INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

FINAL DRAFT AS OF NOVEMBER 16, 2004

FOR APPROVAL BY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

AND

ADOPTION AT THE NOVEMBER 18, 2004
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD MEETING

ACRONYMS USED IN THESE GUIDELINES AND APPENDICES

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

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

I. PURPOSE

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

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

II. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Proposition 50, the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002, was passed by California voters in November 2002. It amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add, among other articles, Section 79560 *et seq*., authorizing the Legislature to appropriate $500 million for IRWM projects. Approximately $380 million is anticipated to be available for IRWM grants during two funding cycles. The balance of the funding is directed towards program implementation by DWR and SWRCB (5%), payment of bond issuance costs (3.5%), and specific funding authorizations, such as implementation of comprehensive statewide groundwater monitoring.

The intent of the IRWM Grant Program is to encourage integrated regional strategies for management of water resources and to provide funding, through competitive grants, for projects that protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water. The IRWM Grant Program is administered jointly by DWR and SWRCB and is intended to promote a new model for water management.

The legislature passed several pieces of legislation that impact the implementation of Proposition 50. The list of major bills includes:

- Senate Bill (SB 278) (Machado, Chapter 892, Statutes of 2002) requires the body awarding a contract for a public works project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 50 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program (California Labor Code § 1771.8);
- SB 1473 (Machado, Chapter 618, Statutes of 2002) provides that DWR will administer 50 percent of the IRWM Grant Program funds and the SWRCB will administer the other 50 percent and requires that not less than 40 percent of the funds be available to each Southern California and Northern California. Prior to awarding a grant, DWR and the SWRCB must determine whether projects that include modification of a river or stream channel will fully mitigate environmental impacts (CWC § 79564.1(a));
- SB 1672 (Costa, Chapter 767, Statues of 2002) enacted The Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Act of 2002 which provides that a regional water management group may prepare and adopt an integrated regional water management plan; (CWC § 10530 *et seq.*)
- Assembly Bill (AB) 1747 (Oropeza, Chapter 240, Statutes of 2003) provides specific mandates and guidance for implementing Proposition 50, includes an exemption from the Office of Administrative Law review and approval process, directs $20 million from the IRWM Grant Program for competitive grants for groundwater management and recharge projects, and includes a preference for water quality projects that will eliminate or significantly reduce pollution into impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significance;
- SB 1049 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 741, Statutes of 2003) amended the Water Code to provide the State additional flexibility in implementing Proposition 50 programs; and

- AB 866 (Pavely, Chapter 493, Statutes of 2003) directs the SWRCB to fund the development of one or more integrated coastal watershed management plans in watersheds that influence water quality in areas of special biological significance and requires consultations with the State Coastal Conservancy and the California Department of Fish and Game on selection of proposals (CWC § 79563.5).

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

- Legislative workshops conducted in the Spring of 2003;
- Meetings of the Economics and Funding work group of the California Watershed Council in late 2003 and early 2004;
- California Bay Delta Authority meetings in February and October 2004;
- Two public scoping meetings in March 2004;
- Two public meeting to solicit comments on the draft guidelines in August and September 2004; and
- California Bay Delta Public Advisory Committee meeting on September 9, 2004.

A. Usage of Terms

To foster understanding and clarity DWR and SWRCB will use the following terms consistently in these guidelines:

- "Plan" refers to an IRWM Plan or the collection of individual planning documents which in conjunction function as an IRWM Plan;
- "Application" refers to the electronic or hard copy submission to DWR and SWRCB that requests grant funding for the proposal that the applicant intends to implement;
- "Eligible Grant Recipient" refers to public agencies or non-profit organizations as defined in Section III.A.
- "Proposal" refers to a project or suite of projects and actions that are proposed for funding pursuant to an application for either Planning Grant or Implementation Grant funding; and
- "Project" refers to an individual effort included in the proposal that may be construction of physical facilities or implementation of non-structural actions.

For example, an applicant, which must include at least one *eligible grant recipient*, will submit an *Application* that details its *Proposal* to implement a suite of *projects* that are consistent with a *Plan*.

B. Funding

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

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

- First Funding Cycle – Approximately $160 million
  - Approximately $12 million for Planning Grants and
  - Approximately $148 million for Implementation Grants
- Second Funding Cycle – Approximately $220 million

C. Maximum Grant Amount

The maximum grant amounts are:

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

D. Minimum Funding Match Requirements

The applicant is required to provide a funding match. "Funding match" means funds made available by the grant recipient from non-state sources. Funding match may include, but is not limited to, federal funds, local funding, or donated services from non-state sources. For a State agency, funding match may include state funds and services. (CWC § 79505.5(b-c))

- The required minimum funding match for a Planning Grant will be 25 percent of the total proposal costs.
- The required minimum funding match for an Implementation Grant will be 10 percent of the total proposal costs.

E. Program Preferences

The CWC and implementing legislation specifies that preference will be given to specific project types. These program preferences are reflected in the evaluation criteria and will be taken into consideration during the review process (Section V.G). Preference will be given to proposals that, as applicable:

- Include integrated projects with multiple benefits;
- Support and improve local and regional water supply reliability;
- Contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards;
- Eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including areas of special biological significance;
- Include safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities; or
- Include groundwater management and recharge projects that are located 1) in San Bernardino or Riverside counties; 2) outside the service area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; **and** 3) within one mile of established residential and commercial development.

Appendix E includes a listing of web links for accessing information on the Program Preferences.

F. Statewide Priorities

DWR and SWRCB will give consideration during the review process (Section V.G) to proposals that assist in meeting Statewide Priorities, established by DWR and SWRCB, which are as follows:

- Reduce conflict between water users or resolve water rights disputes, including interregional water rights issues;
- Implementation of Total Maximum Daily Loads that are established or under development;
- Implementation of Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans, and policies;
- Implementation of the SWRCB's Non-point Source (NPS) Pollution Plan;
- Assist in meeting Delta Water Quality Objectives;

- Implementation of recommendations of the floodplain management task force, desalination task force, recycling task force, or state species recovery plan;
- Address environmental justice concerns; and
- Assist in achieving one or more goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Appendix E includes a listing of web links for accessing detailed information on the Statewide Priorities.

G. Geographic Scope

Proposals from throughout California will be considered for funding. CWC § 79564.(a) requires that not less than 40% of the funds will be available for eligible projects in Northern California and not less than 40% will be available for eligible projects in Southern California. In addition to the required 40% minimum allocation of funding to both northern and southern California, additional geographic distribution factors may be taken into consideration during the review process (Section V.G). As stated above (Section II), the total available funding for the IRWM Grant Program is divided between specific funding mandates and IRWM grant funding. Due to these funding mandates, the IRWM grant will be split roughly equally between Northern California and Southern California.

H. Proposal Solicitation

The IRWM Grant Program will be structured as two separate solicitations, 1) for planning proposals; and 2) implementation proposals. The proposal contents and evaluation criteria are detailed in Appendix B and Appendix C.

Planning Grant Solicitation

Approximately $12 million will be available for Planning Grants during the first funding cycle, of which approximately $2 million will be allocated for the development of Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans. The Planning Grants are intended to foster development or completion of IRWM Plans or components thereof, to enhance regional planning efforts, and to assist more applicants to become eligible for Implementation Grant funding. The Planning Grant solicitation will be a one-step application process.

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

- Major water-related issues within the region and objectives for the Plan;
- Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b));
- Demonstration that applicant is an eligible grant recipient, as defined in Section III.A;
- Process for development and adoption of the Plan;
- Schedule for adoption;
- Participating Stakeholders;
- Funding Match; and
- For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Planning Grants, demonstration that the proposed planning area must be located in a coastal watershed that influences water quality in an area of special biological significance. If there are projects in the same watershed funded by the State Coastal Conservancy, or the SWRCB's Clean Beaches Initiative or Proposition 40 Integrated Watershed Management Program, the applicant must describe proposed integration with those projects.

The Planning Grant applications will be evaluated based on the criteria identified in Appendix B, Section B.2.

IMPLEMENTATION GRANT SOLICITATION

Approximately $148 million will be released in the first funding cycle for IRWM implementation grants. Proposed projects must meet one or more of the objectives of protecting communities from drought, protecting and improving water quality, and improving local water security by reducing dependence on imported water and include at least one of the water management elements listed in Section III.C. The Implementation Grant is designed for projects that are ready for or nearly ready to proceed to implementation.

A two-step process will be used to evaluate the Implementation Grant proposals. Implementation Grant applications must be submitted by regional agencies or groups. The applicant must provide documentation of the following:

- Complete copy of the IRWM Plan, with proof of formal adoption;
- Demonstrated consistency with IRWM Plan Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b));
- Description of specific implementation project(s) for which funding is being requested;
- Prioritization of proposed projects listed in the IRWM Plan and within the proposal; and
- Funding match.

The IRWM Step 1 Implementation Grant proposals will be evaluated based on the criteria identified in Appendix C, Section C.2. Selected applicants will be invited to submit a Step 2 application. The Step 2 proposals will be evaluated based on the criteria in Appendix C, Section C.4.

III. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A. Eligible Grant Recipients

Eligible grant recipients are public agencies and non-profit organizations, as defined below:

- "Public agency" means a city, county, city and county, district, joint powers authority, a state agency or department, or other political subdivision of the State.
- "Non-profit organization" means any California corporation organized under Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the federal Internal Revenue Code.

Other entities may be part of the regional water management group responsible for applying for a grant and may perform work funded by the grant.

B. Eligibility Criteria

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

- Urban Water Management Planning Act Compliance – This eligibility criterion applies to applicants and participating agencies that are urban water suppliers and which have projects that would receive funding through the IRWM grant program. The Urban Water Management Planning Act (the Act), CWC § 10610 *et seq.* provides that urban water suppliers must prepare, adopt, and submit urban water management plans to DWR in compliance with the Act in order to be eligible to receive funding.
- Groundwater Management Plan Compliance – For groundwater management and recharge projects and for projects with potential groundwater impacts, the applicant or the participating agency responsible for such projects must demonstrate that either:
  - They have prepared and implemented a Groundwater Management Plan in compliance with CWC § 10753.7,
  - They participate or consent to be subject to a Groundwater Management Plan, basin-wide management plan, or other IRWM program or plan that meets the requirements of CWC §10753.7(a);

- The proposal includes development of a Groundwater Management Plan that meets the requirements of CWC § 10753.7 which will be completed within 1-year of the grant application submittal date, or
- They conform to the requirements of an adjudication of water rights in the subject groundwater basin.

- Consistency with an adopted IRWM Plan – An applicant's IRWM implementation proposal must be consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan that meets the minimum IRWM Plan standards as shown in Appendix A. This requirement may be waived if the agency or organization can show that it is engaged in the development of an IRWM Plan and that the IRWM Plan will be adopted before January 1, 2007 and demonstrates how the proposal fits into achieving the IRWM Plan objective(s) as evidenced by a draft IRWM Plan. (CWC § 79562.5(c))

C. Eligible Proposals/Project Types

For Planning Grants, eligible proposals include:

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

For Implementation Grants, eligible proposal must meet one or more of the objectives of protecting communities from drought, protecting and improving water quality, and improving local water security by reducing dependence on imported water which must include one or more of the following water management elements (CWC § 79561):

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

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

IV GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

A. Conflict of Interest

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

B. Confidentiality

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

C. Labor Code Compliance

California Labor Code § 1771.8 requires the body awarding a contract for a public work project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 50 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program pursuant to California Labor Code § 1771.5(b). Compliance with applicable laws, including Labor Code provisions, will become an obligation of the grant recipient under the terms of the grant agreement between the grant recipient and the granting agency. California Labor Code § 1771.8 appears to provide, where applicable, that the grant recipient's Labor Compliance Program must be in place at the time of awarding of a contract for a public works project by the grant recipient.

Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding Labor Code compliance. See Appendix E for web links to the Department of Industrial Relations.

D. Modification of a River or Stream Channel

Project that includes modification of a river or stream channel must fully mitigate environmental impacts resulting from the modification. The applicant must provide documentation that the environmental impacts resulting from such modification will be fully mitigated considering all of the impacts of the modification and any mitigation, environmental enhancement, and environmental benefit resulting from the project, and whether, on balance, any environmental enhancement or benefit equals or exceeds any negative environmental impacts of the project. (CWC § 79560 and § 79560.1(b))

E. CEQA Compliance

Activities funded under Proposition 50 must be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq*.). See Appendix E for web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook. (CWC § 79506)

F. CALFED Program Consistency

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

G. Groundwater Monitoring Requirements

Any groundwater projects and projects that affect groundwater shall include groundwater monitoring requirements consistent with the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (Part 2.76 [commencing with § 10780] of Division 26 of the CWC). See Appendix E for web links to the SWRCB groundwater monitoring and reporting requirements.

H. Watershed Management Plan Consistency

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

I. Waiver of Litigation Rights

Grant agreements funded by the SWRCB will specify that acceptance of grant funds constitutes a waiver of litigation rights (including pending actions) to challenge any SWRCB or RWQCB regulation or order, which is reasonably related to the purpose of the grant.

V. PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A. Release of PSPs

Within two months of adoption of these guidelines, DWR and SWRCB will issue draft PSPs for Planning and Step 1 IRWM Implementation Grants. The draft PSPs will be posted for a minimum 15-calendar day public review period on DWR and SWRCB websites at:

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

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

During the public review period, DWR and SWRCB will conduct one public workshop, which will be web broadcasted, to address public questions regarding the draft PSPs and solicit public comments. The workshop will be held at least 7-calendar days prior to the end of the public comment period. Written comments will also be accepted. Following consideration of public comments, DWR and SWRCB will issue the final PSPs for the Planning and Step 1 IRWM Implementation Grants.

Subsequent to the release of the draft PSP for the Step 1 IRWM Implementation Grants, but prior to the Step 1 application submittal date, DWR and SWRCB will issue the draft PSP for the Step 2 IRWM Implementation Grants. The draft Step 2 PSP will be posted for a minimum 15-calendar day public review period on DWR and the SWRCB websites. During the public review period, DWR and SWRCB will conduct one public workshop, which will be web broadcasted, to address public questions regarding the draft Step 2 PSP and solicit public comments. The workshop will be held at least 7-calendar days prior to the end of the public comment period. Written comments will also be accepted. Following consideration of public comments, DWR and the SWRCB will issue the final PSP for the Step 2 IRWM Implementation Grants.

Each draft PSP will provide specific information regarding workshop dates and location and how to submit comments.

B. Solicitation Notice

DWR and SWRCB will solicit grant proposals with the release of the final PSPs for the IRWM Planning and Step 1 Implementation Grants. The PSPs will provide detailed instructions on the mechanics of submitting proposals and specific information on submittal requirements. The final PSPs will be posted on DWR and SWRCB websites at:

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

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

A solicitation notice will be e-mailed to all interested parties on the IRWM Grant Program mailing list. If you are not already on the mailing and wish to be place on it, please e-mail your contact information to:

dfa_grants@swrcb.ca.gov

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

C. Applicant Assistance Workshops

Four informational workshops will be conducted to address applicant questions and to provide general assistance to applicants in preparing their Planning Grant and Step 1 Implementation Grant applications. The workshops will also provide detailed technical assistance on the IRWM Plan Standards, procedures for determining disadvantaged community status, and other relevant topics. Additional workshops will be scheduled and held for the Step 2 Implementation Grants. The dates and locations of the workshops will be provided in the PSPs. In addition to the informational workshops, applicants are encouraged to seek assistance from DWR, SWRCB, and RWQCB staff in understanding IRWM Grant Program requirements and completing grant applications.

D. Proposal Submittal

The procedures for submitting applications will be provided in the PSPs. To the extent feasible, the Planning Grant and Step 1 Implementation Grant applications will be an on-line process. The Step 2 Implementation Grant application process will be a combination of an electronic on-line submittal and a hard copy submittal.

Applications must contain all required items listed in the PSPs. Applications may include attachments with supplemental materials such as design plans and specifications, detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot projects, additional maps, diagrams, letters of support, copies of agreements, or other applicable items. Applicants are encouraged to submit attachments and supporting documentation in an electronic format. **All applications, including attachments and supporting documentation, must be provided by the submittal deadline. Any material submitted after the deadline will not be considered and will be returned to the applicant.**

E. Completeness Review

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

F. Eligibility Review

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

G. Review Process

All complete and eligible proposals will be evaluated and scored by technical reviewers. The group of technical reviewers for each proposal will include one representative each from DWR headquarters, the SWRCB, and the applicable RWQCB or DWR District. At least three technical reviewers will be assigned to each eligible proposal. Furthermore, DWR and the SWRCB may request technical reviewers from other agencies, and assign reviews based on technical elements of the proposals. Staff from the State Coastal Conservancy, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Coastal Commission will be asked to participate as technical reviewers of Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan proposals. These agencies are members of the Critical Coastal Areas Committee which has made important contributions in the areas of coastal NPS pollution control and water quality issues.

The technical reviewers will individually score proposals in accordance with criteria in Appendices B and C, Tables B-1, C-1, and C-2, as applicable. The review and score will be based on the merit of the entire proposal as a whole versus the merit of an individual component. Following completion of the individual technical reviews, the reviewers will discuss the proposals and develop a consensus review and score.

Following completion of the consensus scoring of all eligible proposals, DWR and SWRCB will convene a Selection Panel to review the technical scores and comments. The Selection Panel will generate a preliminary

ranking list of the proposals and make initial funding recommendations. When developing the preliminary ranking list and initial funding recommendations, the Selection Panel will consider the following items:

- Amount of funds available for the grant type,
- Consensus review and score,
- Eligibility as an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan,
- Program Preferences (Section II.E),
- Statewide Priorities (Section II.F), and
- Geographic distribution (Section II.G).

The Selection Panel may recommend reducing individual grant amounts from that requested to allow a greater number of high-ranked proposals to receive funding. However, such reductions will be weighed against whether the reduced funding would impede implementation of the proposal. Additionally, the Selection Panel may adjust individual scores to ensure that: 1) evaluation criteria have been consistently applied; 2) the recommended funding list reflects the breadth of the Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities; and 3) funding is equitably distributed throughout the State.

H. Applicant Notification and Public Meeting

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

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

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

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

I. Funding Awards

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

J. Grant Agreement

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

Following funding commitment, the granting agency will execute a grant agreement with the grant recipient. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by authorized representative of the grant recipient and the granting agency.

DWR and SWRCB encourage collaboration to enhance the integration of water management throughout regions of California. Parties that wish to collaborate on a proposal may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship, a joint venture, a joint powers authority, or other appropriate mechanism. To the maximum extent possible, grant agreements will be executed with one grant recipient for the region, which will then provide funding to individual

project proponents that are responsible for implementation of the component projects. In the event that it is necessary to develop individual grant agreements for components of a proposal, each project proponent must be an eligible grant recipient, as defined in Section III.A and the grant recipient must provide an explanation of which projects should receive separate grant agreements. Such individual grant agreements will be structured to ensure that the integrated nature of the proposal is maintained and that the individual projects progress in a balanced manner.

K. Funding Match Waiver or Reduction

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

L. Reimbursement of Costs

Reimbursable costs are as defined in Appendix D. Only work performed **after** the effective date of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Costs incurred after November 5, 2002, and prior to the effective date of a grant agreement are not eligible for reimbursement. However, these costs may be considered, at the Granting Agency's discretion, as a part of the applicant's funding match. **Advance funds cannot be provided.**

APPENDIX A
IRWM PLAN STANDARDS

Whether applying for a grant to develop or complete an IRWM Plan or an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan (Planning Grant) or a grant to implement a proposal that is consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan (Implementation Grant), the proposed or adopted Plan must meet the standards outlined in this Appendix. **The "Plan" need not be called an "IRWM Plan."** Existing regional planning documents may be utilized as a functionally equivalent plan. These may include, but are not limited to:

- Watershed management plans,
- Integrated resource plans,
- Urban water management plans,
- Habitat conservation plans,
- Multi-species conservation plans,
- Groundwater management plan,
- Floodplain management plans,
- Regional drinking water quality plans, or
- Other regional planning efforts.

While any one planning document may not meet these standards, a collection of local and regional plans may constitute a functional equivalent; provided that the applicant details in the application how the various plans function together to form the basis of an integrated regional water management plan that meets these standards.

For the purposes of this Appendix, "Plan" refers to an IRWM Plan or a functional equivalent set of planning documents. Listed below are the IRWM Plan standards.

A. **Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group** – Describe the regional water management group **or** regional agency responsible for development and implementation of the Plan. Include the member agencies and organizations and their management responsibilities related to water. Demonstrate that all agencies and organizations necessary to address the objectives and water management strategies of the Plan were involved in the planning process.

B. **Region Description** – Explain why the region is an appropriate area for integrated regional water management. Describe internal boundaries within the region (boundaries of municipalities; service areas of individual water, wastewater, and land use agencies, including those not involved in the Plan; groundwater basin boundaries, watershed boundaries, county boundaries, etc.), major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions. Describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region, including surface waters, ground waters, reclaimed water, imported water, and desalted water. Describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon. Describe important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries and the associated water demands to support environmental needs. Describe the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values. Describe economic conditions and important economic trends within the region.

   In certain cases, individual agencies or organizations may participate in different regional efforts depending on geography, Plan objectives, or other relevant factors. For such cases, the application should include an explanation of why participation in various regional efforts is appropriate.

C. **Objectives** – Identify IRWM Plan objectives and the manner in which they were determined. The Plan must address major water related objectives and conflicts within the region, including, at a minimum, water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality.

D. **Water Management Strategies** – Document the range of water management strategies considered to meet the objectives. Strategies to be considered may include but are not limited to:

Table A-1 – Water Management Strategies

◈ Ecosystem Restoration*	◈ Conjunctive use
◈ Environmental and habitat protection and improvement*	◈ Desalination
◈ Water Supply Reliability*	◈ Imported water
◈ Flood management*	◈ Land use planning
◈ Groundwater management*	◈ NPS pollution control
◈ Recreation and public access*	◈ Surface storage
◈ Storm water capture and management*	◈ Watershed planning
◈ Water conservation*	◈ Water and wastewater treatment
◈ Water quality protection and improvement*	◈ Water transfers
◈ Water recycling*	
◈ Wetlands enhancement and creation*	

* *Pursuant to CWC §§ 79562.5 and 79564, these water management strategies must be considered to meet the minimum IRWM Plan Standards.*

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

F. **Regional Priorities** – Include short-term and long-term priorities for implementation of the Plan. Discuss the process for modifying priorities in response to regional changes.

G. **Implementation** – Identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented. Identify the agency(ies) responsible for project implementation and clearly identify linkages or interdependence between projects. Demonstrate economic and technical feasibility on a programmatic level. Identify the current status of each element of the Plan, such as existing infrastructure, feasibility, pilot or demonstration project, design completed, etc. Include timelines for all active or planned projects and identify the institutional structure that will ensure Plan implementation.

H. **Impacts and Benefits** – Discuss at a screening level the impact and benefits from Plan implementation. Include an evaluation of potential impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from Plan implementation. Identify the advantages of the regional plan; including a discussion of the added benefits of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts. Identify which objectives necessitate a regional solution. Identify interregional benefits and impacts. Describe the impacts and benefits to environmental justice or disadvantaged communities. Include an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources, such as air quality or energy.

I. **Technical Analysis and Plan Performance** – Include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in development of the Plan. Include a discussion of measures that will be used to evaluate Project/Plan performance, monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operations and Plan implementation based on performance data collected.

J. **Data Management** – Include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public, and include discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs. At a minimum assess the state of existing monitoring efforts for water quantity and water quality, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed.

If the Plan includes a water quality component, include a discussion of the integration of data into the SWRCB's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment Program. Appendix E provides a listing of web links for accessing information on the SWRCB's statewide data management strategies.

K. **Financing** – Identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for Plan implementation. Discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects.

L. **Statewide Priorities** – Identify statewide or State agency priorities that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the Plan, proposal, or specific projects. Describe how the Plan, proposal, or specific projects were developed pursuant to Statewide Priorities (Section II.E).

M. **Relation to Local Planning** – Discuss how the IRWM Plan relates to planning documents and programs established by local agencies. Demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers. Discuss how local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM strategies and the dynamics between the two planning documents. Discuss the linkages between the Plan and local planning documents.

N. **Stakeholder Involvement** – Identify stakeholders included in developing the Plan. Identify how stakeholders were identified, how they participate in planning and implementation efforts and how they can influence decisions made regarding water management. Include documentation of stakeholder involvement such as inclusion of signatory status or letters of support from non-agency stakeholders, i.e. those who have not "adopted" the Plan. Include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the Plan. Discuss watershed or other partnerships developed during the planning process. Discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process. Discuss efforts to identify and address environmental justice needs and issues within the region. Identify possible obstacles to Plan implementation.

O. **Coordination** – Identify state or federal agencies involved with strategies, actions, and projects. Identify areas where a state agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication, cooperation, or implementation of Plan components or processes, or where state or federal regulatory decisions are required for implementation.

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

- Adopted by January 1, 2007, by all appropriate agencies and organizations;
- Participation of at least three agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water management, which may include water supply, water quality, flood control, or storm water management;
- Provides a map of the region showing the local agencies in the area covered by the Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects;
- Contains one or more regional objectives;
- Documents that the following water management strategies were considered (CWC §§ 79562.5 and 79564) when formulating the IRWM Plan:
    - Water supply reliability,
    - Groundwater management,
    - Water quality protection and improvement,
    - Water recycling,
    - Water conservation,
    - Storm water capture and management,
    - Flood management,

- Recreation and public access,
- Ecosystem restoration,
- Wetlands enhancement and creation, and
- Environmental and habitat protection and improvement;

- Integrates two or more water management strategies listed in Table A-1; **and**
- Presents project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs.

APPENDIX B
PLANNING GRANT

B.1 PROPOSAL CONTENTS – PLANNING GRANTS

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

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

A. Proposal Title, Administrative Information, Summary and Documentation

The applicant must submit the proposal title, the agency or organization responsible for the proposal, and its relationship to the regional water management group **or** regional agency. The applicant must provide administrative information that will include, but is not limited to the following: agency/organization name; address; authorized representative name and phone number; location of region covered by the proposal, including longitude and latitude; and State legislative representatives within the region. The Proposal Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

The applicant will also need to provide documentation from the applicant's governing body designating an authorized representative to file an application and enter into an agreement for a grant.

B. Applicant Authority

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

C. Work Plan

The applicant must submit a complete, detailed work plan consisting of a description of work items, a budget, and a schedule for completion of the work items. The work plan must include a description of work item submittals as well as a description of the final product proposed by the applicant. The budget must identify funding match consistent with the minimum funding match requirements Section II.D.

D. Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group Description

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

E. Description of Region

Describe the region that the proposed Plan will cover. Explain why the region encompassed is an appropriate area for water management. Provide a map and narrative description showing internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region. Describe the quality and quantity of water resources of the region; as relevant, describe areas of special biological significance and other sensitive habitats such as Marine Protected areas and impaired water bodies within the region; describe important ecological processes and environmental resources; describe the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; and identify important cultural or social values and economic conditions and trends within the region. The applicant must describe the benefits of planning for this region and managing water within the region as compared to individual local efforts. If applicable, disadvantaged communities within the region should be noted on the figure/map.

F. Objectives

Describe the planning objectives for the proposed Plan to address the major water related issues and conflicts within the region, including, at a minimum, water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality elements. If the planning objectives have not been established, describe a process for determining planning objectives. The planning objectives should relate to the water issues of the region as discussed in the Description of Region, Section B.1.E.

G. Integration of Water Management Strategies

Describe the water management strategies that will be considered in the Plan and how they were determined. If the water management strategies to be considered have not been determined, describe the process that will be used to determine the range of strategies to address planning objectives. In either case, describe how the selected strategies are seen to work together to benefit water management.

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

H. Implementation

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

For NPS pollution control activities, describe how the Plan will identify the appropriate management measures and management practices of the State's NPS Plan that will be employed through implementation of the Plan, identify who will be responsible for such implementation, and include a schedule for implementation. See Appendix E for a link to the NPS Plan.

I. Impacts and Benefits

Describe, at a screening level, the potential impacts and benefits of plan development and implementation. If the potential impacts and benefits have not been identified, describe a process for determining impacts and benefits of plan development and implementation. Impacts should be inclusive of the region and adjacent areas. Describe the plan for compliance with CEQA as it is applicable to adoption and implementation of the Plan.

J. Data and Technical Analysis

Describe the types and amount of data that are available to support development of the Plan. Describe studies that have been conducted or will be conducted to support the planning process. The applicant should identify data gaps where additional monitoring or studies are needed. Describe how the Plan will assess the status of existing water quantity and water quality monitoring in the region, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed.

K. Data Management

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

L. Stakeholder Involvement

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

M. Disadvantaged Communities

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

N. Relation to Local Planning

The proposal must identify existing local planning documents that will be considered during development of the Plan. Discuss how these local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents.

O. Agency Coordination

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

B.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA – FOR PLANNING GRANTS

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

TABLE B-1 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PLANNING GRANTS

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Work Plan *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal.* Does the proposal include a work plan with specific work items, schedule, and budget for completing the proposal? Is the work plan clear and implementable? Were work item submittals identified? Are the work plan, budget, and schedule consistent with respect to work items and sequence of work items? Is the budget reasonable, logical, and supported with other documentation, assumptions, or estimates? Does the budget demonstrate a minimum funding match of 25% of the total proposal costs? Is the schedule reasonable and show a definite performance period? Will the IRWM Plan be adopted by January 1, 2007?	3	15
Description of Region *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region.* Is the region for the proposed Plan well defined? Was the basis for the region's boundaries presented? Is the region encompassed by the proposal an appropriate area for water management? Did the applicant describe the internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region? Did the application include a figure/map of the region showing the agencies involved in the proposed Plan and the location of proposed implementation projects? Was the quality and quantity of water resources of the region described? If relevant, were areas of special biological significance and other sensitive habitats such as Marine Protected areas and impaired water bodies within the region described? Did the applicant describe important ecological processes, environmental resources, the social and cultural makeup of the regional community and identify important cultural or social values and economic conditions and trends within the region? Is the agency or group responsible for development of the proposed Plan described? Are the benefits of defining this region and managing water within it versus individual local efforts described in the application? If relevant, did the applicant explain why participation in various regional efforts is appropriate?	1	5
Objectives *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives.* Are the regional planning objectives explained? How were these objectives determined? Will the proposed Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region including at a minimum water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality? Does the proposed Plan include statewide priorities?	2	10
Integration of Water Management Strategies *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated.* Does the proposal include multiple water management strategies or a technical process for determining water management strategies to be considered in the proposed Plan? Does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of how the selected water management strategies work together to produce some synergistic effect in water management? Do the water management strategies to be considered meet the IRWM standards? *For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans*, are the proposed Plan's components consistent with the Critical Coastal Areas Program "Watershed Action Plan Outline"?	2	10

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Implementation *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation.* Does the proposal have a general schedule for implementation of the Plan beyond adoption or a process to determine such a schedule? Does the proposed Plan include or will it develop an institutional structure to ensure project implementation? Is there a mechanism or process in the proposal that allows for monitoring the performance of the plan implementation and changes to the Plan? For NPS projects, does the proposal identify appropriate management measures and practices and implementation responsibilities and schedule?	2	10
Impacts and Benefits *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan.* Will the proposed Plan include an analysis of potential impacts within the region and adjacent areas? Does the proposal include an analysis of potential benefits of developing the proposed Plan? Does the proposal discuss a plan for complying with CEQA?	2	10
Data and Technical Analysis *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal.* Will available data adequately support the proposed planning? Have technical studies been conducted, or are they planned, that will support the proposed planning?	1	5
Data Management *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures.* Does the proposed Plan include a process for gathering and managing data from development and implementation of the Plan and disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public? Does the proposal demonstrate how the data management will support statewide data needs?	1	5
Stakeholder Involvement *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns.* Does the proposal identify processes for stakeholder involvement in plan development and implementation of the Plan, including how they may influence decisions? Are water related agencies and organizations within the region included in the planning process? Does the proposed Plan address environmental justice concerns? Are all appropriate stakeholders included? Is there a process to identify and include additional stakeholders?	1	5
Disadvantaged Communities *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns.* Does the region include one or more disadvantaged community(ies)? Does the proposal document water supply and water quality needs of disadvantaged communities? Will implementation of the proposed Plan and associated projects directly benefit disadvantaged communities? Are representatives of disadvantaged communities included in the planning process?	1	5
Relation to Local Planning *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts.* Does the application identify existing local planning documents that will form a foundation for the regional plan? Does the application indicate how local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents?	1	5

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Agency Coordination *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues.* Does the proposed Plan provide for coordination and cooperation with the relevant local, State, and federal agencies in plan components? Will the proposed Plan facilitate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? Will the proposed Plan facilitate coordination with State and federal regulatory agencies?	1	5
Total Possible Points		90

APPENDIX C
IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

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

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

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

The application must be submitted by regional agencies **or** regional water management groups, of which at least one member is an eligible grant recipient, i.e. a public agency or non-profit organization. The proposal must include projects from one or more of the water management elements listed in Section III.C.

A. Proposal Title, Administrative Information, Summary and Documentation

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

B. Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption

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

C. Demonstrated Consistency with IRWM Standards

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

If functionally equivalent planning documents are provided, the applicant must also provide a discussion on how the alternate documents meet the IRWM Plan Standards contained in Appendix A.

If the Plan has not been adopted, the applicant must demonstrate that it is engaged in the development of an IRWM Plan, how the proposal fits into achieving an IRWM Plan objective, and provide a copy of the draft IRWM Plan

and a schedule detailing the steps to be completed and showing that the IRWM Plan will be adopted before January 1, 2007.

D. Description of Proposal

The application must include a detailed description of the proposal, which may consist of one or more projects, for which funding is requested. The proposal must implement one or more of the eligible water management elements listed in Section III.C. The goals and objectives of the proposal must be identified. Also provide a discussion that demonstrates the individual projects are consistent with the IRWM Plan. For proposed IRWM Plans, the applicant must also discuss how the proposed project(s) fit into achieving the IRWM Plan objectives.

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

E. Cost Estimate

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

The sources for the funding match must be identified. **To be eligible for consideration in Step 2, the applicant must demonstrate a commitment of a minimum funding match of 10 percent of the total proposal costs.**

F. Schedule

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

G. Project Prioritization

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

H. Need

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

I. Disadvantaged Communities

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

J. Program Preferences

Discuss the proposed project elements that meet the Program Preferences identified in Section II.E.

K. Statewide Priorities

Discuss the proposed project elements that meet the Statewide Priorities identified in Section II.F.

L. Environmental Compliance

The proposal must include a plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements including any CEQA or, if applicable, NEPA obligations. The proposal should also address compliance with local, county, State, and federal permitting requirements. Appendix E provides web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook.

C.2. Evaluation Criteria – for the IRWM Implementation Grants, Step 1

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

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

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

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Regional Description *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described the IRWM Plan region, and whether the defined region is appropriate to the planning and implementation.* Was a map or maps, with accompanying descriptive narrative, showing the region encompassed by the IRWM Plan provided? Did the map/maps include appropriate internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region? Did the IRWM Plan describe the current and future water resources of the region? Did the applicant explain why the region is an appropriate area for regional water management? Did the applicant describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region? Did the applicant describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon? Were important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries discussed? Did the IRWM Plan discuss the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values; and describe economic conditions and important trends within the region?	1	5
Objectives *In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described appropriate IRWM Plan objectives.* Did the IRWM Plan identify regional planning objectives and the manner in which they were determined? Does the IRWM Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region covered by the Plan?	1	5
Water Management Strategies & Integration *In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on how well the IRWM Plan integrates a wide range of water management strategies.* Did the IRWM Plan describe the range of water management strategies that were considered to meet the objectives of the plan? Was a brief discussion of why a water management strategy was not applicable provided? Did the applicant discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives? Was a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies provided?	1	5
Regional Priorities *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan has adequately described the priorities of the region.* Was a presentation of regional priorities for implementation provided? Did the applicant identify short-term and long-term implementation priorities? Does the IRWM Plan discuss how: 1) decision-making will be responsive to regional changes; 2) responses to implementation of projects will be assessed; and 3) project sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses?	1	5
Implementation *Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is implementable and implementation steps are well documented.* Does the IRWM Plan identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented? Did the IRWM Plan include timelines for active or planned projects? Did the applicant identify the entities responsible for project implementation? Were the linkages or interdependence between projects clearly identified? Was the economic and technical feasibility of projects demonstrated on a programmatic level? Was the current status of each element of the IRWM Plan presented? Was the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation discussed?	1	5

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

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination *Scoring will be based on whether development and implementation of the IRWM Plan includes stakeholder involvement through a collaborative regional process* Does the IRWM Plan identify stakeholders and the process used for inclusion of stakeholders in development of the plan? Does the process include a discussion of how: o Stakeholders are identified, o They participate in planning and implementation efforts, and o They can influence decisions made regarding water management? Did the IRWM Plan document public outreach activities specific to individual stakeholder groups? Does the IRWM Plan include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during plan implementation? Are partnerships developed during the planning process discussed? Did the application discuss environmental justice concerns? Did the application discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process? Were any possible obstacles to IRWM Plan implementation identified? Was coordination with State or federal agencies discussed? Did the IRWM Plan identify areas where a State agency or agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of plan components or processes, or identify any state or federal regulatory actions required for implementation?	1	5
Adequacy of Proposal		
Funding Match *This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that it will meet the minimum funding match standard.* Did the applicant propose a minimum Funding Match of 10% of the total proposal costs?	Pass/Fail	
Description of Proposal *Scoring will be based on whether the proposal is consistent with the IRWM Plan and how well the proposal serves to implement the IRWM Plan and achieve its objectives.* Did the application include a detailed description of the proposal for which funding is requested? Does the proposal consist of one or more of the eligible water management element (Section III.C)? Were the goals and objectives of the proposal identified? Did the application discuss how the proposal is consistent with the IRWM Plan? For proposed IRWM Plans, did the applicant also discuss how the proposed project(s) fit into achieving the IRWM Plan objectives? Was the rationale for the proposal sufficient to understand its relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan? Does the proposal include a plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements? For proposals affecting water quality, does the proposal include: o A description of the water body that the project(s) addresses and corresponding beneficial uses; o A discussion of water quality problems the project(s) addresses including specific pollutants or parameters and the importance of addressing the specific water quality problem relative to the overall health of the region; o A description of how the proposed project(s) is consistent with the applicable RWQCB Watershed Management Initiative Chapter, plans, and policies; and o For NPS pollution control projects, a description of which Management Measures will be applied?	3	15
Cost Estimate *Scoring will be based on whether the costs of the proposed project(s) are well presented and reasonable* Did the applicant provide a reasonable estimate of costs for each project contained in the proposal? Did the estimate show land costs, planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match?	1	5

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Schedule *Scoring will be based on the reasonableness of the proposed schedule.* Did the applicant provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing of the implementation of the proposal? Did the applicant demonstrate that related elements of the IRWM Plan, not proposed for funding, will be completed on schedule?	1	5
Project Prioritization *Scoring will be based on the extent to which the proposal implements the highest priorities of the region.* Did the application provide a prioritization of the project(s) within the region and within the proposal itself? Does the proposal include high priority projects or activities of the Plan? Was the prioritization of the proposed project(s), activities, and facilities sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan?	2	10
Need *Scoring will be based on the degree of need for the proposed project(s).* Did the applicant describe the current water management systems and the expected long-term regional water management needs? Did the applicant describe how the proposal will help meet that need? Were local and regional economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts conditions discussed relative to the need for the proposed project(s)? What are the there critical negative impacts that would result from not completing the projects?	2	10
Disadvantaged Communities *Scoring will be based on the degree that disadvantaged communities will benefit from the proposed project(s).* How much direct benefit does the proposal provide to disadvantaged communities?	2	10
Program Preferences *Scoring will be based on the extent that the proposed project(s) meet the specified Program Preferences.* How do the proposed project elements meet the IRWM Grant Program Preferences identified in Section II.E?	1	5
Total Possible Points		120

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

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

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

The application must be submitted by regional agencies **or** regional water management groups which are an eligible grant recipient, i.e., a public agency or non-profit organization. The proposal must include projects from one or more of the water management elements listed in Section III.C.

A. Proposal Title, Administrative Information, Summary, and Documentation

The applicant must provide the proposal title, the agency or organization responsible for the each component project, and their relationship to the IRWM regional planning agency or group. The applicant must provide administrative information which includes, but is not limited to the following: agency/organization name; address; authorized representative name and phone number; location of each project included in the proposal, including longitude and latitude; agency/organization for each project proponent for which funding has been requested; and State legislative representatives within the region. The Proposal Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

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

B. Applicant Authority

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

C. Work Plan

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

Based on the goals and objectives of the proposal, a description of all work that will be necessary to complete the project or suite of projects must be included in this section. The work plan should include a description of work items to be performed under each task and work item submittals for assessing progress and accomplishments. The description should include as much detail as possible, and explain all work items necessary to complete the proposal and how the applicant will coordinate with the granting agency. The work plan should discuss whether the proposal assists in meeting Statewide Priorities, as identified in Section II.F.

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

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

D. Budget

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

- Land costs, planning and design costs, environmental compliance and documentation costs, construction costs shown by project task, or phase, and the contingency amount for the proposal;
- All sources of the funding match;

- The amount of funding match applied to each task; and
- Work items that are completely supported by funding match.

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

E. Schedule

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

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

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

F. Funding Match

Applicants must identify minimum funding match of at least 10 percent for the total proposal costs. The requirement for funding match may be waived or reduced for those applicants that demonstrate that the proposal will provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities.

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

G. Disadvantaged Communities

Applicants requesting waiver or reduction of the funding match requirements for disadvantaged communities must demonstrate that the proposal will be designed to provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities. The PSP will provide information on the procedures to be used for applicants to receive credit for providing benefits to disadvantaged communities.

H. Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

Applicants will be required to provide an economic analysis of their proposal, including an enumeration of the costs of implementation or construction and operation of the proposed project(s), as well as, the benefits related to water supply and water quality derived directly from the proposal. The economic benefits may be quantified in monetary terms and when economic values cannot be assigned to the benefit the applicants should quantify the benefits in physical terms. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements of the economic analysis – water supply and water quality.

I. Other Expected Benefits

Applicants will be required to describe other expected benefits derived directly from the proposal that are not accounted for in the Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality, above. For example, the applicants must describe benefits such as flood control, habitat restoration, ecosystem improvements, fish and wildlife enhancement, in-stream flows, or other environmental benefits; recreation and public access; or energy use and cost. When economic values cannot be assigned to another expected project benefit, the benefits should be quantified in physical terms to the extent possible. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements for documenting the other expected benefits.

Note that commitment to providing the other expected benefits will become a term of the grant agreement if the proposal is selected for funding.

J. Scientific and Technical Merit

The applicant will be required to demonstrate the scientific and technical merit of the proposal. Such demonstration **may** include:

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

K. Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

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

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

L. Program Preferences

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

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

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

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

Criteria	Weighting Factor	Maximum Score
Work Plan *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal.*	3	15
Budget *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the proposal.*	1	5
Schedule *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the proposal and on the readiness to proceed with the proposal.*	1	5
Funding Match *The criterion will be scored on a sliding scale based upon the percent of funding match to total proposal costs.*	1	5
Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits *Scoring will be based on the economic benefits of the proposal. The scores will be assigned relative to all other proposals.*	3	15
Other Expected Benefits *Scoring will be based on the certainty that the proposal will provide the benefits claimed as well as the magnitude and breadth of the other expected benefits.*	2	10
Scientific and Technical Merit *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal has scientific and technical merit.*	3	15
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures *Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented an adequate monitoring and assessment program that included performance measures.*	1	5
Program Preferences *Scoring will be based on whether the proposal meets one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program preferences.*	1	5
Total Possible Points		80

APPENDIX D
DEFINITIONS

Adopted IRWM Plan – means an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan that has been formally accepted, as evidenced by a resolution or other written documentation, by:

- The governing body of the regional agency authorized to develop the Plan and has responsibility for implementation of the Plan, **or**
- The governing bodies of the agencies and organizations that participated in the development of the Plan and have responsibility for implementation of the Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

Critical Coastal Areas Program – means an innovative program, required by California's Non-point Source Plan to foster collaboration among local stakeholders and government agencies, to better coordinate resources and focus efforts on coastal-zone watershed areas in critical need of protection from polluted runoff.

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

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

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

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

Impaired Water Body – mean surface waters identified by the RWQCB as impaired because water quality objectives are not being achieved or where the designated beneficial uses are not fully protected after

application of technology-based controls. A list of impaired water bodies is compiled by the SWRCB pursuant to § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

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

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

Non-point Source Pollution Plan (NPS Plan) – means a SWRCB-adopted plan developed in collaboration with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) and the California Coastal Commission to meet the requirements of Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 and Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. The Plan addresses California's NPS pollution by assessing the State's NPS pollution problems/causes and implementing management programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regional Water Management Group – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a group in which, at a minimum, includes three or more local public agencies, at least two of which have statutory authority over water management, which may include but is not limited to water supply, water quality, flood control, or storm water management, participate by means of a joint powers agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other written agreement, as appropriate, that is approved by the governing bodies of those local public agencies (CWC § 10537). Other public agencies or community-based organizations may also be members of a Regional Water Management Group.

Reimbursable Costs – means costs that may be funded under Proposition 50. Reimbursable costs include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement, legal fees, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, and project implementation. Costs that are <u>not reimbursable with</u> grant funding include, but are not limited to:

a. Costs, other than those noted above, incurred prior to effective data of a grant agreement with the State;

b. Operation and maintenance costs, including post construction project performance and monitoring costs;

c. Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project;

d. Establishing a reserve fund;

e. Purchase of water supplies;

f. Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs;

g. Support of existing agency requirements and mandates;

h. Purchase of land in excess of the minimum required acreage necessary to operate as an integral part of the project, as set forth and detailed by engineering and feasibility studies, or land purchased prior to effective date of a grant agreement with the State; and

i. Payment of principal or interest of existing indebtedness or any interest payments unless the debt is incurred after effective date of a grant agreement with the State, the granting agency agrees in writing to the eligibility of the costs for reimbursement before the debt is incurred, and the purposes for which the debt is incurred are otherwise reimbursable project costs.

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

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

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

303d List – refers to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) that requires each state to periodically submit to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a list of impaired waters. Impaired waters are those that are not meeting the state's water quality standards. Once the impaired waters are identified and placed on the list, Section 303(d) requires that the states establish total daily maximum loads that will meet water quality standards for each listed water.

Total Maximum Daily Load – is generally a means for recommending controls needed to meet water quality standards for a particular water body. Establishing a Total Maximum Daily Load is an important step in watershed protection because it sets quantified goals for water quality that may then determine what actions are needed to restore or protect the health of the water body. More specifically, a Total Maximum Daily Load identifies the maximum quantity of a particular pollutant that can be discharged into a water body without violating a water quality standard, and allocates allowable loading amounts among the identified pollutant sources.

Urban Water Supplier – means a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, that provides water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-fee of water annually (CWC § 10617).

APPENDIX E
USEFUL WEB LINKS

RWQCB Program Priorities/Watershed Management Initiative Chapters

Region 1:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/programs/watermanageinit.html
Region 2:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/2004grants.doc
Region 3:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/WMI/WMI 2002, Final Document, Revised 1-22-02.pdf
Region 4:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/html/fundings.html
Region 5:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/available_documents/watershed/R5_WMI_chapter.html
Region 6:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/WMI/WMI_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/wmi.html
Region 8:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/html/wmi.html
Region 9:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/units/grants/wmchT15trgtproj103.PDF
	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/wmc.html

Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans)

Region 1:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/programs/basinplan/basin.html
Region 2:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/basinplan.htm
Region 3:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/BasinPlan/Index.htm
Region 4:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/html/meetings/tmdl/Basin_plan/basin_plan.html
Region 5:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/available_documents/index.html#anchor616381
Region 6:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/BPlan/BPlan_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/documents/RB7Plan.pdf
Region 8:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/html/basin_plan.html
Region 9:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/basinplan.html

SWRCB Program Priorities:

303d List:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/docs/2002_cwa_section_303d_list_wqls_020403.pdf
TMDL List:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/docs/tmdllist.doc
NPS Program:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/protecting.html
NPS Plan:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/5yrplan.html
Critical Coastal Areas Program:	http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-nps.html
Watershed Action Plan Outline	http://www/coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-plan-outline.pdf
California's Ocean Plan:	http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/plnspols/oplans/index.html
USEPA Watershed Plan Elements:	http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/Section 319/319guide03.html

SWRCB Statewide Data Management Programs

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

DWR

Home Page	http://www.water.ca.gov/
Division of Planning & Local Assistance	http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov
Northern District	http://wwwdpla.water.ca.gov/nd
Central District	http://wwwdpla.water.ca.gov/cd
San Joaquin District	http://www.sjd.water.ca.gov/
Southern District	http://wwwdpla.water.ca.gov/sd
Grants & Loans	http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/
Water Use and Planning	http://www.water.ca.gov/nav.cfm?topic=Water_Use_and_Planning
Bulletin 118 California's Groundwater	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov/bulletin118
Groundwater Information Center	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov
Floodplain Management Task Force	http://fpmtaskforce.water.ca.gov/
Desalination Task Force	http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/desal/desal.cfm
Recycling Task Force	http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/index.cfm

CEQA Information

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

CALFED Bay-Delta Program

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

California Watershed Portal

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

Department of Industrial Relations

http://www.dir.ca.gov/lcp.asp