



San Luis Obispo County Region
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)
Regional Water Management Group (RWMG)

Date: February 6, 2019
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: SLO City Council Chambers
990 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA

- 1) Introduction, Public Comment and Member Updates
- 2) Stormwater Resources Plan Update
- 3) 2019 IRWM Plan and Program Updates
- 4) Prop 1, Round 1 Grant – Project Selection Process
 - a) DWR Schedule and Funding
 - b) RWMG Selection Process
 - c) Consider forming an RWMG Working Group to review submitted project scores and prepare a funding recommendation for the RWMG to consider at an upcoming meeting.

The Draft Project Solicitation Package (PSP) can be viewed and downloaded from DWR:
<https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs/Proposition-1/Implementation-Grants>

NOTICE: All IRWM notices will be emailed only by the online mailing list service. Please sign-up for the IRWM Stakeholder mailing list online at
<http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm>

UPCOMING RWMG MEETINGS:

1. Wednesday **March 13, 2019** at 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
SLO City/County Library Community Room, 995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA
2. Wednesday **April 3, 2019** at 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
SLO City/County Library Community Room, 995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo CA

For more information, please contact
Brendan Clark, County of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department
bclark@co.slo.ca.us
(805) 788-2316
www.slocountywater.org/irwm



San Luis Obispo County Region
 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)
slocountywater.org/irwm

2019 RWMG SCHEDULE

IRWM Plan Adoption and Prop 1 Grant Application

The following meetings, workshops, and actions are scheduled to achieve adoption of the 2019 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan and respond to Proposition 1 IRWM grant opportunities for San Luis Obispo (SLO) County.

For notices via e-mail, please sign up for the IRWM Stakeholder Mailing List online at <http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm>

Date	Activity	Location	Key Actions
2018			
January 2, 2019	No RWMG Meeting		
February 6	RWMG Meeting	SLO City Council Chambers	<i>Prop 1 Grant Project Selection Process</i>
March 13**	RWMG Meeting (if necessary)	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>Prop 1 Grant Project Selection</i>
April 3	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>Plan, Program and Grant Updates</i>
May 1	RWMG Meeting	SLO City Council Chambers	<i>TBD</i>
June 5	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>TBD</i>
July 3	No RWMG Meeting scheduled at this time		
August 7	No RWMG Meeting scheduled at this time		
Mid 2019	IRWM Plan Adoption by RWMG Members due		
Mid 2019	Round 1 Grant Applications Due to DWR.		

**Note date is the 2nd Wednesday of the month.

RWMG = Regional Water Management Group

WRAC = Water Resources Advisory Committee

SLO City/County Library Community Room is located at 995 Palm Street in San Luis Obispo, CA

SLO City Council Chambers is located at 990 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

County of SLO Board of Supervisors Chambers is located at 1055 Monterey Street in San Luis Obispo, CA

University of California Coop. Ex. Auditorium is located at 2156 Sierra Way, Suite C, in San Luis Obispo, CA



Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant, Round 1 Key Facts/Dates

Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule	
Draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for Public Comment	October 2018
Draft PSP Public Comment Period Closes	November 20, 2018
DWR Releases Final PSP	February 2019
Funding Area Pre-Application Workshop	<i>Est. May / June 2019*</i>
Round 1 Grant Applications Due to DWR ³	<i>Est. September 2019*</i>
Round 1 Grant Awards	<i>Est. November 2019*</i>
Round 1 Agreements Finalized	<i>Est. March 2020*</i>
Round 2 Grant Solicitation Process Begins	2020

<https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs/Proposition-1>

* Note: these are the best estimated times for our Funding Area's workshop, application and award.

Funding Available:

- DWR proposes 50% of general implementation funds and 35% of DAC implementation
- This amounts to ~\$3.1 million for our region, based on the MOA with Funding Area partners.

Grant Award Timing (mid to late 2019):

- Application submittal dates vary by Funding Area.
- Expected application due date is Sept. 2019.

Local Cost Share:

- 50% of total proposal cost being paid by for with non-State funds.
- Costs incurred after January 1st, 2015 can be used for local cost share
- Waived or partially reduced for projects/proposals that directly benefits DACs

Reimbursement Eligibility:

- The "funding award date" as the date reimbursements will start.
- For the Central Coast Funding Area, this roughly points to Nov. 2019.

Agreement Requirements:

- CEQA and Construction permits must be complete by the Agreement, est. March 2020.
 - If not, project will be dropped from the application by DWR.
 - This may be waived for DACs.

TO: IRWM Regional Water Management Group
 FROM: Brendan Clark, Water Resources Engineer
 DATE: February 1, 2019
 SUBJECT: Item #4: Prop 1, Round 1 Grant – Project Selection Process

Recommendations

1. Consider forming an RWMG Working Group to review submitted project scores and prepare funding recommendation for the RWMG to consider at an upcoming meeting

Discussion

1. DWR Application Process and Timing
2. Funding Available for Round 1
3. RWMG Process for Selecting Projects

1. DWR Application Process

DWR has presented a complete overhaul to the application process compared to previous grant solicitations. Rather than having each project sponsor create their own application, DWR has provided a standardized, fillable form for project sponsors to populate. Additionally, prior to submitting the final form, each project sponsor will present their project to DWR and other State agencies. These presentations will take place at the Funding Area level. So, over a one to two-day period, the 6 regions in our funding area will present our proposed projects to DWR for feedback regarding the project. Essentially, we will know with a level of confidence if the selected projects would be supported by DWR, prior to submitting the final application.

2. Funding Available for Round 1

The total funding available to our Region is summarized below, based on the Draft Grant PSP provided by DWR and the MOA between the Central Coast Funding Area IRWM regions. DWR anticipates awarding 50% of the available Implementation funds, as well as up to 35% of the DAC-specific Implementation funds. DWR's intention of holding back 65% of the DAC-specific funds for future rounds is for the planning work related to the Needs Assessments and DAC-Involvement Grant projects to be completed prior to awarding the majority of Implementation funds. Of course, the funds set aside for DAC Implementation is only a minimum.

	Total Prop 1 Funds (per MOA)	Available for Round 1 (per DWR)	Available for Round 1	Available for Round 2
DAC Involvement (2017)	\$ 938,570	n/a	n/a	n/a
DAC Implementation (future)	\$ 774,099	35%	\$ 270,934	\$ 503,165
Planning Grant (2017)	\$ 204,183	n/a	n/a	n/a
Implementation Grants (future)	\$ 5,790,160	50%	\$ 2,895,080	\$ 2,895,080
Total for SLO Region (Per MOA)	\$ 7,707,012		\$ 3,166,014	\$ 3,398,245

3. RWMG Process for Selecting Projects

In general, the RWMG process for this opportunity will mirror what was used for the 2015 Prop 84 IRWM Implementation grant opportunity. This is a competitive process based on project merit and project sponsor's eligibility. Projects will be evaluated against DWR's provided scoring sheets to maximize potential for approval from DWR. The eligibility criteria provided in the Draft Project Solicitation Package is included as an attachment to this report.

DWR's scoring is both an evaluation of project merit and of application completeness. As with the 2015 grant selection process, not all scoring criteria that DWR is using will be used to generate our Region's list. Our selection process will focus only on the merit-based criteria and assumes a complete application will be provided. For example, our local selection process will not score a submitted project for #7 of DWR's scoring criteria "*Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified?*". But, for example, projects will be evaluated for if they address contaminants listed in AB 1249 (Nitrate, Nitrite, chromium, etc.). The DWR project scoring sheet from the Draft PSP is attached, and the highlighted criteria are what local projects will be scored against.

Proposed schedule for SLO Region project selection:

1. 2/15 to 3/8, Project solicitation – 3 weeks – project sponsors will submit information to verify eligibility and project merit to DWR's scoring criteria.
2. 3/11 to 3/18, Project evaluation – 1 week – a staff-level team will review submitted materials and score projects.
3. 3/18 to 3/25, RWMG Working Group – 1 week – an RWMG Working Group will meet, possibly multiple times, to review the scoring and prepare a funding recommendation to the RWMG.
4. 4/3, Regular RWMG Meeting. The RWMG Working Group recommended projects and funding will be presented to the RWMG for consideration as the region's Prop 1, Round 1 IRWM Implementation Grant suite of projects.
5. 4/3, Regular WRAC Meeting. Assuming the RWMG approves a project and funding package for submittal, this will be presented to the WRAC for affirmation and support to an eventual Board of Supervisors vote.

With an expected timing of the funding area presentation to DWR being end of May or early June, this allows approximately 8 weeks for project proponents to:

- Provide all eligibility paperwork
- Complete the DWR Project Information Form
 - Required to be submitted to DWR 2 weeks prior to the funding area presentation
- Prepare for the funding area presentation
 - Note, until told otherwise, this presentation is expected to be held outside of San Luis Obispo County (i.e. Moss Landing in Monterey County).

In the event a project needs to be removed or replaced from the application, we will have the flexibility to do so at the May 1st meeting, though it is not recommended given the time constraints for preparing for the funding area presentation and meeting DWR's timeline for pre-presentation submittals.

Following funding area presentations, DWR will provide information as to whether they will support the project suite as-is or if they would like to see something else. Given this is a new

method for evaluating projects and providing input, the RWMG will need to remain flexible to respond to what kind of feedback DWR will provide.

Staff-Level Review Team

The 2015 Prop 84 Implementation grant process included County staff and a consultant team to evaluate and score projects. For this Prop 1 solicitation, a staff level review team will be assembled to score projects and verify eligibility. This team is intended to be staff members from the County as well as staff level members from other member agencies/organizations who are not submitting proposals for this grant funding round.

RWMG Working Group

An RWMG Working is recommended for consideration to review submitted project scores from the staff-level review team and prepare a funding recommendation for the RWMG to consider at an upcoming meeting. Participants of this Working Group will need to be available the week of March 18th. At a minimum, an RWMG Working Group is intended to include representation from each the North Coast, North County, and South County.

**TABLE 1
IRWM Implementation Grant Eligibility Checklist**

Criteria Type	Eligibility Criteria	Required Documentation	Additional Details	Attachment	Criteria Met (Yes, No, or NA)
Applicant Eligibility	Has the IRWM region been accepted into the IRWM Grant Program through the Region Acceptance Process?	None. DWR to verify.	2018 Guidelines Section II.B.	NA	
	Did applicant participate in Funding Area Pre-Application Workshop?	None. DWR to verify.	PSP Section V.A.1	NA	
	Has the region submitted an IRWM plan that meets 2016 standards to DWR for review prior to application submittal?	Provide proof (i.e., email confirmation) that plan has been submitted to DWR for review, including date of submission. DWR will also verify.	PSP Section V.A.2 & Section V.B.3	NA	
	Is the applicant an Eligible Applicant for Proposition 1 funding?	Written statement describing how the applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant, legal authorities, agreements between applicant and local project sponsors, etc. (Specific requirements vary based on eligible applicant type.)	2018 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Urban Water Management Compliance ¹⁾	Agency name and contact information DWR verification documentation for Urban Water Management Plans DWR verification for validated water loss audit report(s) Water meter self-certification, if applicable	2018 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Agricultural Water Management Compliance ¹⁾	Agency name and contact information DWR verification documentation for Agricultural Water Management Plan Enhanced Watershed Management Plan documentation as required Farm-gate delivery documentation, if applicable	2018 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Surface Water Diverter Compliance ¹⁾	Agency name and contact information SWRCB verification documentation	2018 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	
	Groundwater Management Compliance ¹⁾	Agency name and contact information Self-certification regarding Groundwater Management Plans OR Statement if no projects affect groundwater	2018 Guidelines Section II.B. & PSP Section V.B.3	1	

	CASGEM Compliance ¹⁾	Agency Name and contact information Service area boundary, including GIS Shape file Groundwater Basin Name, Number, and listed priority Name of Monitoring Entity (ME) OR If no ME, indicate whether applicant is an eligible ME	2018 Guidelines, Section II.B. & PSP, Section V.B.3	1	
Local Project Sponsor Eligibility	Does each Local Project Sponsor meet all applicant eligibility requirements (as applicable)?	Each Local Project Sponsor must meet the same eligibility requirements as the applicant.	See specific requirements above	1	Utilize same checklist as above for each LPS
Proposal Eligibility	Only one application per IRWM region	DWR to Verify.	PSP Section II.A	NA	
	Does the proposal respond to Climate Change?	Indicate which project(s) in proposal respond to Climate Change	2018 Guidelines Section II.C. & PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	2	
	Does the proposal contribute to regional water self-reliance?	Indicate which project(s) in proposal contribute to regional water self-reliance OR Provide explanation why the proposal does not need to contribute to regional water self-reliance	2018 Guidelines Section II.C. & PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	2	
	For regions where nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination (AB 1249 contaminants) has been identified, does the proposal include a project(s) to address contamination?	Indicate which projects in proposal address AB 1249 contaminants OR Provide explanation why the proposal does not include that kind of project(s)	2018 Guidelines, Section II.B	2	
Project Eligibility	Is Project an Eligible Project Type?	Applicant to complete Question A.8 of PIF, Attachment 3	2018 Guidelines, Section II.C & PSP Section II.B	3	
	Does the project meet the critical needs of the region?	Applicant to complete Question B.2 of PIF, Attachment 3	PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	3	
	Does the project have a useful life of at least 15 years?	Applicant to complete Question B.3 of PIF, Attachment 3	PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	3	
	Is the project consistent with Statewide Priorities?	Applicant to complete Question B.6 of PIF, Attachment 3	PSP Section II.C, Exhibit A	3	
	If the project is a stormwater and/or dry weather runoff capture project, is it included in a Stormwater Resource Plan that has been incorporated into an IRWM plan?	Applicant to provide documentation that the project is included in a Stormwater Resource Plan that has been incorporated into the IRWM Plan.	2018 Guidelines Section II.B, Section II.C & PSP Section V.B.3	Add doc to Att 3	
	If the project affects Groundwater, does the project have the support of the local Groundwater Sustainability Agency?	Applicant to provide documentation that the project has support from the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA).	2018 Guidelines Section II.B, PSP Section V.B.3	Add doc to Att 3	
Post Funding Award Eligibility/	Is each project included in an IRWM Plan that is consistent with the 2016 IRWM Plan Standards?	DWR to verify prior to execution of Agreement.	2018 Guidelines Section II.B & PSP Section II.B, Section VIII	NA	

Agreement Requirements	Has the IRWM Plan been deemed consistent with the 2016 IRWM Plan Standards by DWR?	DWR to verify prior to execution of Agreement.	2018 Guidelines Section II.B & PSP Section VIII	NA	
	Have grantee and all Local Project Sponsors adopted the IRWM plan?	DWR to verify prior to execution of Agreement.	2018 Guidelines Section II.B; PSP Section VIII	NA	
	Has CEQA been completed and all permits necessary to begin construction acquired within 6 months of Final Award, and prior to agreement execution?	Provide documentation if complete. Otherwise, requirement shall be met before execution of agreement.	PSP Section VIII, Exhibit A	NA	

NOTES

1) Eligibility Criteria compliance required only if applicable to the Grantee or Local Project Sponsor.

Table 4 – Scoring Criteria

SCORING CRITERIA – PROPOSAL LEVEL				
		Leg Citation (CA Water Code)	Form/ Question No.	Max Points
1	How does the proposal support the intent of IRWM? Is coordination and/or collaboration within and between agencies, regions, and/or Funding Areas discussed? Are any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized discussed?	10531; 79741(b)	Proposal Summary, Question 7	3
2	If the IRWM region has been identified as an area where contaminants listed in AB 1249 exist, does the proposal include projects that address the contaminant(s)? (Full points if N/A)	10541(e)(14)	PIF Section D.5	1
3	Does the proposal include one or more projects that provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	106.3 (AB 685)	PIF Section D.6	1
Maximum Possible Proposal Score				5
SCORING CRITERIA – PROJECT LEVEL				
		Leg Citation	Project Information Form Question No.	Max Points
Meeting Needs of the Region/Nexus to IRWM Plan				
4	Does the project address a critical water resource related needs and priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	79707(a)	B.2	1
5	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1? Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.? Did the narrative include other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits?	NA	D.1	3
6	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	79741(a); 79742(e)	B.4	2
Work Plan, Budget, Schedule, and Grant Agreement Readiness				
7	Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified?	NA	C.1.a	3
8	Collectively, are the workplan, schedule, and budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other? Considerations include (one point each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the <u>project description</u> clearly and concisely address all required topics, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project? Are the tasks shown in the <u>Workplan, Schedule and Budget</u> consistent? Are the costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> backed up by and consistent with supporting justification/documentation? Is the <u>schedule</u> reasonable considering the tasks presented in the workplan? 	NA	C	4
9	Does the applicant have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project; and if not, did the applicant provide a clear and concise narrative / schedule to obtain the necessary access? (Full points if N/A)	NA	D.10	1
Project Benefits and Program Preferences				
10	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or Local fund resources above and beyond cost share requirements? If additional cost share is not provided, did the applicant provide describe attempts to use other funding sources and justify why it was not included.	79707(b)	C.2	1
11	For each of the anticipated physical benefit(s) claimed, described, and quantified in Table 4 of the Project Information Form? Is each benefit claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan?	NA	D.2	2
12	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	NA	D.2	1
13	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	79742(a)	D.3	1
14	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB 1249, does the project benefit a small disadvantaged community?	10545	D.5	1
15	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	79707(e)	D.7	1
Cost Considerations				
16	Did the applicant provide a narrative on cost considerations that is fully explained based on information requested in the Project Information Form?	NA	D.4	2
Maximum Possible Individual Project Score				23
Average Project Score				
			Average Project Score	23
(Sum of Individual Project Scores/# of Projects; rounded to nearest whole number)				
Total Application Score				Maximum Possible Score
				5
Enter Proposal Score				5
Enter Average Project Score				23
Bonus Point: At the time of original submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?				1
Total Application Score (Sum Above Two Rows)				29