects are more long term strategic rather than a response to acute drought issues.
- A general comment is that we feel IRWM groups need to work together with DWR to develop a grant application process that is not as onerous but that still meets the need to show accountability and justifiable use of public funds. There may be value in having an advisory committee made up of regional IRWM representatives to work with DWR staff in developing guidelines and PSPs.
- Adequate Timing for Application Development to Ensure Effective Project Review and Selection: The region's project review and selection process is rigorous and thorough. Additionally the process includes a high standard for inclusiveness and transparent decision-making requiring a number of both technical and policy committee in-person public meetings. To implement a high-quality and effective project review process takes time.
- Allocate minimum funding to all regions that meet requirements. Defer to regions’ project selection process. Be clearer and more consistent with the timing and amount of solicitations. Look at funding DACs through a separate process.
- An improvement in the process would be allocating/awarding funds directly to regions with a DWR-approved Plan for high priority projects identified in the Plan. DWR has already vetted/approved the IRWM Plan; the RWMG has already vetted/ranked high priority projects in the Plan.
- Ask legislature to prioritize implementation of critical projects and reduce the amount of additive “eligibility” requirements. The Guidelines are often cumbersome largely due to DWR having to include potentially unrelated requirements or language. The legal and/or legislative language often reduces clarity, especially for most general public/ stakeholders.
- Avoid overlapping deadlines with various State-led water resources management efforts (e.g. grant application process overlapping with CA Water Plan review/ release).
- Continue the streamlined process used with the 2014 Drought application process but not as accelerated. Provide a written guidance on how to obtain full scores for each rating category. This information would add transparency to the DWR scoring process, help us to understand how the DWR applies the criteria, and assist regions to better meet the objectives of grant funding initiatives. We recommend that the DWR consider implementing a step in the grant review process whereby applicants have an opportunity to meet with the DWR to discuss any

questions or issues with their proposals. Allowing applicants to provide clarification and input to the DWR regarding their proposals is important to ensuring that proposals are fairly scored in a consistent manner across the State. Instead of a statewide competition, we recommend that DWR establish Funding Area allocations to continually provide fair and predictable allocation of funding. This will eliminate additional challenges that can result from the uncertainty over available funds for future solicitations in the event that a single region applies for the maximum funding area allocation in the current solicitation. We believe all areas of the State face impacts and challenges from this extreme drought and the funding allocation for this round should follow the process used in all prior funding rounds.

- DAC Project Technical Assistance: The predominantly disadvantaged communities in the region have limited technical or funding capacity to respond to the rigorous and complicated IRWM application process. Suggestions include up-front allocations of funds (or block grant) for technical assistance and capacity building to disadvantaged communities, to provide for a first phase of technical assistance, feasibility study and preliminary project design.
- Do not tie emergency funding to IRWM funding. Otherwise the process was relatively easy – especially compared to previous rounds
- DWR is constantly changing their minds on how they would like the reporting to be completed. Even though we sent the in-kind in exactly how it was requested each time – it took 6 submissions before it was accepted.
- DWR is now requiring that all of the in-kind match be achieved “up front” with the very first invoice. This normally is required throughout the life of the project so that it can be achieved as the project is completed. By requiring this up front it definitely prevents work from being done because you are too involved with trying to get in-kind then actually doing the project because you cannot bill for contractors and other expenses.
- DWR should streamline the application process by adhering to PRC §75028(a), which says that DWR “shall defer to approved local project selection and review projects only for consistency with the purposes of §75026.” §75026 requires that eligible projects (1) be consistent with an adopted IRWM plan or its functional equivalent as defined in the IRWM Guidelines; (2) provide multiple benefits; and (3) contribute to DWR’s program preferences. So long as regions can demonstrate that their project review and selection processes meet these guidelines, DWR should defer to the list of projects selected by the regions and eliminate extensive scoring and ranking of grant proposals. DWR also should streamline grant application requirements for non-competitive funding areas. DWR should request only information necessary to confirm consistency of grant application projects with the local IRWM Plan and any MOU adopted by the region or funding area.
- Ensure that DWR communicates openly both internally and with Regions when it appears issues are arising or eligibility criteria aren’t met (e.g. expressing the unwritten deadlines for CASGEM deadline – Sept 9th vs Oct 8th). This might be handled in something like an RFP process where once final guidelines are released all communications (region’s/DWR Q/A) are compiled and distributed to all DWR and region staff involved.
- Fewer Rounds of Funding with Larger Funding Allocations: In an effort to promote effective integrated projects and planning, the region requests that DWR provide increased funding allocations and fewer rounds of funding if the California budget allows. Multiple rounds of IRWM funding applications require substantial staffing resources and may act as a deterrent to the participation or success of the projects serving a region’s most disadvantaged communities.
- Guidelines need to get more simplified.

- Having both the retention on the back end of the grant and the in-kind required at the front end of the grant put the grantee or the fiscal agent in a complete financial bind – especially if they were hiring contractors to do work.
- Honor and follow the Public Resources Code in grant applications. Public Resources Code (PRC) §75028(a) says that competition should be limited to areas with more than one applicant in a Funding Area. The DWR should review such applications only for consistency with the law and the principals of IRWM. PRC §75028(a) states: *The department shall defer to approved local project selection, and review projects only for consistency with the purposes of §75026. PRC §75026 states that the DWR should request only information necessary to confirm that a grant application project is consistent with the local IRWM Plan, provides multiple benefits, and helps to achieve the DWR's program preferences.* We suggest a pass/fail approach on many sections of the grant application for consistency with the law and not second guessing IRWM governance evaluation and selection.
- In general the process would be drastically improved if the Project Justification section was eliminated. Approximately 60% of the grant effort goes to just this part of the application.
- It is frustrating that in addition to regional taxpayers contributing to payments for the bond, additional local funds are expended to compete for getting the money back to fund regional projects, and that even though significant effort is put into competing, there may not be a return. This is why it is very important to streamline the process and consider alternatives to competition.
- It is still too onerous. Scrap the existing application, and review legislation to bring back only the required components of the application. It has just been continuously appended over the years.
- Overall our region greatly appreciates the allocation of funding to improve water resources management. Focus on the intent of the funding and of the IRWM program.
- Overall, the Prop 84 allocations to the regions in the funding area has not be equitable. To some extent, the inequity perpetuates a feedback mechanism – well functioning regions receive funding which further establishes their IRWM efforts, promotes greater participation and improves their capacity, this in-turn puts them in a better position to receive future funding.
- Process needs further streamlining
- Reduce the complexity, in particular the economic analysis.
- Regarding the Drought Solicitation – more time to prepare the application would have been better.
- Scale back the economic analysis
- Thank you for streamlining the grant process. Please continue this streamlined process into future grants and work with the IRWM Regions to implement an even more streamlined application process that still meets legislative requirements. On the back side, please make the progress reporting more streamlined, potentially using some federal grant reporting as a model and work closely with the grantees to get more input and collaboration.
- The drought grant took a good step towards reducing the documentation required in the application – thereby hoping to focus on the intent of the grant funding. However, in general, the application process should be further streamlined to reduce the burden on and high costs borne by the grant applicants (e.g. minimize unnecessary and onerous practices).
- The expedited application schedule created a need to somewhat degrade what has been one of the most thorough and transparent application review processes in grant making. While earlier rounds of funding may have been more costly and technically challenging for IRWMs to prepare their applications, the reduction in each was minimal in comparison to the value of portions of DWR's typical application process that were eliminated in the Drought round.

- The grant application process must be streamlined and must do away with redundancies, i.e., requirements for duplicate information in various section. The process must make allowances for DACs, i.e., through a special fund for DACs or a DWR unit to assist DACs. Outreach workshops should be relevant and information gather should be absorbed into the process, not summarized (erroneously) and then given back to IRWM groups for consumption.
- The IRWM grant process is inefficient, unequitable, and wasteful use of public resources. Bond funding needs to be aligned with the Resource Management Strategies of the State Water Plan and administered through existing departments supporting existing programs. It is not clear why an IRWM program needs to also function as the grant funding agency for all the technical topics within the SWP. The IRWM program could be coordinating and prioritizing programs and projects to be aligned for funding that matched with the State Water Plan RMSs; there is a limited number of RMSs and the priority for funding an RMS is different by location in the State. The all or nothing funding competition between IRWMs, based on scoring of how well an application is written and polished, does not provide incentive for the collaboration among IRWMs to complete integrated regional projects of significant scale. The original intent was to fund project packages of the \$50M scale. The program was reduced to \$25M per proposal and since then even further reductions for the same level of detailed planning effort per IRWM application. Why is an IRWM department required to administer a \$4M pool of funds for multiple IRWMs within a Funding Area?
- The IRWM program is very competitive and the cost:benefit calculation (risk:reward ratio) of high application costs with high uncertainty of a successful grant award is decreasing interest in applying for future funds.
- The requirement of having to sign letters such as “we are not working with Darfur” and other such signature requirements were a hindrance and made no sense for the projects we were completing in the areas we were completing them – yet this was a requirement before we could get a signature from DWR.
- The requirement to “demonstrate that we really don’t need the funding to complete the project” before we could get the funding and the contract to do the project was an extreme hardship and made no sense at all.
- The scoring and award distribution on the Drought Implementation grant was such that even a high scoring application (which had it been in a different region would have received funding) didn’t get funded because of funding limitations. There seems to be an inequity in that scenario.
- The use of the IRWM funds for drought-specific issues did not relate equally to all IRWM constituencies. Many project types went unfunded and faith in the IRWM process has been somewhat undermined. It confused and complicated planning already underway for Rd 3 general purpose IRWM. Once announced, DWR efforts to expedite and streamline were appreciated.
- Though helpful to have funding available for drought relief projects, local stakeholders found it contradictory to the IRWM process to narrow the allowable scope of projects to only drought relief.
- We are not eligible for funding without an IRWMP but DWR will not fund our planning after two attempts

4. How would you compare the 2014 application process with previous application processes, if applicable? Was it easier, harder, about the same?
- 2014 Drought Grant Application was easier
 - A little easier than past Prop 84 grant applications but still includes unnecessary sections for funding areas with no other competitive IRWMs in their funding area. Applications should not be ranked across State but only within a funding area.
 - A little easier. The cost-effectiveness discussion was easier than doing an economic analysis.
 - About the same given the quick time to complete
 - DAC tool does ease the process of DAC definition
 - Definitely more streamlined, but there was still a lot of work to prepare the level of information requested; room for improvement to streamline more
 - During the 2014 Drought solicitation, only the GRanT system application upload was required, which was a substantial improvement from previous grant cycles when printed copies were required as well.
 - Easier in some ways; however given the expedited nature, it shortened normal stakeholder processes, project sponsor documentation development, etc.
 - Easier to apply for previous grants - difficult to rally "regional" partners and DWR will not fund if they don't participate.
 - Equally challenging due to the amount of resources required to compete in the Funding Area. They were all hard.
 - For the Drought Round, the simplification gained was offset by the short-timeframe. That said it would be appreciated if the simplified application was used in future solicitations.
 - Getting better
 - It was about the same. There were fewer areas of required information, but each area seemed to encompass more topics.
 - It was much easier.
 - Nominally easier
 - Process needs further streamlining
 - Quicker/Shorter than Rounds 1 & 2. Still need to hire writing team plus economist to complete requirements quickly, which made the application process very costly.
 - The 2014 application process was easier than previous application processes because it was slightly more streamlined.
 - The 2014 Drought application process was more streamlined and efficient compared to past application processes. Additionally (and more importantly), the application review and contracting process has been timely allowing greater continuity between project proposals and implementation. The elimination of the cost benefit analysis requirement reduced the application costs by 40-50%.
 - The expedited application schedule created a need to somewhat degrade what has been one of the most thorough and transparent application review processes in grant making. While earlier rounds of funding may have been more costly and technically challenging for IRWMs to prepare their applications, the reduction in each was minimal in comparison to the value of portions of DWR's typical application process that were eliminated in the Drought round.
 - The requirements for financial justification (cost-benefit ratio) have only grown and this a costly aspect of the application.

- The timeline for the 2014 Drought application submittal was too short and created significant stress for the volunteer technical committee, the policy committee, and project proponents – many of whom represent disadvantaged communities.
 - While the 2014 process was done at a much faster turn around, the stream lined process was much more cost effective for our region, our previous grant application was more time consuming and difficult.
5. How would you compare the IRWM grant application process to that for other State or Federal grants? What is easier or harder and why? Please provide examples.
- Almost every other grant is easier than a DWR grant. When asked, most would much rather apply for funds from BOR or other agencies then anything for IRWM (DWR). Continued issues such as returning an invoice to be re-done because of a .01¢ difference seems a little excessive. When a phone call or an adjustment may have sufficed.
 - Depends on the other grants that compared to. Some state grants are easier (less justification and technical analysis requirements), but none are more complex. Some federal grants are easier (requesting less information/detail about work plans, schedules and budgets – simpler the better), and some federal grants require a lot of explanation/analysis to explain how a project meets certain criteria/program preferences, which can be very challenging on your one shot to write it well.
 - DWR State Grants are the most burdensome of any grants that we prepare. Much more difficult and costly than Federal Grants.
 - Federal is much easier excluding NEPA
 - Harder due to the econ analysis
 - Harder. Far more compliance elements involved. For example, having to attach copies of diversion filings took a long time. That information was on-line and could have simply been confirmed by DWR staff.
 - How \$ were to be distributed that was ACTUALLY used was not clear (e.g. how \$ were to go first to highest drought risk regions etc)
 - IRWM grant applications are more difficult for two reasons. The first is the depth of information required and the second is coordinating the application to cover all of the projects within the region. The IRWM applications do a better job of showing what the state will be receiving for their funding than many other application do.
 - IRWM most difficult process
 - More difficult, but the fact that multiple projects are included and benefits of each must be integrated in various ways requires some additional effort.
 - Much more complicated than Federal applications. Application longer than State Board or Strategic Growth Council (but larger grant funding amounts).
 - Overly complex, complicated, and expensive. The IRWM grant process is the most difficult for the IRWM RWMG to compete in. The 2014 IRWM Plan Update contains an appendix that summarized all the funding received since the Plan was adopted in 2007. Only one successful IRWM award compared to multiple Federal and State grants received for this IRWM RWMG. The entities within the IRWM have received over a dozen federal funded awards, totaling well over \$20M. Individual communities have been successful obtaining state and federal funding. In total, among the communities and agricultural districts, over \$82M of capital improvements has been completed since forming the IRWM. Only one, reduced funded IRWM award of \$8.25M, or roughly 10 percent of the Region’s local, state, and federal contributions, can be

shown as funding from the IRWM program. The area least successful at securing funding to advance regional formulated projects and programs identified in the IRWM Plan is the IRWM funding program itself.

- Process needs further streamlining
- Still too extensive than most other State and Federal grant programs. Example: SWRCB Prop 84 Stormwater Grant was much simpler and less labor intensive. The federal grants are more streamlined in that they have specific goals and ask focused proposal questions specifically on the project work plan, budget, schedule and benefits to be provided, whereas the DWR IRWM grant applications appear to be trying to capture every possible dimension of the project and its impacts/benefits on everything imaginable.
- The cost-benefit analysis requirement is somewhat unique compared to other state and federal (public) funding opportunities. The technical justification sections of the grant application process can also be challenging. See below for a specific example of a very feasible and practical application process/requirement.
- The Drought Round is easier – asks for less detail, has easier guidelines, is more straightforward. Questions are asked once – rather than multiple times with nuances – thus making it easier to build a consistent and stronger case.
- The IRWM application process is substantially more difficult and complicated than all federal grant programs we have been involved with (USBR Water 2025 and ARRA) and than earlier state programs (Prop 13, Prop 40, Prop 50 Non-IRWMP). Application costs are at least 30% more than those of USBR WaterSMART or non-IRWMP State grants.
- The IRWM applications are tedious, repetitive and expensive. It becomes a disincentive to put together an expensive application that may or may not be funded.
- The IRWM grant application process is significantly more complex than other State or Federal grants due to the length of the application and technical/economic information required. The IRWM Grant program is far more demanding than other grant programs.
- The IRWM grant application process was much harder than Prop 13 grant process with both DWR and SWRCB.
- With information in both PSP and Guidelines (which includes IRWM plan requirements) necessary to complete the grant application, it was necessary to be intimate with BOTH documents for very specific minute detail. It seems that the information necessary to complete ALL of the grant application elements are in two places – the Guidelines and PSP. This puts a premium in being intimately familiar with both and makes the application more complex. Also, the level of effort to do the economic justification is the same whether for a large or small project. Some Fed grants (USBR) require economic justification and FEMA grants for flood risk reduction require economic justification – however the instructions seem to less dense/detailed than for IRWM.

6. What are your recommendations for streamlining the IRWM grant solicitation and application process?

- Allow flexibility to "phase" areas of a region that have the most critical issues.
- Consider an independent grant program for DACs.
- Consider having several DWR staff or a focus group to “test drive” based on some known project Guidelines, PSPs, and application process drafted. Improve and clarify as needed before releasing publicly.

- Continue the streamlined process of grant solicitation used for the 2014 Drought Grant. Add more measure to further streamline the process.
- Cost benefit can be challenging
- Create more defined preferences and provide incentives if those are met.
- DWR also should make up-front grant payments (as opposed to reimbursements) for projects from NGOs and projects that benefit DACs. Perhaps there would be a maximum dollar figure for such projects to be eligible. This could make it easier for such groups to participate in IRWM.
- DWR should streamline the application process by adhering to PRC §75028(a), which says that DWR “shall defer to approved local project selection and review projects only for consistency with the purposes of §75026.” §75026 requires that eligible projects (1) be consistent with an adopted IRWM plan or its functional equivalent as defined in the IRWM Guidelines; (2) provide multiple benefits; and (3) contribute to DWR’s program preferences. So long as regions can demonstrate that their project review and selection processes meet these guidelines, DWR should defer to the list of projects selected by the regions and eliminate extensive scoring and ranking of grant proposals. DWR also should streamline grant application requirements for non-competitive funding areas. DWR should request only information necessary to confirm consistency of grant application projects with the local IRWM Plan and any MOU adopted by the region or funding area.
- Eliminate hardcopy submittals... reduce the detail and complexity of grant attachments... especially the economic analysis... organize the application by project rather than by attachment type (i.e. project 1 workplan, budget, schedule; project 2 workplan, budget, schedule ... rather than att 1 workplan... att 2 budget... att 3 schedule)... this could possibly make the entire proposal easier to track
- For Funding Areas with only one IRWM, remove sections on “Project Justification” “Physical Benefits”, “Technical Analysis of Physical Benefits Claimed” and Cost Effective Analysis” since these have been evaluated by the IRWM governance. Avoids second guessing and ranking of IRWM governance.
- Form a systematic, annual solicitation similar to how the U.S Bureau of Reclamation administers the WaterSMART program or the Salinity Reductions Program for the Colorado River. An annual budget available for projects that align with the Funding Area’s RMS under the State Water Plan. Annual, semi-annual, or quarterly workshops could be held within the Funding Area where applicants present their projects by RMS with two-page summaries and 15 minutes overview. Program managers within the DWR IRWM program then select no more than 2 times the funding available in estimated project costs for an invited proposal with a minimum and maximum score to determine the level of funding percentage. All IRWMs would be included in the funding award, based on the scoring, at some level of support; no proposals would be 100 percent funded by IRWM fund alone. This method would force IRWMs to select their best projects knowing they were going to have to share in the pool of funds and not allowed to secure all the funding in the Funding Area by outspending the opponent on project development and application costs, which are reimbursed for those who win presently, not for the those left out of the system. Added incentive for larger awards would include regional projects that benefit more than one IRWM group; this would foster collaboration versus closed door competition which exists presently. Empower your PMs to make selections and to be interactively involved in the IRWM implementation process, less to do about some uninformed staffer reviewing an application that is less than accurate portrayal of the truth in the field. Too much gaming in the present system is allowed as reviewers can only consider what is written in

front of them and are not allowed to even QA/QC the statements by finding out the facts in the local area.

- Greater lead time on the basic framework of the round (eligible project types, general emphasis and funding amounts) as well as pre-PSP outreach on new or changing eligibility requirements that can affect participation (such as CASGEM).
- Have a web based drop down menu formatted summary of IRWMP Plan goals, objectives, RMS, etc that the proponent could simply check as being relevant. Host a workshop with invitations to applicants of past IRWMP grants who are NOT professional engineers, economists, attorneys, or accountants (and who did not hire consultants) and learn what aspects of the grant process they struggled with and may not be necessary or could be modified.
- In general, the application process should be further streamlined to reduce the burden on and high costs borne by the grant applicants (e.g. minimize unnecessary and onerous practices). This could be done by using a multi-stage application, with screening process before requiring full proposal, proof of eligibility, etc. Some factors and eligibility requirements could be included in a conditional award phase rather than during application period, for items such as those legislatively required elements (e.g. CASGEM, UWMP, etc.). Overall DWR Staff might consider “Do we use this information to make funding decisions?” “What can be removed from the application process?” Another possibility would be allowing short-form applications for returning Grantees. A resource for considering how to streamline grant application and administration processes: <http://gmnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/RightSizing.pdf> and <http://gmnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Online-Applications-and-Reporting.pdf>.
- It is still too onerous. Scrap the existing application, and review legislation to bring back only the required components of the application. It has just been continuously appended over the years.
- Maybe DWR go over to the DOC office and learn how they administered their grants. I have never had an issue with them – they are very easy to work with, talk to, report to, invoice, etc. Yet they get exactly what they want through example and communication.
- Regions shouldn’t have to expend so much effort to justify the validity of their projects, assuming those projects have been through the region’s IRWMP planning process and the project sponsor’s planning process. For instance, a project that is in a region’s IRWMP Plan, is in an agency’s funded CIP, and has an Engineers Report should be good to go. Project sponsors should not have to re-document their eligibility in each and every application. Instead they should just have to document compliance with new requirements. For example, urban water suppliers shouldn’t have to re-document that they are in compliance with UWMP requirements until after July 1, 2016, when the next UWMP is due. Same with GW management plans, etc.
- Require less information
- Retain information from previous grants rounds (e.g. Attachment 1 type material) to reduce repetition and reentry. Embed IRWMP components in application.
- Somehow include documentation provided by Grantee’s from previous applications so that it doesn’t need to be resubmitted. Streamline the econ analysis.
- Streamline further for non-competitive funding areas. DWR should consider refining the Guidelines and PSP to request only information necessary to confirm consistency of grant application project(s) with the local IRWMP Plan and any Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) adopted by the region or Funding Area. Encourages regional cooperation, coordination, and collaboration between IRWMP regions within a funding area.
- The information that is requested in the grant application should also be what DWR is going to need for their grant agreement. The grant agreement process seems like a second application

for the same group of projects. The application and agreement processes could be streamlined so that the regions could receive their funds in a more timely fashion.

- The number one recommendation to streamline the grant application process would be to eliminate the Project Justification section.
- Use the 2014 SWRCB Interim Emergency Drinking Water grant process as a model for at least some future IRWM grants.
- While it is not DWR's "job" to help RWMGs select projects, I'm sure they've seen enough applications to say "if they'd dropped Projects x and y, we could have funded this application". Some info along the lines of "Considerations for Project Selection for Inclusion in an Implementation Grant Application" could be helpful so that RWMGs strategically select projects that have a higher probability of success.
- While not specifically related to streamlining, it seems that project selection for inclusion in the application can have a significant impact on the success of the application (i.e. the projects that it is easy to articulate immediate benefits for; projects for which CEQA/difficult permitting is on its way/completed; and for which match is readily available) can be easier to articulate in an application.

Regional Perspective on Grant Administration

7. Please rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best, your satisfaction with DWR's invoicing procedures and explain.

Average = 3.7

- After having worked with DWR for several years now on invoicing and reporting, we are over the hump of the learning curve and have gotten into a routine that makes the process more efficient and even enjoyable. However, we continue to face different invoicing requirements from different DWR grant managers and even have grant managers answering the same questions completely differently. It is also still very difficult for a person new to the IRWM process to learn and understand DWR's reporting requirements.
- Can be a very slow process and guidance as to what is needed can change frequently
- Constantly changing requirements, templates, etc. make administration QA/QC difficult.
- DRW has done a good job explaining the invoicing procedures.
- DWR has worked with us over the years to streamline the procedure.
- DWR's invoice options need improvement. The "Task-by-Task" invoicing drawdown (requiring all match met prior to any reimbursement) is very difficult for smaller agencies and NGOs to manage and a huge disincentive/barrier to participation. Task-by-Task however was still preferable to the "Concurrent Drawdown" method (which we opted not to use) as it appeared to be administrative time sink. DWR should, like SWRCB, allow match to be submitted over the duration of the grant without requiring all match upfront or a fixed grant:match ratio on each submittal.
- DWR's program representative has done a marvelous job
- For Round One – Prop 84 – We would say a "2" given how long the invoice review and payment processing takes. Too much back and forth in review of invoices.
- For the Prop 84 Planning Grant, would rate invoicing procedures at a 4. Although labor intensive to gather and present detail, the process was very logical and methodical, no real surprises. - For Prop 84 Round 1, would rate invoicing procedures a 4. The invoice forms provided by DWR in

Excel format are very helpful but not as user friendly as they could be. For example, there should be a way for the user to create a new invoice for the next invoicing period without doing a “cut & paste” from the previous invoice. Also, sometimes there is a lot of time spent tracking down “small change” errors that can result from rounding errors. It would be nice if pennies could be disregarded in invoicing (or if discrepancies of less than \$1 could simply be “adjusted”). The level of detail required for compiling invoice backups is labor intensive and costly.

- Invoicing procedure is very labor intensive. Excel Master Invoice percentage drawdown of grant is overly complicated. The formulas cause an over reliance on using one spreadsheet to manage a large grant program. It makes it difficult for the entity reporting to have supporting financial systems to report information. The invoice number is tied to the formula calculation which causes numerous problems in reporting for multiple projects with different reporting schedules. Too much detail in progress report write up is being required.
- Invoicing turnaround times have improved, but still place a significant burden on projects, especially those with limited cash reserves or lines of credit. Would like to see improvements on the amendment process, perhaps a cap on the amount that triggers a formal amendment. 5 or 10% of a line item can mean that formal amendments are required for changes of as little as a few hundred dollars. This holds up a project’s ability to invoice until the amendment is approved. Would like to consider additional options for cost share submittal. Concurrent drawdown doesn’t work for project’s who’ve received non-state funding sources for specific tasks and by task, burdens project timing in order to expend cost share funds in advance of receiving DWR grant funds. Finally, would like DWR to consider paying for certain activities (and/or accepting cost share submittals for these activities) that are described in the implementation tasks *before* the FAPP 2 process is completed.
- It has been resource intensive to go through the draft, review and revision process. This is due in part to the multiple DWR comment periods, lack of a finalized standard format and competing priorities, as well as project sponsor availability to respond to questions in a timely manner.
- Lots of room for improvement and streamlining. Too much backup detail required in the invoice. Not enough DWR staff to get review and payment done in a timely manner. DWR staff is overloaded, which is one element of slowing the process. Also, the level of detail that is required in an invoice slows the process. If that detail was summarized in an invoice and retained by the grantee for a later audit, payments would get out much quicker.
- Once an understanding of requirements was established, the process and turnaround has been smooth
- Our regions experience has been approximately a 4, once you know exactly what needs to be included the process isn’t overly difficult. The process is time consuming even after the process is understood.
- Really slow and burdensome invoicing process
- Round 1 has more duplication of work in there and seems to be more inefficient. We have not submitted an invoice for Round 2 yet, but based on the kick-off meeting, it seems to be more streamlined.
- Takes some new people a while to get up to speed. But, DWR is more reasonable than in procedures than the SWRCB.
- There is too much “back and forth” as well as indecision in their invoicing. There is a lack of decision making prior to receiving the invoices so they don’t really know what they are looking for, so it ends up on the back of the agency submitting the invoices. To spend many hours reworking and redoing invoices before they are paid.

- Unfortunately, DWR doesn't have a standard invoicing procedure – it depends on the RWR for your grant. We have had four RSRs, and each did things differently. DWR really, truly needs to standardize invoicing and reporting procedures, and to involve practitioners in the process of developing them.
 - Very time consuming on administrators part
 - We are lucky to have very knowledgeable, flexible, and helpful grant managers at DWR. The required information is tedious however.
 - We have never had a major issue with our DWR invoicing
 - We have not experienced significant delays in reimbursement. Our grant managers have been supportive and easy to work with on invoices. Significant time does go into invoice preparation so invoice packets are clearly organized and presented to facilitate DWR review.
8. Please rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best, your satisfaction with DWR's response time for invoice review and payment. Please explain.

Average = 3.2

- Between DWR and the Project Sponsor review/response and negotiations, one grant's first invoice took over one year to finalize, approve and pay.
- Can be a very slow process and guidance as to what is needed can change frequently
- Depends on who is doing the review.
- DWR has a bit of lag when processing invoices but we plan for it so we are not affected
- DWR's program representative has done a marvelous job.
- DWR's response time for invoice review and payment has improved since the beginning of Round 1. However, the invoice review is tied to the progress report review, which can hold up invoice processing. Sometimes it seems that the comments on the invoices are things that cannot be controlled – a subcontractor's labor multiplier, what a subcontractor sent via FedEx/UPS, etc.
- Electronic deposit is one alternative that should be explored.
- Feedback once the invoice is provided is ok, actual payment time is long (sometimes several months out)
- For the Prop 84 Planning Grant, would rate response time for invoice review and payment at a 3. The DWR grant manager was very responsive and quick to assist in resolving questions and doing his part to approve the invoice package and move it on through the system. Once approved, it usually took a couple of months to receive the grant reimbursement. - For Prop 84 Round 1, the response time has varied significantly, but I'd rate it a 3. Sometimes invoice review takes days, other times weeks or even months. The amount of time for payment has also varied widely, ranging from a minimum of about 6 weeks from the time the DWR grant manager approved payment to nearly 3 months from the time of approval, which seems excessive. Thankfully, the trend is moving towards faster response times.
- In most cases, we receive prompt turnaround time in the DWR review. Occasionally there is a question that the Project Manager must research and this can delay the review time. The most troublesome aspect is when a change is made to the DWR invoice form, or when an error is found on this form. Often the Project Manager cannot resolve the problem and must work with another DWR staffer to resolve. The Grantee is unable to manipulate the spreadsheet in any way.

- It really depends on the RSR for your grant. We have had RSRs I would rate a 5 for prompt response and willingness to work with us. Others I would rate a 1, for lost invoices and response time of up to 330 days to get an invoice paid. So I guess I will give an average score of 3.
- Not enough DWR staff to get review and payment done in a timely manner. DWR staff is overloaded, which is one element of slowing the process. Also, the level of detail that is required in an invoice slows the process. If that detail was summarized in an invoice and retained by the grantee for a later audit, payments would get out much quicker.
- Our average submittal to payment is approx. 12 weeks, we have not experienced instances of prolonged delays in payment since the 2008 funding freeze.
- Payment seems to take time.
- Payment time by State Controller could be better.
- Review and approval process at the local level by DWR takes 1-2 months and another month for reimbursement to be processed and a check issues.
- Sometimes very responsive and at other times not. We've found that some RSRs (maybe most) at times get pulled away to work on other projects and that can have an effect on response time. But to be fair, that's a common issue on the grantee/sub-grantee side as well.
- Takes longer than expected
- There are vast differences from project manager to project manager regarding consistency of review. This has a huge impact on a region's ability to receive payment in a timely manner.
- There is too much "back and forth" as well as indecision in their invoicing. There is a lack of decision making prior to receiving the invoices so they don't really know what they are looking for, so it ends up on the back of the agency submitting the invoices. To spend many hours reworking and redoing invoices before they are paid.
- This, too, has gotten better over time as we get better at invoicing and establish more of a relationship with DWR grant managers, but the review time is still inconsistent, and if there is any kind of larger problem with an invoice or the grant agreement, invoice finalization and processing can take several months (for example, I am still waiting on finalization for an invoice from June 2014, and it is mid-November 2014).
- We are lucky to have very knowledgeable, flexible, and helpful grant managers at DWR. The required information is tedious however.
- We have a very responsive rep with an average turnaround of 2 months from submittal to reimbursement
- While the turnaround time is long, staff has always been responsive to reviewing our submittals.

9. Please estimate your invoice preparation costs, on a per invoice basis. Who prepares your invoices, RWMG staff or consultants?

Average = \$7,166.50.

- A consultant prepares them.
- Approximately \$35,000 is spent on preparing invoices for a total of 10 for 2014. This process only takes into account District IRWMP staff, Finance staff, and management time to prepare, review, package, and submit invoices to DWR including, responding to DWR's review comments and resubmittal of invoices. Project proponent costs are not included. The whole process takes 2-3 reiterations for invoices to be approved by DWR.

- Average of \$5,000– (this includes all staff time and operating expenses). Activities include correspondence with project proponents, preparation of the invoice and reports, uploads to BMS/GranTs, maintenance of tracking tools, review of deliverables/report/invoice submittal. RWMG staff prepare invoices.
- Consultants prepare invoices.
- Currently we are only invoicing on a planning grant and the regions consultant for that grant is preparing the invoices. Future invoices will be done by region staff.
- For invoicing costs only. That is just our staff time, not including the time that the projects spend gathering their information.
- For the Prop 84 Planning Grant, invoices were prepared by agency staff, as cost share and partially paid for under the grant. In total, admin/invoicing/reporting took much more time/effort than the amount allocated in the grant. - For Prop 84 Round 1, agency staff prepare the invoices. Invoice prep time varies significantly depending on which projects are invoicing in a given period, and costs can range from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per invoice. Large, high cost construction projects tend to have the lowest relative admin costs, while “smaller” projects such as rebate programs tend to have relatively high admin costs.
- Grantee (RWMG Lead Agency) staff prepares the invoices. We’ve successfully been paid for two implementation invoices so far, with review and revisions ongoing on our other grant program. It’s estimated approximately \$3,000 per invoice.
- Has been staff (estimated ~5-10K or more per invoice internal processing). Now using a consultant at ~15K per invoice
- Invoice costs per invoice are approximately \$30,000 per invoice for the Prop 84 Round 1 Implementation grant that was received. Of the \$30,000 total, consultant costs are approximately \$20,000 per invoice and staff costs are approximately \$10,000 per invoice. Staff costs include Project Proponent staff and County staff, which is the lead agency and invoice signatory. These excessive amounts are due to the cumbersome and unclear review and revisions associated with each invoice submitted. Tracking for the Prop 84 Round 1 Planning grant indicated a much lower amount, on the order of \$2,000 - \$4,000 per invoice submittal, however, the same issues arose with invoice review and revision requests.
- Invoice preparation costs can easily be around \$10,000 or more. Water District prepares the invoice with support from the agencies involved with the grant.
- Invoices are prepared as a combination of the local project sponsors and consultants. It costs approximately \$3,300 per project per invoice for Prop 84. This is approximately 40% more than the cost per invoice for Prop 50. The difference is the rigid requirement that costs be reported by task and budget category and a requirement to amend the budget tables whenever grant or cost share need to be moved between budget categories. Invoice preparation costs would be DRASTICALLY reduced if costs were just reviewed as “eligible” or “ineligible”.
- Invoices are prepared by the consultant
- Prepared by a Consultant
- Prepared by RWMG staff
- Prepared by Watershed staff and Public Works Accounting staff
- Project sponsors (or their consultants) prepare individual project reports and invoices; RWMG staff prepares the full report and invoice.
- RWMG staff prepares the invoices. Invoice preparation cost depends on the number of projects included in the invoice. For agencies with just several projects, the cost is much lower than for larger regions with many projects per grant agreement. For the USWM IRWM Region, we have

2-3 projects on an Implementation Grant invoice, which on average costs about \$6,000 from prep by to submission to DWR.

- The IRWM Program Office (staffed by one NGO employee and several independent contractors) prepares invoices for the Planning Grants and DAC grant. A different RWMG Member is the grantee for the Implementation grant (and we do not have access to their information about invoicing procedures). For the Program Office to prepare an invoice, the amount of hours varies widely, but we estimate on average about 50 hours of staff time per invoice. This includes one main staff person who does the bulk of the work and a few hours for other staff members to submit hours and expenses.
- We use one of our partner agencies or organizations as the grantor or the Fiscal Agency. Their staff prepares the invoices.

Section 3 – General IRWM Questions, Assuming Continued Grant Program Structure

10. If there is more than one IRWM planning region in your Funding Area (under Prop. 84), how well are you working together? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being best, and explain.

Average = 3.7

- 1-2 representatives from each of the six regions participates in conference calls; calls generally occur in relation to new guidelines/PSPs. Region often coordinates on comment letters to DWR on issues of common interest. Relatively little interaction on project specific items.
- A monthly coordination of IRWMs groups meeting is held but has not resulted in a cooperating or cost sharing arrangement among all the IRWM groups.
- FANTASTIC PARTNERS in the Funding Area! A definite 10 (OK 5)
- In one funding area, we are working well together. Divided funds among IRWMPs and no do not compete. In another funding area, there is little coordination but some interest in exploring a funding allocation agreement.
- The Funding Area corresponds and hosts conference calls at key milestones of DWR's program. Additionally, we have frequent communications related to shared resources and processes. Each region has participated to-date individually for grant funding rounds.
- The funding area has collaboratively worked together to draft an Inter-Regional agreement with all IRWM's splitting the remaining prop. 84 funds (50% divided equally/50% divided in proportion to each IRWM's population)
- The Funding Area has three IRWM planning regions and has executed an MOU to work collaboratively across region boundaries and equitably split the Prop 84 funds.
- The IRWM regions in the funding area are cordial and communicate on a regular basis with one another.
- The three regions in the Funding Area have an MOU that commits us to working together on inter-regional projects and that includes an agreement about how we will split the available funding based on a mutually acceptable formula involving land mass and population. We have one shared project to date that was funded in rounds 1 and 2.
- There are 6 IRWM regions in the Funding Area. The regions collaborated to equitably distribute Proposition 84 funds to each region. 5.
- There are four IRWM Regions in our funding area and we are working closely with two of them – those which have shared boundaries with our region. We are working very well together (5). We are not coordinating at all with the other region due to their distance from our region.

- Three other IRWM planning regions are in our Funding Area. The regions works collaboratively with each of them. Overall rating is a 3. Some regions are more interested in collaboration than others.
- We are fairly well coordinated with the RWMGs that are immediately adjacent to us. We do not hear much from others.
- We are not currently communicating with other IRWM groups
- We are not really working with the other regions with in our funding area.
- We have always been in touch with the other IRWM regions in our funding area, but communication has increased substantially in the last year. We have developed an informal agreement among the six IRWM regions regarding allocation of the remaining Prop. 84 funding. This agreement was not difficult to achieve, and we have continued to communicate even after the agreement was made.
- We have either a Memorandum of Understanding or a Letter of Agreement with each of our surrounding IRWMs. We have not yet started working with them to figure out joint projects because there is still so much to do within our region.
- We have had some conflict in our overlap in the funding area, however have established some forms of regular communication and have members who sit in both forums.
- We meet monthly to discuss topics of mutual interest, but as of yet no interregional projects have been advanced and there are currently no agreements related to distribution of funding.
- We talk regularly, coordinate well on California Water Plan stuff, and we've tried to coordinate funding applications. However, we haven't been able to reach an agreement on how to share funding.
- Work with adjacent regions is solid.

11. What are some of the challenges with working with other regions in your funding area?

- Changes in other regions' RWMGs.
- Figuring out how to best divide the Prop 84 funds based on region population and land area.
- Finding an equitable division of funds. Slow shift from "winner take all attitude"
- Intend to reach out, but haven't yet. Perception is that the other regions are very competitive.
- It is generally cooperative though there is an inherent challenge with the funding structure in that region's are essentially competing against one another over very limited amount of funding that is nowhere close to sufficient to even partially address the high priorities in all the regions.
- It seems as most neighboring regions are very involved with creating their IRWMP which occupies most of everyone's time. Communications could be better, but I understand how busy all RWMG's and TAC's are. I would imagine communication would be greater if our region had a shared project or program that encompassed both regions.
- Large, well funded groups have had continued success.
- Limited funds. We have one of the largest and diverse geographic areas, which ends up necessitating that we have many RWMGs. The allocation of funds based on population makes for limited funds going to these groups.
- Mostly we are all very busy implementing our own plans, so it can be challenging to find time to attend each other's meetings. We do the best we can given our time constraints
- No common issues
- None worth mentioning.
- None. We all communicate well and share similar challenges within our watersheds.

- Other IRWMs are funded with more resources and identified staff from the agency leading their plans. In addition, our IRWM is overlapped by another IRWM and has received funding from entities within the our IRWM without sharing of resources to implement the IRWM. Although DWR reviewed the overlap as part of the RAP process, no referee rules are in place to enhance communication to the DWR from the overlapping IRWM and neighboring IRWMs. Neighboring IRWMs have received several planning and implementation grants in each round that has enabled continuous interaction DWR staff at various levels, again, placing them in an advantage position for communicating their programs and projects with DWR.
- Our funding area is very large, so it is not practical to be able to meet with all of the regions in person. There is also a great variety in population and types of communities throughout the region (e.g., urban/rural, dense vs. sparse populations), that makes it so we don't all speak the same "language". Also quite different water issues.
- Our regions current challenge is finding the staff or volunteer time to reach out to regions in our funding area.
- Our regions work well together. The only challenge is that we all compete for the same funding "pot", but can rarely apply collaboratively given our usually hydrologically distinct areas.
- Overlapping boundaries, lack of collaboration in planning activities.
- The amount of time needed to really work strongly and collaboratively over extended periods of time, especially on project development or issue resolution, exceeds the available budget of several of the regions, making for inconsistent levels of connectivity and collaboration.
- The challenge we have found in the past are the rules and regulations are different from county to county though their may be some common state laws. This difference in government and "who will be in charge" is a bit of a challenge.
- The MOU organized a coordinating committee, which meets periodically to identify potential interregional projects, discuss cross-boundary issues, and work with a common voice when discussing issues within the Funding Area with DWR. Some positions on issues vary within the regions from time to time, but overall, the coordinating committee seems to work through the challenges.
- There appear to be somewhat different emphases for the two groups. With past grant cycles, it has been difficult to ascertain ahead of time whether the other region is planning to submit a grant proposal seeking funding for projects that are located within the same funding area.
- There are no outstanding issues or challenges to report on.
- There is not enough funding and this creates tension across regions.

12. How is your ongoing IRWM program funded? Funding may include membership dues, local assessments, cost share distributed either uniformly or based on size, cost share based on ability to pay (some stakeholders pay nothing), in-kind match of staff time and resources, grants, and regional water management group/JPA.

- Administrative Funding: 5% administrative funding from each funding round, funds grant administration and outreach Matching Funds: substantial matching funds and allocation of staff resources have been provided by the water agency. Planning Grants: Multiple from different organizations In-kind Services: 16 policy committee members are locally elected officials that spend 50 – 100 hours/year; 16 technical committee members are Tribal and agency staff that spend 50 – 100 hours/year and an additional 40 – 70 hours/funding round;

stakeholders spend 10 – 60 hours/year participating in the program; project proponents 10 – 300 hours/ per funding round

- Cost share agreement equally shared between parties.
- Cost share among RWMG members
- Currently the RWMG Lead Agency has provided program funding, along with grant funding when possible (e.g. partial funding of grant administration and IRWM Plan update to meet new standards) and limited cost sharing by local agencies that receive grant funds.
- Funding for the IRWM Program and staff comes almost entirely from Prop. 84 IRWM funding. Historically, an NGO, our “lead” agency, has provided the most funding support. RWMG Members and stakeholders fund their own participation in the Program, which we count as in-kind match to use against our grants. At times, we have had small contributions from other Member groups to help fund the Program and staff (\$500-\$5,000), but we have not received such contributions for some time.
- Funding is through contributions of member groups. Stakeholders pay what their budget allows, with the larger agencies contributing the most significant budget amounts. There is no in-kind match at this time.
- Grantee agency, the water agency, provides in-kind match of staff time and resources
- In kind participant contributions and a small core of funding partners have provided multi-year support under a trust agreement; funds are held and managed by one participating agency.
- In-kind staff and resources, grants
- In-kind time and materials.
- It is currently funded by an annual dues by the voting/signatory members.
- JPA Member dues, voluntary contributions, in-kind, altruism.
- JPA members share the cost with a \$100 contribution per Watershed Advisory Committee organization.
- Ongoing IRWM program is funded through voluntary contributions and in kind match of staff time and resources. Application cost is funded by project proponents and voluntary donation of staff resources from member agencies.
- Our ongoing program is funded by contributions from our major stakeholders (cities, County entities, water districts, sanitation districts, groundwater management agencies, etc.) The contributions are based on a formula related to size and the ongoing program is administered through an MOU.
- RWMG agencies contribute \$5000-\$10,000 annually to partially support a NGO (foundation) that was created specifically to support IRWM and now also supports related regional water management efforts. Contribution based on agency size and ability to pay (e.g., DACs with no funding mechanism make no financial contribution)
- Shared cost among JPA member agencies. In-kind staff time by project proponents.
- Still working on Planning Grant funds and portion of county cash match
- The IRWM is funded through an MOU with a cost sharing equation, distributed to the agricultural districts that are part of the RWMG. The equation takes into account the size of the district and an equal portion by district. Stakeholders and DAC have not been charged for participation since the start of the IRWM since they have limited ability to pay. The RWMG is considering changes to their funding structure.
- The IRWM Program is funded by in-kind match of staff time and resources, and the water district pays for overall management of the IRWM Region – provides the Program Manager, organizes and hosts quarterly stakeholder meetings, manages call for projects, and manages and

funds applications, with some in-kind match and infrequent funding from other RWMG members.

- The IRWM program is funded by the RWMG. The lead agency, the County, funds 50% of the IRWM programs and the rest of the RWMG participants proportionately share the remaining 50%. NGOs and DACs are typically precluded from payment requirements and do provide in-kind services or time.
- The IRWMP is currently being funded through the Prop. 84 funds. In-kind match of RWMG time and resources are also used as part of the IRWM planning grant agreement.
- The three RWMG agencies cover all costs on an equal basis, as described in an MOU that we all sign and occasionally renew. The costs include staff time from the three agencies to keep things moving.
- The water agency is funding the majority of costs.
- Through membership dues from the RWMG JPA.
- Water District and participants within the pay for staff. Some of these costs are reimbursed through the grant program.
- Water District only (all funding) to date and nothing to show for it!

13. Please address how non-governmental entities participate in the funding and project selection process.

a. Do they contribute to ongoing management costs?

Yes: 4

No: 22

b. Do they get to participate in project selection process?

Yes: 24

No: 2

c. Can they submit projects for consideration in the plan?

Yes: 27

d. Do they contribute funding to grant application costs, particularly if they are a project proponent?

Yes: 14

No: 11

14. Please indicate your region's annual budget related to the ongoing IRWM effort (not including grant administration and application costs) below:

a. Less than \$25,000: 6 regions in category

- b. \$25,000 to \$150,000: 9 regions in category
- c. \$150,000 to \$500,000: 9 regions in category
- d. Greater than \$500,000: 1 region in category

15. How much of the annual budget is for consultants? Average = 49%

16. How much of the annual budget is for staff? Average = 63%

17. How do you identify DACs and DAC projects in your region?

- A dedicated effort was made under the Plan Update process. This work was conducted by public outreach consultants; the effort and outcomes are described at length in the 2013 IRWMP and appendices.
- Any way we can. The tools for DAC identification are difficult to use
- Approximately 88 percent of the geographic area of the region and 36 percent of the population is economically disadvantaged. Mechanisms for outreach and involvement of DACs in the region include the website, public workshops across the region, one-to-one technical assistance to project proponents, and direct meetings at individuals' request.
- Census tract data
- DAC Outreach Pilot Study; submittal of projects by DACs, counties or/and EJ orgs.
- DAC submits project concept or project solicitation form
- DACs are identified through the American Community Housing Survey – 5 year estimates. DACs are identified by working with water districts serving these areas to determine critical water supply and water quality needs
- DWR DAC tool/census data + local knowledge. Coordination with known DACs to identify/advance projects.
- GIS tools, outreach, active stakeholder participation
- Income levels
- Majority of region is DAC
- Open call for projects to all stakeholders in region
- Outreach and Census and Dept of Finance data
- Outreach and Education – we received to concurrent “Facilitation Support Services” grants which provided us with a Facilitator to assist with the DAC outreach. We also created a DAC packet, application, and procedure in our bylaws to address DACs specifically.
- Partially using DWR's definition of a DAC and partially self-identification. We have some great DAC projects that DWR won't acknowledge because they don't involve drinking water sources.
- Periodic request for project characterization form to be submitted to the RWMG.
- Primarily through census data. By talking with DACs to determine their needs. Feasibility studies of DAC projects through grants.
- Proposals presented by project proponent
- The project proponents use the U.S. Census 2000 data, 80% of the statewide annual MHI of \$37,994 criteria to identify whether or not a project considered for submission is located within a disadvantaged community and/or will benefit a disadvantaged community. In addition, the 5 Subcommittees that represent the region follow regional parameters to select projects. This

includes evaluating DAC projects together with non-DAC projects and setting aside 10% of grant funds for DAC projects.

- Through a regional DAC coordinating agency.
- Use the DAC mapping resources provided by DWR.
- Use the DWR DAC identification strategy – also do separate census analysis (2010).
- We have used the state criteria for MHI and DAC status and also applied recent census data and the DWR DAC tool
- We use the 80% of MHI definition; we have identified them using the DWR mapping tool and community-specific income surveys. We have also done research into other potential indicators to be used in identifying DACs through our DAC grant.
- We use the DWR IRWM DAC mapping tool. DAC Tracts is the surface area we utilize as it provides DAC coverage for most of the submitted projects

18. How do DACs participate in your IRWM planning and implementation processes?

- A DAC Representative serves as a voting member of the RWMG. Some DACs are large enough they have staff participate and the smaller DACs are represented by Self-Help Enterprises.
- All DACs are included on our IRWM Contact List, invited to all stakeholder meetings, invited to submit projects during call-for-projects time (or anytime), participate on committees, and communicated with on an individual basis, as needed. One area DAC is very active in the IRWM Region.
- All members of our RWMG represent a DAC. Most of our stakeholders are from a DAC as well.
- As equals
- As much as they are able to. One DAC is a member of the steering committee and very active in IRWM efforts.
- As RWMG members to-date.
- By attending scheduled IRWM stakeholder meetings
- DACs are invited to participate in any or all of the planning and implementation processes. DACs can be MOU signatories and hold just as much voting power as any other group. We also try to make certain allowances to encourage DAC participation, such as conference call options for all of our meetings and the use of proxies at our meetings if DAC representatives cannot participate.
- DACs are part of the RWMG steering committee and have had projects funded. DACs are active in the region.
- DACs have the option to participate as paying Members of the JPA (must be a public agency) or as non-paying Interested Parties who participate with Members on a standing Advisory Committee. Work groups (including the project work group that selects which projects will be included in a grant application) are open to participation and voting by DAC Members and Interested Parties.
- DACs participate by attending RWMG meetings and the region's strategy of 'circuit riding' by consultants to keep them informed and gather their input, as well as provision of technical support. The technical support will diminish substantially when the Planning Grant funds are no longer available.
- DACs rep prepared chapter of IRWM plan and conducted outreach for planning and implementation.
- Directly through their regional coordinating representative.
- Limited

- Open stakeholder meetings
- Participation in RWMG meetings/workshops
- Primarily through the agencies that serve their water or provide sanitation services
- Since contributions are in-kind, they cover their own costs
- Stakeholder meetings, outreach, special subcommittee to the IRWMP project team dedicated to DACs
- Targeted outreach was conducted during the Plan Update process, as noted above. Beyond past and potentially future targeted outreach, DACs and Native American tribes are informed of RWMG activities, project solicitations, etc. as part of the region's general public outreach processes - via the website and listserv.
- The Region has a standing Disadvantaged Communities Committee (DAC Committee) that functions as a regional subcommittee whose goal is to identify and work with DAC communities to develop projects consistent with the integrated regional water management plan. A DAC Coordinator and Community Liaison were hired to identify projects for consideration. Regular meetings of the DAC Committee are held on a monthly basis in person and via teleconference at a centrally located facility, and are attended by a variety of interested stakeholders that represent DAC communities.
- The region holds quarterly meetings throughout the region with agenda presentations from DAC stakeholders and time for public comment. All meetings are Brown Act compliant and are open and welcoming to the public. A major avenue for involvement of DACs recently is the "Water Supply and Wastewater Service Providers Outreach and Support Program" of the regional partnership, which aims to increase drinking water quality, supply, and safety through local collaborations to improve infrastructure, operations, and maintenance.
- They are not directly active. We have relied on elected representatives of the areas that serve on city councils and water boards.
- They are treated as every other member except they do not have to pay dues and they have one representative (they choose) and one vote for the whole group of DACs – instead of one vote for each entity.
- We have one urban DAC and one rural DAC representative on our advisory committee. One DAC representative is always on our project selection workgroup. Representatives of DACs participate in the IRWM Program on an ongoing basis. DAC representatives were part of the six advisory committee workgroups that helped to shape different sections of the 2013 Plan. We held community workshops that were targeted at DACs to gain input into the plan development.
- Workshops and meetings

19. How do Native American tribes participate in your IRWM planning and implementation processes?

- All tribes and the BIA are included on our IRWM Contact List, invited to all stakeholder meetings, invited to submit projects during call-for-projects time (or anytime), invited to participate on committees, and communicated with on an individual basis, as needed. They have not been very active as of late in the IRWM Region, even after personal contacts during the IRWM Plan Update process.
- As equals, however, they have not signed the MOU, so we reached out to the tribal council for project development
- As non-paying members – they are treated as the DACs
- By attending scheduled IRWM stakeholder meetings
- Directly as a member of the JPA and also in the Watershed Advisory Committee

- None are within the Region Boundary (5)
- Of the four members of our RWMG, one member is a Native American representative
- Open stakeholder meetings
- Since contributions are in-kind, they cover their own costs
- Targeted outreach was conducted during the Plan Update process. Beyond past and potentially future targeted outreach, DACs and Native American tribes are informed of RWMG activities, project solicitations, etc. as part of the region's general public outreach processes - via the website and listserv.
- The region has continued to prioritize – and has formalized - Tribal involvement since Plan inception in 2005. The region has a significantly higher percentage of Native American residents than that of the state's 2 percent; about 4 percent of residents identify themselves as Tribal members. Representatives of Tribes are active participants in the policy and technical committees via designation per the "Tribal Representation Process" that was endorsed by 20 Tribes. A Tribal Outreach Coordinator has been retained to ensure the region continues to incorporate Tribal priorities into its planning processes and implementation projects. The goal is a continually improved IRWM Plan that utilizes indigenous knowledge and expertise, represents the needs of Tribes, and is sensitive to Tribal concerns.
- The Region is not home to any current tribe or tribal lands according to the Native American Heritage Commission.
- There are two prominent tribes in the region. There are no tribal lands with specific water resources management needs; however, members of these tribes are encouraged to engage in the IRWM Program through notifications using the Native American Heritage Commission contact list.
- They are not directly active. We have relied on coordination through the water agency supplying the primary active tribe in our region. There is very limited tribal area in our region.
- They are on the stakeholder list, receive all IRWM related information and attend meetings
- Tribal rep participates on IRWM Steering Committee, outreach conducted with two tribes in IRWM region, invited them to all stakeholder workshops
- Tribal representatives were informed of IRWM efforts early in the region's development and remain on the IRWM email distribution list and receive period updates and invites to IRWM stakeholder events but have not actively participated in IRWM planning or implementation.
- Tribes are invited to participate in the planning and implementation processes just as any other group. They may be MOU signatories and have an equal seat at the table and equal voting power to any other party. Six tribal entities are Members of the RWMG.
- Tribes participate formally (via letter-format outreach and notifications) but have not, to date, participated in the RWMG.
- Until recently, we had a tribal representative on our advisory committee and on our project selection workgroups. For the past three years or so, the Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association has chosen to not send a representative. The spot remains open. We also held community workshops that were targeted at the tribes to gain input into the plan development.
- We have no major tribes in the County but there are individual Native Americans included in our stakeholder group who participate
- Workshops and meetings

20. How do you make data available to stakeholders and the public? Mark all that apply.

- a. Website or other online method: 26

- b. Written publications, i.e., IRWM Plan updates, separate reports): 26
- c. GIS-based database: 12
- d. Other (please specify)
 - Email and phone -direct contact, public workshops
 - Email updates to RWMG and stakeholders; presentations providing updates at stakeholder committee meetings; media releases and notices in newspapers
 - Extensive e-mail list
 - Maintain a regular set monthly meeting time, but, hold meetings as necessary.
 - presentations, conferences, workshops, project videos, project posters
 - Specific data requests that are fulfilled by Program Office staff and provided to the requestor.
 - Via RWMG agencies' Boards and Commissions (e.g., County Water Advisory Commission; County Commission on the Environment; etc.)

21. Please indicate the approximate percentage of funding that has gone to the following project types (based on PRC §75026.(a)):

- a. Water conservation: Average = 15%
- b. Water recycling: Average = 18%
- c. Groundwater recharge and management: Average = 19%
- d. Water banking, exchanges, and interties: 14%
- e. Other water supply reliability projects: Average = 21%
- f. Stormwater: Average = 9%
- g. Non-point source pollution reduction and management: Average = 5%
- h. Invasive species, wetlands, and open space: Average = 8%
- i. Contaminant and salt removal: Average = 6%
- j. Flood management: Average = 5%
- k. Watershed protection and management: Average = 9%
- l. Drinking water treatment and distribution: Average = 20%
- m. Ecosystem and fisheries restoration and protection: Average = 11%

Section 4 – IRWM Long-Term Program Sustainability, Possibly Without Continued Grant Funding

22. Please rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best, how well you think your region's IRWM process promotes integration in the design of projects with multiple benefits.

Average = 4.1

- Much integration happens at the project level between project partners and proponents, however much of the decision making is segmented amount project types (functional areas) and subregionally.
- Our region has had some successes of combining study needs or raising awareness among stakeholders of project/program concepts under consideration or projects/programs underway that might serve as good projects.
- Our region is aware of the IRWM ethos of promoting integration with not only the planning process but when the region applies for implementation dollars. The RWMG is always thinking about grouping projects together in order for them to have multiple benefits and support multiple stakeholders.
- Overall, the IRWM Program promotes multiple benefit projects; lower score due to relatively small funding round allocations
- The IRWM Region's projects are in response to contributions of water supply to environmental water uses outside of the Region in the Delta and San Joaquin River.
- We think we are just now on the brink of fully embracing various meanings of integration in our very large region. It has been difficult to develop truly integrated projects, but we now have some examples of very integrated "efforts" within the Program that will likely result in projects. That being said, integration can be viewed from different perspectives – institutional, geographical, etc. The region has tried to integrate viewpoints, needs, capacity building, etc. from an institutional-capacity building perspective (many different entities engaged) as well as geographically.

23. Do you feel that IRWM substantively reduces conflict over water management issues in your region?

Yes: 14

Somewhat: 7

No: 4

- I think we've reduced conflict, perhaps not substantively.
- I would not say substantively. Conflict still exists, but it is getting better. IRWM's are as much about managing relationships as managing resources.
- It has increased coordination and promoted relations amongst participating agencies resulting in collaborative projects outside of IRWM funding.
- It's somewhat effective
- Not substantively
- Over the last decade, IRWM has helped to smooth water management conflict in the region but it has not had a dramatic impact.
- The IRWM meetings allowed communication among water users that has advanced regional solutions to the water supply reliability challenges facing the Region.

- The IRWM Program has not directly dealt with the major source of conflict over water in the region. Although the the agency at the source of the conflict participated occasionally during the first two years of our program, the absence of the agency since then has limited the potential for both conflict resolution and assistance to small water suppliers. However, the IRWM Program has provided a forum for all water stakeholders in the region, including those that are typically at odds with each other, to come together to seek common ground apart from the major areas of conflict. Indeed, one focus of regional efforts has been to identify and address “low hanging fruit” that are apolitical. In part this was done as a means to build regional trust and a venue in which historic animosities did not hinder the building of a regional, collaborative Program.
 - The region resolved its largest conflicts through a regional Water Forum process concluded in 2000. We do believe that IRWM could have been helpful had a major conflict existed.
 - The region's counties, Tribes, and other stakeholders clearly recognize the need for collaboration regarding water resource management. The IRWM Plan preamble and statement of purpose is as follows: “The ... Integrated Regional Water Management Plan is by design a voluntary, non-regulatory, stakeholder-driven planning framework meant to emphasize shared priorities and local autonomy, authority, knowledge, and approaches to achieving Tribal, state, regional, and local priorities related to ... water infrastructure, watersheds, public health, and economic vitality. The IRWMP focuses on areas of common interest and concern to [the Region's] stakeholders and on attracting funding to the ... Region, and recognizes unique local solutions in different parts of the Region.”
 - Yes, as the IRWMP Vision states the intent to “Create a united framework among...County Stakeholders for sustainable water resource management.” The IRWMP development and implementation has helped to bring regional stakeholders to the same table, and has helped to facilitate improved communications and management in the region.
- a. If so, what is the greatest area of conflict reduction that IRWM has sponsored in your region?
- Aided in a more regional assessment of long-term water supply needs and potential collaborative solutions, such as interagency water transfers between surface water dependent and groundwater dependent agencies.
 - Better understanding and collaboration of water issues – quantity, quality, stormwater, conservation issues, water sources, programs and projects; needs that can be addressed cooperatively, particularly with cities that aren’t water suppliers, with DACs and tribes, and in watersheds that cross boundaries.
 - Breakdown of silos. Understanding of inner-connectivity between missions. Concept of one water.
 - Chloride and TMDL compliance
 - DAC issues
 - Governance-interests having equal way and representation
 - IRWM has served as a catalyst in bringing water agency managers to the table on a regular basis, and has also brought managers and staff from all water resources functions to the RWMG table. This ongoing face time and collaborative discussion has contributed to water managers from throughout the region and from various perspectives and functional areas, establishing greater understanding of issues facing others within the region.
 - One area of conflict has been between the environmental entities and water supply agencies – now that the non-governmental agencies have a secure seat at the table, and

multi-benefit projects have been implemented collaboratively – there is less conflict among those entities.

- One of the key benefits of IRWMP planning has been opening dialogues between agencies, organizations, and the public/ other interested stakeholders. It has also been an added mechanism for improving cross-county discussions.
- Promotes projects that will benefit the entire region and that have multiple water resource benefits.
- Promotes working together
- Regional operations regarding water conveyance. Several key interties have been constructed and the environmental documents completed that will allow water banking, transfer, and exchanges over 25 years.
- Responsibility for urban runoff is everyone's, not just the county's, not just the cities, and not just the water agencies.
- The foothills (upper watershed) is talking to the valley (lower watershed) and vice versa.
- The IRWM Planning process has brought many agencies together that usually do not communicate under normal circumstances
- The PUD Conjunctive Use Project helped eliminate conflict between the PUD and a local base. Nutrient Management Project is bringing together stakeholders throughout the watershed to solve problems where such cooperation previously didn't exist.
- The region has nearly 300 water supply and wastewater treatment service providers, many of which are impacted by inadequate, failing or non-existent infrastructure. Failing infrastructure causes conflict on many fronts including regulatory non-compliance, resource disputes, and public health concerns. Many of these facilities were built decades ago to serve much smaller communities. These providers are geographically isolated, serve economically disadvantaged communities, are under staffed and lack current technological advancements, making infrastructure improvements difficult to finance.
- Water management
- Water recycling and water rights
- We think there is huge opportunity for the IRWM Program to help reduce and prevent conflict over groundwater in the region. The RWMG is just starting to think seriously about how to collaborate on groundwater management. Moreover, through current/pending outreach, efforts to engage a major agency will hopefully result in their involvement in the Program.
- Working together, big picture, assurance that if "your" project is not ready, support "my" ready to go project and the IRWM group will support "your" project when ready.

b. Do you feel that the grant funding is fundamental to achieving this conflict resolution? In other words, if would it be achievable and sustainable without the grant funding?

Yes: 15

No: 10

- Base program funding is more important to helping to reduce conflict over water in the region than project funding. Individual on-the-ground planning and implementation projects are not (as of yet) helping to directly reduce conflict. Rather, it is the continued interaction of stakeholders through the ongoing practice of IRWM that is encouraging collaboration and communication.

- Grant funding – and good integrated planning -- made both projects possible. They would not have occurred otherwise.
- Grant funding certainly helps but is not imperative. Our agency was formed in early 70s primarily for conflict resolution.
- Grant funding for capacity building support and project implementation is critical to improving water infrastructure in economically disadvantaged communities.
- Grant funding helps promote cooperation between multiple agencies.
- Grant funding is fundamental to bringing smaller stakeholders to the table and to achieving conflict resolution. No, this would not be achievable and sustainable without the grant funding.
- Grant funding is fundamental, because without funding projects and programs don't progress. Many collaborative agencies – public, non-profit, DACs, tribes, and others – don't have the matching funds or the upfront funds to move projects. Conflict resolution is achievable without grant funding, but funding is the motivator for people to come together to plan collaboratively and cooperatively. Otherwise, they are busy making their world of things to accomplish work and don't seem to find the time or need to collaborate.
- Grant funding was just the carrot to get everyone to the table
- I'm not sure if it is fundamental to achieving this conflict resolution, but it will help improve relationships. The more these groups can communicate and work together the healthier their relationships will become, expectantly.
- In part, grant funding helps to incentivize this collaborative way of managing resources. Grant funding in some cases also becomes the very reason that a smaller community's project is able to move forward.
- It is not fundamental to our region, but it is always welcome. We can see where it is needed in other regions.
- It was fundamental at the onset and continues to reinforce it
- It would be more difficult without funding
- Potential for grant funding continues to bring partners to the table.
- The grant funding has been fundamental as an incentive to bring participants to the table, however the communication that has occurred has been above and beyond just the grant funding. It would most likely not be sustainable without continued grant funding at meaningful levels.
- The grant program helped to establish this collaboration and now that we have successfully implemented some of these projects I believe that collaboration will continue even without grant funding.
- The incentive is needed.
- The single-goal nature of this grant increased distrust of the IRWM process.
- Without grant funding the collaboration would continue, however the venue for truly collaborative and ongoing conversation would diminish.
- Yes, however, the primary source of grant funding has been through US Bureau of Reclamation programs and a secondary source from the DWR AgWUE and IRWM programs.

24. Do you feel that, absent the grant program, IRWM would still achieve financial benefits to participants?

Yes: 11

Maybe: 13

No: 1

- Financial benefits would be limited mostly to water supply agencies.
 - Grant funding provides the initiative for collaboration and regional planning.
 - It would be much more difficult. As of now, it is uncertain who would keep the IRWM program going in the absence of program funding (which so far has been planning grant and DAC grant funding). Without someone leading the program, it is unlikely the RWMG would seek funding through the regional IRWM Program.
 - It would likely achieve some benefit, but likely many stakeholders' engagement would decrease significantly.
 - No, we would still practice integration and collaboration but remove the many administrative and bureaucratic IRWM program requirements from the process.
 - Possibly – but it would take some serious strategic planning to continue to keep active.
 - Probably not, unless participants did more thorough and complete integrated project planning (complete comprehensive feasibility studies). This could reduce implementation costs for large projects and improve integration.
 - There are potential benefits associated with the IRWM Program absent financial incentives such as having a formalized group of entities that understand the academic model of IRWM, however, it is unlikely that participants would continue to take part in a process where financial benefits are not garnered.
 - Yes – although without the potential grant funds the interest by agencies' politically elected Boards is perceived to be significantly less due to the financial challenges already faced by many agencies in carrying out their respective mandates.
- a. If yes, please identify how your region would likely achieve the greatest financial benefits, absent grant funding.
- Based on the fact that only 10 percent of the Region's programs and projects developed as part of the IRWM program have received any funding through the IRWM program. The IRWM Region has funded by local, federal, and other state sources over 90 percent of the projects and programs implemented. Thus, if credit for the benefits realized goes to who has funded the accomplishments, then only 10 percent of the benefits is accredited to the IRWM program funding.
 - Collaborating on multi benefit projects
 - Collaboration lessens duplication of efforts, joins multiple agencies for one common goal, brings elements of multiple strategies together in a cost-effective manner to solve issues within one watershed at a lower cost.
 - Continuing to provide a forum for water districts, special districts, cities, county and stakeholders to collaborate.
 - Encourage local partnerships and seek federal and state grants and loans.
 - Local entities appreciate the value of integrated, multi-benefit projects. This is more cost-effective than individual entities only pursuing single purpose projects. We believe the collaboration on project selection and implementation through the IRWM grant program will continue even in the absence of large grants – in order to achieve ongoing financial benefits.
 - Multiple agencies can contribute towards single project
 - Strategic planning. Partnering with each other, dues, and fund raising

- Through integration and sharing resources
- Water agencies have found natural funding partnerships that emerge through the IRWM process. However, most other types of stakeholders (watershed, stormwater, habitat) would suffer greatly, as these are largely unfunded activities.
- We would continue to stress the financial benefit through multi-benefit and multi-jurisdictional projects which leverage scarce financial resources.

25. Please describe the organizational structure of your IRWM region (MOU, JPA, other).

- Cooperative Agreement
- Informal partnership of the RWMG. Initially supported by a “Letter of Mutual Understandings” (LOMU), the effort has evolved over time and the LOMU is no longer applicable.
- JPA (4)
- Memorandum of Agreement
- MoMU
- MOU (15)
- Water Management Association

26. If State funding were available to help pay for the ongoing administration of each region’s IRWM program, do you think your region might adopt a more permanent organizational structure?

Yes: 14

Maybe: 3

No: 4

a. Please describe what changes you would expect.

- A more formal governance structure, such as, a JPA could be formed and an employee hired. This would help reduce the uncertainty of a water or special district using staff to work on project development outside of their service area, which is in conflict with public special district code to be using funds collected from a rate payer to pay for programs outside of the rate payers’ jurisdiction.
- Better data management, more thorough implementation of the IRWMP, improved ability to respond to DWR requests for things like the CA Water Plan.
- Better website and more active participation in IRWM
- Can’t predict at this time
- Greater circuit riding to support idea exchange, project development and technical assistance.
- Hire permanent FT staff (or even one person) as well as have office space.
- I think it would help formalize the financial structure and how some of the components (grant selection, tracking, management, etc) are structured, which remain ad hoc. Additionally, it would provide for continuity of effort, especially for tasks such as keeping tabs on updates needed to the IRWMP and other duties that no one has volunteered to take on at this point.
- If State funding were available to pay for the on-going administration, we would anticipate a full-position to be dedicated to IRWM endeavors and measurable successes. We envision that tasks, including liaising with all the IRWM RWMG entities, stakeholders and neighboring

- regions would occur in a more coordinated and robust manner as opposed to the current situation where IRWM responsibilities are divvied up between various County staff members and consultants. Therefore, we would anticipate better project continuum with greater regional integration, more regional understanding and participation in IRWM, more synchronized projects and a generally more pro-active region.
- If the RWMG had some type of solvency I guarantee there would be greater participation.
 - Improved outreach, technical and facilitation support to small communities and other stakeholders.
 - It is difficult to get participation among IRWM stakeholders when they can't see a benefit to them. A more permanent organizational structure would give the IRWM Stakeholder Advisory Committee more legitimacy and importance. The ability to hire a person dedicated to the IRWM Program, promoting its benefits, meeting with stakeholders more frequently, identifying projects and programs for collaboration and resulting in multiple benefits, etc., could result.
 - It would be nice if the RWMG could distribute IRWM funds from the state for stakeholder participation and limited planning activities for other watershed interests. These groups tend to be under- or unfunded.
 - It would help resolve the uneasiness of funding programs and projects that are outside of a jurisdictional boundary.
 - It's hard to know without seeing what that funding, its requirements, and the nature/frequency of the funding would look like.
 - More formal structure
 - One change may be that another, different "agent" step in to lead the Program. Additionally, at this time, it looks like the RWMG would continue with the formation of a 501(c)(3) which would open up alternative funding avenues for the Program.
 - Our MOU took some 11 months to finalize. All members of my RWMG meet outside of their regular jobs as City Engineers, Tribal Administrators, etc. This makes it difficult to maintain participation levels and ultimately IRWM planning progress.
 - State funding would create more stability for the local IRWM program and enable greater coordination of IRWM efforts. State funding would indicate a longer-term commitment to IRWM that would likely result in greater local agency commitment to participate. Ongoing funding could enable more public education/outreach, greater support for stakeholders and NGOs, in particular DACs, that may otherwise have limited participation due to staff/resource limitations.
 - The ability to expand our ongoing IRWM efforts.
 - We actually need assistance funding data management. Getting the system up-and-running more quickly and updating more frequently.
 - We already have a successful, ongoing program that has been in place since 2004. Of course, State funding would be nice and could facilitate an expansion of our effort, but it would not necessary in order assure that we keep our current structure.
 - We are permanent, but it would help some of the NGO stakeholders participate.
 - We might be able to agree to a joint powers authority.
 - What would be more motivating is the substantial lowering or elimination of a funding match. This would bring many more participants to the IRWM table to work collaboratively.
 - Without a carrot (grants), our region's organization would focus on perceived inequalities in administration of water rights and contracts.

27. How many IRWM projects has your region been awarded grant funding for and how many of those projects is your region actively administering currently (not closed out)?

- \$102 million for 51 projects (includes Drought Grant Funds). Actively administering 34 projects. Once the Drought Grant Agreement is executed there will be 48 projects that the Region will be actively administering.
- 0
- 1 grant, 2 projects
- 1 Implementation grant (Prop 50) – closed out --- 1 Planning grant (Prop 84) – active, to close out in 2015---- 1 DAC Pilot Study contract (Prop 84) – active, to close out in 2015
- 11 projects have been awarded and we are currently administering all of them.
- 18 projects, 4 closed
- 2 projects, both active.
- 20 projects total / 7 still active
- 24
- 25/20
- 33 projects through Prop 84 IRWM so far and 7 projects through Prop 50 IRWM. We are actively administering 29 Prop 84 IRWM projects.
- 44 projects funded, 38 of which are being actively administered (including the seven that are getting under way with funding from the drought solicitation grant program).
- 48 (including the 17 for the drought grant), with 37 active.
- 6 still working on 3
- 8 projects; 3 that are interregional joint projects. Currently, one closed out, IRWM Region is administering 5 projects; 1 joint project is administered by another region in the funding area, and 1 joint project is administered by another region in another funding area.
- None yet
- One partially funded award, which reduced the projects from 8 to 6 that could be completed. One project is left to close out from Prop 84, Round1 IMP; the grant contract is expected to be closed out at the end of 2014.
- Prop 50 – 16 projects total, 5 are not yet closed out (including admin). - Prop 84 Round 1 – 32 projects total, 25 are not yet closed out (including admin).
- Prop 50 Planning Studies (4 studies) – Closed out; Prop 84 Planning Studies (IRWMP update + 6 studies) – Underway; Prop 84 Round 1 Implementation (3 projects) – Underway; Prop 84 Drought Grant (3 projects) – Agreement negotiations underway
- Prop 50 R2, Mini 50, Prop 84 R1 and R2. 15 total projects, 9 current.
- Seven implementation projects, three planning projects, one DAC participation project
- Since the first round of Prop 50 through the most recent Prop 84 Drought solicitation, our region has been awarded funding for 71 implementation projects. Of these, 25 have been completed, 35 are “active” and the remaining 11 are pending grant execution.
- We have received funding for 32 projects through Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 IRWM Grants. We are still actively administering 19 projects (including the 7 new projects in the 2014 Drought Solicitation).

28. Is your region able to pay for all aspects of administering the IRWM grant program with the 5% of the grant awards that are allowed for administration?

Yes: 13

No: 9

- 5% may pay for the process if it went smoothly the first time.
 - Can pay for administration of implementation grant projects, but not ongoing maintenance of IRWM program
 - Grant administration is underway and full costs will not be known until projects are constructed, final reports and annual post-implementation reports are submitted.
 - Historically, yes, but this has become increasingly challenging. However, with several grants active at the same time, we are able to spread our costs over all the grants.
 - Implementing the grant award is the easiest and most efficient component of the IRWM program. It is the competitive application system that is very time consuming, expensive, and inefficient. All the participating entities are public agencies that have completed many public projects through many years. The frustration at the RWMG level is the amount of time and resources that are incurred before getting to implement an IRWM project and that the system is not inclusive to all IRWM groups.
 - No, requires in-kind services.
 - Probably not – it depends on what is considered “all aspects” of administering the IRWM program.
 - This depends entirely on how onerous the DWR invoicing and reporting process is. Different RSRs seem to prefer different forms and or procedures/processes. Generally the 5% is inadequate.
 - We have never required 5%.
 - Yes – 2% covers it
 - Yes; but it is challenging. If the reporting requirements were relaxed and streamlined, it would be much easier to meet the 5% limit.
- a. If no, what percentage of the grant awards would be necessary to cover your region’s existing administrative costs?

Average = 10%

- 10% works better. This allows the coverage of staff, insurance, and any contingencies due to having to continually resubmitting invoice after invoice. A lot of the process, especially for the Planning Grant, had to be completed by volunteer hours.
- 8%, of which 3% would go to the LPS and 5% to the water agency to offset our administrative costs.
- Costs seem to vary most depending upon how many projects are under one contract. Perhaps percentage should be flexible if administering x number of projects or more.
- For Prop 84 round 1, the “grant admin” project was budgeted at 2.3% of the total grant cost (two other “admin” projects were included in the grant, one for conservation administration and the other for watershed program admin – the total grant funds allocated to “admin” tasks were about 5% of the grant. While the conservation admin and watershed admin projects combined have invoiced for approximately 40% of their project costs to date, the overall grant admin project has already billed for nearly 70% of the total project cost. The costs associated with invoicing and quarterly reporting is greater than what had been budgeted.

- The cost of quarterly reporting and invoicing alone seems to be running around 2% of the grant amount (this doesn't include other costs such as initial legal fees for setting up the contract, amendments to the contract, etc). The cost will vary depending on the types of projects being funded. Large construction projects appear to have relatively low admin costs as compared to projects such as conservation rebates and retrofit projects, which have lots of paperwork for small dollar amounts. Administering such projects and submitting these invoices is time consuming and cumbersome.
- Not sure. Grant awards are lumpy. Need approximately \$200k per year to more actively manage IRWM program
- The percentage of an awarded grant is not the problem in our Region. Once funded, the IRWM RWMG completed their grant administration for 1-2 percent of the funding. The higher cost is maintaining all the specific compliance to IRWM standards and the development of projects to the level needed to compete for IRWM funding required by the application process.
- This depends on the size of the grants award. There is a baseline of costs regardless of how many projects there are. If the funding award is relatively small, then the 5% allowed may not cover the costs. Additionally, when the time from grant award to execution and ultimately project completion takes longer than anticipated in the application, the additional costs for administering the grant over that time may be hard to recover with the original budget.
- We have used 8-20% to cover administration costs.

29. Does the Regional Water Quality Control Board in your region actively participate in your IRWM Planning?

Yes: 17

No: 9

- A representative has recently been assigned to our region and has attended some committee meetings
- Haven't in the past, but staff attended our more recent Board meeting.
- Minimally; the RWQCB's designated IRWM contact is on the email distribution list but does not actively participate
- They did until 2012
- They have just started to attend meetings.
- I converse with someone at the RWQCB dealing mostly with the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan but staff members of the RWQCB have never attended a IRWMP function.
- Not directly. They participate through individual projects and programs.
- Periodically; they are included on the IRWM Region Contact List and provided notices of all meetings and information.
- Sporadically
- The RWQCB has been sporadically active throughout the process and it has been project dependent. For example, a RWQCB staff member actively participated in the stakeholder group's formation of a Groundwater Basin Assessment in support of a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan for a local groundwater basin. On the other hand, the RWQCB was also not supportive of a project that Project Proponent received Prop 50 funding for and this created friction between the SWRCB and the RWQCB with the Project Proponent in the middle.

RWQCB Staff has inquired about IRWM projects, generation of IRWM projects, project selection and have come to select RWMG meetings and public outreach forums.

- Yes, as of a few months ago.
 - Yes, in the IRWM Planning. Further, we have Reg Bd member on our IRWM Steering Committee.
 - Yes. Regional Water Quality Control Board staff attend the quarterly meetings on a regular basis. Staff and leadership provide presentations to the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- a. If yes, has this resulted in any regulatory flexibility when prioritizing projects for implementation?

Yes: 1

No: 5

- No circumstances have arisen to date that have required any regulatory flexibility, so we are unsure if this has resulted.
- We have seen no impact, positive or negative, regarding regulatory flexibility on project implementation.
- Not yet been tested.
- We don't have a mechanism for making this assessment, however it has helped demonstrate to the RWQCB that progress is being made toward meeting regulatory requirements and that the region and its agencies are committed to finding solutions for regional water resources sustainability.

- b. If yes, please describe.

- Rolled in the Salt and Nutrient Plan into the IRWM stakeholder process
- RWQCB has assigned one supervisory level staff as the IRWM lead. He has attended meetings at key points, and reviewed materials when applicable to RWQCB efforts. The RWQCB staff also helped review and participate when the region developed a summary of salt and nutrient management planning needs and priorities in the region.

Section 5 – Other Feedback

- DWR appears to have made significant errors when scoring our IRWM grant applications. This has resulted in no Implementation Grant Funding under Proposition 84. This discourages our participants from using their limited resources to participate in the IRWM process.
- DWR should encourage the Legislature to appropriate large chunks of funding for grant rounds. It is difficult to prioritize projects and work with neighboring regions when the maximum grant awards are relatively small.
- I think the IRWM grant process could be improved by having DWR encourage all IRWM regions to use new tools to design sustainable infrastructure such as the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure's Envision tool and watershed sustainability report cards.
- In general, the cost to compete for IRWM funds has limited IRWM implementation and the need for a special district to cover the cost of project development for DACs to be part of a Proposal has raised red flag of unlawful use of special district funds. This has resulted in the

neighboring IRWMs being able to outspend this IRWM group by 2 to 5 times as much during the project development and application process. Since DWR uses an all or nothing funding based on their scoring, large IRWMs with many projects to select from with the funding resources, compete for the funding well. For RWMGs who have included DAC projects that are less than fully developed, the result is low scores and failure of the Region to receive funding for the entities the IRWM program is supposed to be targeting.

- Several Stakeholders and RWMG Members have expressed a great concern that agricultural water users and rural residents have a significant challenge participating in IRWM project planning and when seeking grant funding. In some rural regions there are not water districts or entities to represent those stakeholder groups in seeking smaller scale projects (e.g. agricultural water best management practices implementation). As a key stakeholder and largest groundwater user, maintaining this water use sector as a partner seems to be critical to IRWM success. The following is an excerpt from one of our agricultural stakeholders that conveys input on the points above: *Certain criteria imposed on rating projects by DWR for IRWM money prejudice project in the favor of municipalities. For instance, farmers and the environment don't get a DAC rating. But more onerous is the readiness-to-proceed criteria. Most organizations like the RCD, industry alliances, etc. do not have the staff or resources to progress ideas to the point they are ready to proceed without some funding (e.g. usually to hire consultants like engineers, hydrologists, to do the detailed work needed to progress ideas to this stage). Indeed, this prejudices projects toward municipalities who have these staff. Even less well-endowed groups, e.g. the farmers along the creek, don't have anyone representing them and probably don't come up with the ideas*
- The costs of the application could be drastically reduced if the Project Justification section was eliminated. Costs for invoicing and reporting on grant awards would be drastically reduced if the invoicing was more similar to that done in Prop 50 IRWMP (e.g., no requirement to classify costs by budget category, costs simply reviewed as eligible or ineligible).
- The DWR has made this program too cumbersome for a small region to be competitive - only wealthy agencies can afford to participate!
- The funding arrangement between the 3 RWMG's in the Funding Area has fostered a collaborative relationship as opposed to a competitive relationship. Funding areas should be encouraged to follow this model.
- The grant application process is overly complex and costly, in particularly the economic analyses which require economic consultants to complete.
- The IRWM Program overall is a very good program that generally succeeds in promoting coordination and collaboration. However the lack of funding and difficulty/competitiveness of grant awards is a significant deterrent to future participation.
- We would appreciate a more streamlined approach to application for funding and administration of funding. Our observation is that there is ineffective communication between the Sacramento DWR office and regional offices as well as disparities in administration of funding, invoice review, and responsiveness. Staff members within the Sacramento office are generally more knowledgeable, responsive, and efficient. The IRWM process overall must be effective, transparent and more responsive to regions. The application process must be streamlined, less onerous and therefore more affordable for DACs and others to participate. Feedback given to DWR should be incorporated into practice.

Section 6 – Results Comparison

Question	2008 Survey	2011 Survey	2014 Survey
Number of Regions Responding	28	27	27
If there is more than one IRWM planning region in your Funding Area, are you working together to ensure cooperation and integration? (2008)			
Yes	23		
No	1		
If there is more than one IRWM planning region in your Funding Area, how well are working together on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best? (2011 and 2014)		3.6	3.7
Region's Annual Budget			
Less than \$25,000	4	6	6
\$25,000 to \$150,000	10	12	9
\$150,000 to \$500,000	4	6	9
Over \$500,000	4	3	1
Did your Region apply for a Prop 84 Implementation Grant?			
Yes		21	23
No		6	4
Was cost factor in deciding not to apply?			
Yes		3	4
No		3	1
How many projects were in your grant application? (2011 - Prop 84 Round 1; 2014 Prop 84 Drought Solicition)		9.5	5.3
What was the total amount of the grant request?		\$9,723,188	\$10,539,431
Did you include the cost of grant administration in your grant request?			
Yes		16	21
No		3	2
If so, what percent?		3.6%	9%
What was the total cost to prepare your application?		\$114,085	\$101,518
What were the application preparation costs per project?		\$16,800	\$24,105
What percent of the application cost was for:			
Consultants		64%	74%
Staff Time		26%	15%
In-kind or project proponent time		47%	13%
Did you include the cost of preparing the application as a funding match in your grant application?			
Yes		2	8

No		16	12
Sometimes			2
What percent of your request was for DAC projects?		44%	31%
Please indicate the number of projects that fit into each organizational type below:			
Large Agency		4.2	3.1
Smaller Agency		4.1	2.7
Disadvantaged Community		4.5	1.7
Non-profit or environmental entity		1.8	0.7
Other		2.8	1.0
Please provide feedback on the implementation grant process. Rate each of the following on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best.			
BMS/GRanTS		3.1	3.5
Clarity of Guidelines		3.5	3.6
Clarity of PSP		3.5	3.3
Amount of detail required in the application		2.0	3.2
Overall cost to apply		2.0	2.2
Responsiveness of DWR staff providing technical assistance		3.9	3.8
DWR Workshops		3.7	3.3
Please provide input on the level of effort required for each of the following major applicatin attachments. Rate on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest level of effort.			
AB 1420 and Meter Compliance Info (2011)/Authorization and Eligibility Requirements (2014)		4.4	5.3
Economic Analysis (2008)/Project Justification (2014)		9.3	8.3
Work Plan		8.9	7.0
Budget		7.6	6.2
Schedule		6.0	5.9
Program Preferences		5.4	6.0
DAC Assistance		5.1	5.6
How do you make data available to stakeholders and the public?			
Website or other online method?		20	26
Written publications, e.g., IRWM Plan updates, separate reports		20	26
GIS-based database		7	12
Other		5	6

BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

Date	Location
October 22, 2018	MTC/SFEP (6 th Floor CR 6102 Bay Area Conference Room)
December 3, 2018	Coastal Conservancy, Big Sur Conference Room
January 28, 2019	Zone 7