



Project Comments

Commenting Agency:	City of Anaheim
Comment Contact:	Rick Shintaku
Comments for Project ID:	1026 (City of Anaheim)

-General

The regional and long-term benefit of this project should be considered when ranking this project. The project is intended to serve as an educational showpiece increasing public awareness and support for development of local drought-proof water supplies, rainwater harvesting, and water conservation which are necessary for the region's sustainable growth. The project objectives are:

- Showcase development of a new and reliable, drought-proof water supply.
- Provide an educational facility benefiting the whole region.
- Allow the public to interact/view the process.
- Encourage inclusion of dual plumbing in future developments for use of recycled water.

The regional benefits arising from these objectives should be factored in when ranking the project based on the indicators such as cost effectiveness and water supply benefits.

-Water Supply

The project creates a new source of water supply for the region by producing recycled water from treatment of local sewage flows.

-The project should also be given a higher weighting factor when evaluating its water supply benefits. The water supply benefit of the project goes beyond the quantity of its water supply. As stated earlier, the project is intended to increase public awareness and support for development of local drought-proof water supplies, rainwater harvesting, and water conservation which are necessary for the region's sustainable growth.

-Project Readiness

Anaheim is currently bidding the project for construction and anticipates starting the construction in January 2011. The project is expected to go on-line in the beginning of calendar year 2012.

-Cost Match

Anaheim initially requested a 20 percent grant award match for the project. However, in consideration of the amount of Prop 84 funding available for the OWOW projects, Anaheim has revised its grant funding request to up to \$800,000 or 10 percent of the total project cost.

-Cost Effectiveness

When reviewing the return on investment solely based on the unit cost of water, the project will rank low when compared to large-scaled water supply projects. Considering that this project is a demonstration project with the goal of promoting water recycling and the public's acceptance of this new water source to supplement existing water conservation efforts; its overall and regional benefits should be considered and ranked higher.

-The major benefits of this project are increasing public awareness and support for development of local drought-proof water supplies, rainwater harvesting (i.e., roof runoff collection/reuse system, pervious pavement), and landscape water use efficiency measures (i.e. weather-based controllers, water efficient nozzles, drought-tolerant landscaping, etc.), which are necessary for the region's sustainable growth.

The project will provide state and regional long-term benefits from developing recycled water supplies utilizing the smaller-scale MBR treatment technology, such as:

- Providing less disruption to existing land uses and to the public; and
- Reducing capital and energy costs by minimizing distribution piping and the distance of transporting water to and from the treatment facility.

Water Quality and Salt Management (Stormwater Captured)

As a result of implementing this project, mitigation measures have been developed to capture and recharge a least 110 acre-feet per year of stormwater. This will occur at various locations within the City of Anaheim, and it is intended to mitigate the salinity impact of using recycled water for landscape irrigation. Therefore, the net effect would be a salt benefit to the Orange County groundwater basin. In the pre-application, we inadvertently left out this information.

Commenting Agency:	City of Anaheim
Comment Contact:	Rick Shintaku
Comments for Project ID:	1099 (City of Anaheim

Project Readiness

In the pre-application, we inadvertently left out the information on the Project Readiness/Status. The pipeline under consideration for this project is an existing pipeline, and Anaheim intends to purchase the pipeline assets and associated rights of way. Some design and construction efforts (valving, etc.) are needed to put the pipeline into service. Furthermore, CEQA requirements for the project should be very minimal. This could place the project beyond the construction stage and should qualify the project for the highest rank in terms of project readiness.

Cost Effectiveness

This project would provide a recycled water transmission backbone for the area and would correspondingly provide for the development of new recycled water projects spanning from West Orange County to Los Angeles County. The pipeline would facilitate the use of recycled water from both the GWRS system (year-round) and the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (seasonal surplus flows).

Commenting Agency:	City of Anaheim
Comment Contact:	Rick Shintaku
Comments for Project ID:	1045 (City of Anaheim)

Project Readiness

This ranking for this project should be re-evaluated based on the proposed project scope. The grant award request of \$100,000 will be used to conduct a feasibility study that will further evaluate the benefits of implementing this project. As demonstrated in the Cost Effectiveness and Partnerships scores, this project has the potential of meeting the additional goals of the OWOW process.

Water Quality and Salt Management (Stormwater Captured or Water Treated)

The project will provide a water quality and salt management benefit by: (1) treating brackish groundwater to the level suitable for irrigation and salt loading to the basin; and (2) creating constructed wetlands to capture dry "low-flow" urban runoff, as well as the first flush from storm events and treat the water, for reuse as irrigation and groundwater recharge. The total quantity of water treated is estimated at 570 acre-feet per year. This quality and its associated benefit ranking for Water Quality and Salt Management Benefit should be reflected in the project ranking spreadsheet.

Commenting Agency:	City of Anaheim
Comment Contact:	Kevin Miako
Comments for Project ID:	Overall Comments

We would like to suggest that consideration for funding under the current Prop 84 call for projects be given to projects in different categories—from the planning to construction.

The distribution of funding will support agency coordination/discussion strengthening the OWOW vision. By allocating a certain amount of money for each category it will ensure the following: the planning of future OWOW projects, the design/coordination of future OWOW projects, and will also guarantee that the Prop 84 objective of “shovel ready” projects is realized

Commenting Agency:	City of Fontana
Comment Contact:	Chuck Hayes
Comments for Project ID:	1167 (City of Fontana)

The City of Fontana's Recycled Water, Flood Control, and Aquifer Recharge Program Project consists of 3 phases. Phase 1 being a shovel ready recycled water construction project providing water supply benefits of nearly 2000 AFY with Phase 2 & 3 being planning projects that would enhance wter supply benefits estimated at 10,000 AFY. This project was originally ranked first of all 297 projects submitted during the first round of project consideration. The City presented the same project to the independent interview panel. After the panel completed its vetting process, the City's Project ranked 17th.

Upon inquiring with a member of the panel, Salvador Lopez, the city was advised that the revised scoring resulted from the city receiving no points for Phases 2&3 water supply enhancements. The city intends to use the requested funding with SRF and local funding to construct phase 1 and to develop Phases 2 and 3 so that they will be shovel ready projects when Prop 84, Round 2 funding is available.

The city requests that the Steering Committee reassesses the city's project scoring to include points for water supply benefits for Phases 2 & 3, since those benefits are consistent with OWOW goals and since other non-construction projects received funding (Project No. 1291 & 1016). The funding is essential to the city to implement the program.

We request the opportunity to address the Steering Committee on Sept. 30th, 2010.

Commenting Agency:	Inland Empire Resource Conservation District
Comment Contact:	Mandy Parkes
Comments for Project ID:	1049 (SBV Water Conservation District)

Earlier this year, the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District staff approached the Inland Empire Resource Conservation District staff in order to pursue a joint grant application for the One Water One Watershed Prop 84 funding program. We are excited to have been notified by the program's founder and manager, the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, that our project has been ranked 67 out of all submitted proposals. This ranking puts our project into the top 25% of all those in competition for OWOW grant monies, signifying its value to the watershed management goals of the region. To assist in future selection and implementation of our project, I am sending this letter to your agency to document our commitment to the \$10,000 in-kind match that our organization agreed to during the initial grant application process.

The IERCD is a local public agency with a long history of supporting a wide range of local restoration and non-native plant removal projects. In recent years, we have also begun work on a variety of mitigation projects assigned as a result of development-related impacts from construction projects. Typically, these impacts result in the requirement of habitat restoration, and the resulting mitigation assigned has ranged from preservation of open spaces to creation of wetland acreage. Our programs also incorporate environmental education components, including public outreach and education elements, designed to promote stewardship of natural resources and sustainability.

The OWOW Steering Committee will review the ranked projects on September 23rd and we feel our criteria ranking may merit higher ranking consideration. Some of the key reasons are our grant's high level of "project commitment" is reflected in the form of "availability of funds" through in-kind match and "readiness for implementation" (shovel ready status). This is based on the ranking criteria defined by the OWOW process that we hope will ensure that our rank can be upgraded during the final vetting process before September 30th.

Commenting Agency:	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Comment Contact:	LeAnne Hamilton
Comments for Project ID:	General

Suggests loop vetting process earlier so people have a better understanding of why the results came out the way they did.

Commenting Agency:	Irvine Ranch Water District
Comment Contact:	Paul D. Jones II
Comments for Project ID:	General Comments

This letter is regarding the recent discussions by the OWOW steering Committee to select projects for funding from the Round 1 funds from Proposition 84. At the Steering Committee meeting Sept. 23, SAWPA staff and consultants presented three ‘portfolios’ of projects to the Steering Committee and sought public input on the 3 options presented which will be decided by the Steering Committee at its Sept. 30 meeting. The 3 portfolios represent different ways to distribute the approximately \$12 M in Round 1 funding.

During public comment, the representative from IEUA suggested the Steering Committee select Portfolio 3 but modify it by reducing the limit on the grant funding for any project from \$1.2M to \$1M thereby expanding the number of projects to receive grant funds. This recommendation from IEUA is consistent with the views expressed by Steering Commissioners Krom and PonTell at the July 22nd Steering committee meeting. IRWD supports this modification which would provide \$1M in grant funds to help fund an important water supply project in the Central Orange County region, and the development and treatment of two domestic water wells that will:

- Produce approximately 6330 AF per year of a new potable water supply
- Reduce imported water supplies and Utilize local water supplies that are otherwise unusable
- Reduce dependence on imported water from the Bay-Delta
- Remove approximately 5590 tons of salt per year from the Orange County groundwater basin.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	Overall Comments

Please accept the following comments on the proposed OWOW projects within the Santa Ana River Watershed for consideration for funding under Proposition 84. We have reviewed the 25 projects that have been selected for interviews and request that these comments and questions be addressed as part of the interview process.

Overall Comments

In reviewing all the proposed projects we suggest the following three points be considered:

1. The benefits of each project should be evaluated on a consistent basis. The benefits claimed should be limited to those that are obtained through the construction of the proposed project, not related projects or future phases of the project that will not be constructed under the grant. Also, benefits accrued from completion of previous phases of the proposed projects should not be claimed.
2. Water supply benefits should be evaluated based on benefits to the entire Santa Ana River (SAR) watershed rather than benefits to the project area or sub-watershed. If a project in one part of the watershed increases the supply of water in the project area and as a result reduces the water supply in another part of the watershed, the project sponsor should claim only the net water supply benefit to the entire SAR watershed.
3. For projects that claim to reduce imported water usage in the project area and thereby reduce GHG emissions, the GHG emission reduction should be evaluated at the watershed scale; for example, if a project reduces the need to import water in the project area but reduces the supply of water available to another party in the watershed so that the affected party has to either increase its imported water supply or develop a new source of water, the GHG emissions reduction should be determined for the net change considering the project and other affected parties (this should be done at a minimum for the entire SAR watershed, if not for the entire state of CA).

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	General

The Orange County Water District Board of Directors adopted the following policy statement at its August 18, 2010, meeting, which was meant to reaffirm its support of the guiding policy principle of evaluating projects through the One Water One Watershed (OWOW) process on a watershed wide basis:

"The Orange County Water District supports collaboration among all stakeholders in the Santa Ana River (SAR) Watershed. Because of the large population in the watershed, natural resource values, and the inter-related nature of activities in watershed, it is vitally important that stakeholders work together to maximize water resources in an environmentally responsible manner. The District supports placing a high priority on developing additional water supplies for the watershed and collaboration among agencies in the watershed to maximize efficient use of water resources throughout the watershed. For proposed water resource projects that may affect the rate of flow in the Santa Ana River or its tributaries, the District supports evaluating the net impact of the project at the scale of the entire SAR Watershed. The goal should be to fund projects that increase the net water supplies of the watershed."

We would encourage that projects submitted for funding under the OWOW program be evaluated regarding their impact to the entire watershed.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	General

Thank you for your efforts to develop a fair and transparent process for evaluating and selecting projects within the Santa Ana Watershed for funding under Proposition 84. I understand the difficulties in executing the process amidst the uncertainties of the availability of state funds and the short timetables imposed upon your agency by deadlines set by DWR funding requirements.

Now that all the 297 potential projects have been submitted, ranked, and made available for public review, OCWD respectfully requests clarification of the selection process going forward. We understand that 25 projects were selected for further review based on ranking results as well as the OWOW Steering Committee's decision to consider only projects that are "shovel ready" and providing funding for only one project per agency. However, it is unclear what process will be followed once the review of the top 25 projects is complete. With the expectation that the scores for individual projects may change, OCWD requests that the following issues be further clarified as the process moves forward:

- Anticipating that project rankings will change based on information obtained through the interview process, does SAWPA intend to re-run the model and produce a new ranking list? If yes, will the entire list of 297 projects be re-run or only the original list of 25 top projects?
- If some projects fall off the top 25 list during the interview process, will they be replaced with new projects farther down on the list?
- How will comments from stakeholders on individual projects affect the decision-making process with the deadline of September 17 for submission of comments coming after completion of the top 25 project interviews?
- What is the process and schedule for determining proposed funding allocations for the selected projects? How and when will these decisions be made? Will the interview team provide a recommendation or will the OWOW Steering Committee review the interview results and determine the most appropriate funding levels on a project-by-project basis?
- How will the final project list be processed with the OWOW Steering Committee and the SAWPA Commission?

Thank you in advance for your response to these questions. Given the short schedule and the accelerated pace, it would be helpful to receive more frequent updates of the status of this process during the next few months, perhaps a weekly update posted on the website. Providing information to all stakeholders in a consistent manner will facilitate improved communication between SAWPA and the various stakeholders as the process unfolds.

We look forward to supporting your efforts to allocate Proposition 84 funds in the Santa Ana River Watershed in a manner aimed at maximizing the benefits to all.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1167 (City of Fontana)

#1 Project ID 1167 City of Fontana Flood Control and Aquifer Recharge Program

- Please clarify the description of the proposed project. If this project includes only Phase I of a larger project, the benefits of the project should include only those that are accomplished by implementing Phase I.
- Explain how the proposed project employs resource efficient land use practices and has positive impacts to natural hydrology as claimed in Section G.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1015 (City of Menifee)

#2 Project ID 1015 City of Menifee Detention Basins and Storm Drains

- Assuming that the proposed project is the first phase of a multi-phased project, please clarify whether the benefits claimed in the proposal are for the first phase or for all four phases? Will the parks, trails, and recreational facilities be constructed under this grant proposal?
- Please verify the claim of 62,300 tons/year of salt/contaminant removal as well as the benefits claimed in Section G.
- Please explain how the proposed project creates 108,761 construction jobs and 61,498 operational jobs.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1272 (Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority)

#4 Project ID 1272 SAWPA SARI Line Repairs

- Please explain the claim of desalination of 38,000 afy of water supply. If the construction of the desalter is not part of this construction project can the benefits of desalination be claimed?
- Please clarify that the claim of removal of 64,040 tons/year of salt/contamination is based solely on the increased capacity of the brineline.
- Clarify that repair and refurbishment projects meet the goals of the OWOW program.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1211 (OC Sanitation District)

#7 Project ID 1211 Orange County Sanitation District Sludge Dewatering, Odor Control, and Primary Sludge Thickening

- Please explain how this project results in the increase of recycled water by 78,400 afy and groundwater recharge of 78,400 afy.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1190 (SBC Flood Control District)

#9 Project ID 1190 San Bernardino County Flood Control District Cactus Basins

- Please clarify how this project achieves the stated goals of providing a reliable water supply, preserve and enhance the environment, ensure high water quality, and maintain quality of life?
- The stated benefits of this project include 15,000 afy new storage capacity and 15,000 afy recharge capacity. Does this mean that 100% of the water captured in the flood control basins will be recharged into the groundwater basin?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1047 (City of Costa Mesa)

#15 Project ID 1047 City of Costa Mesa Industrial Way Water Quality and Storm Drain Improvement Project

- Please verify the source(s) of the stormwater capture benefit of 355,468 afy.
- Please explain the City's claim of 100% of the project benefiting disadvantaged communities.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1082 (City of Corona)

#16 Project ID 1082 City of Corona Arlington Desalter Connection Project
Number 27-1208 and Western Municipal Water District Promenade Connection

- Explain how an interconnection project will achieve resource efficient land use such as LID, LEED or Ahwahnee Principles and how the 80% of the project will implement resource efficient land use.
- Please explain how the water conservation benefit of 11,202 afy and water transfer and operational efficiency of 11,202 afy were determined.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1166 (Costa Mesa Sanitary District)

#22 Project ID 1166 Costa Mesa Sanitary District Infiltration and Inflow Reduction Program

- Please verify the source(s) of information for the stormwater capture benefit of 355,468 afy.
- Please explain the District's claim of 100% of the project benefiting disadvantaged communities.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1291 (California Resource Connections, Inc.)

#24 Project ID 1291 California Resource Connections Place-Based GIS Land Use Design Tool to Protect Watershed Function in the Upper Santa Ana River Watershed

- Explain how a GIS design tool addresses environmental justice concerns and implements resource efficient land use
- Please verify the source(s) of information for the water conservation benefit of 7,087 afy.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1090 (USDA Forest Service – SB National Forest)

#28 Project ID 1090 USDA Forest Service San Bernardino National Forest
Ecological Restoration and Watershed Improvement

- Please provide contact names for the six listed project partners.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	983 (City of Huntington Beach)

#29 Project ID 983 City of Huntington Beach East Garden Grove Wintersburg Channel Urban Runoff Diversion Project Phase I

- Please explain the City's claim of water benefits including 500,000 afy of new source of water supply, non-point source and stormwater pollution reduction of 500,000 mgd, 1,120 afy of stormwater captured, water conservation of 560 afy and groundwater recharge of 560 afy.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1216 (Inland Empire Utilities Agency)

#43 Project ID 1216 IEUA Regional Water Budget Program

- Please explain the water supply energy estimate of 3,894,000 kWh/acre foot for this program.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1075 (SBV Municipal Water District)

#44 Project ID 1075 San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District Enhanced Stormwater Capture and Recharge along the Santa Ana River

- Are the benefits calculated limited to the actual projects that will be constructed under this grant request? Please provide a clear project description so that benefits claimed can be properly evaluated.
- Since this project is diverting and recharging flows from the Santa Ana River that are currently being used as water supplies downstream, the claim of benefit from new water supplies of 11,943 afy should be carefully reviewed. The new water supply estimate should be based on the net water supply benefit to the entire SAR watershed.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	943 (NLine Energy, Inc.)

#81 Project ID 943 NLine Energy Inc. In-Conduit Hydroelectric Project

- What is the plan to overcome the significant institutional/technical barriers identified in the project proposal?
- The project location is identified as all pipelines for all existing SAWPA member agencies. Have more specific locations been identified?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1288 (Shea/Baker Ranch, LLC.)

#89 Project ID 1288 Shea/Baker Ranch LLC Borrego Canyon Wash Bypass
Channel Improvements

- Does the state allow Prop. 84 funds to be granted to private entities?
- Can state grant funds be used to construct a project on private property?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	1227 (West Valley Water District)

#92 Project ID 1227 West Valley Water District Perchlorate Wellhead Treatment System Pipeline

- Requested funding is 100% of project cost. How will matching funds be secured and how will O&M be funded?
- What is the plan to overcome the significant institutional/technical barriers identified in the project proposal?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Michael R. Markus
Comments for Project ID:	General Comments

On behalf of the OCWD I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of Portfolio 3 for Prop 84, Round 1 funding.

Out of the three portfolio options being considered by the OWOW Steering Committee, Portfolio 3, which funds 11 projects with a funding cap of \$1.2M, provides the greatest distribution of benefits to the watershed. These benefits include additional water supply, improvement in water quality, and flood management enhancement. Additionally, Portfolio 3 provides appreciably greater benefits to disadvantaged communities in the watershed than the other portfolio choices.

For the reasons stated above, OCWD respectfully requests selection of Portfolio 3 for Prop 84, Round 1 Funding. Thank you for your consideration.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	943 (NLine Energy, Inc.)

- What is the plan to overcome the significant institutional/technical barriers identified in the project proposal?

- The project location is identified as all pipelines for all existing SAWPA member agencies. Have more specific locations been identified?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	983 (City of Huntington Beach)

- Please explain the City's claim of water benefits including 500,000 afy of new source of water supply, non-point source and stormwater pollution reduction of 500,000 mgd, 1,120 afy of stormwater captured, water conservation of 560 afy and groundwater recharge of 560 afy.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1015 (City of Menifee)

- Assuming that the proposed project is the first phase of a multi-phased project, please clarify whether the benefits claimed in the proposal are for the first phase or for all four phases? Will the parks, trails, and recreational facilities be constructed under this grant proposal?
- Please verify the claim of 62,300 tons/year of salt/contaminant removal as well as the benefits claimed in Section G.
- Please explain how the proposed project creates 108,761 construction jobs and 61,498 operational jobs.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1047 (City of Costa Mesa)

- Please verify the source(s) of the stormwater capture benefit of 355,468 afy.
- Please explain the how 100% of the project benefits disadvantaged communities.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1075 (SBV Municipal Water District)

- Are the benefits calculated limited to the actual projects that will be constructed under this grant request? Please provide a clear project description so that benefits claimed can be properly evaluated.
- This project would divert and recharge flows from the Santa Ana River that would otherwise be used as water supplies downstream. The new water supply estimate should be based on the net water supply benefit to the entire SAR watershed.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1082 (City of Corona)

· Explain how this interconnection project will achieve resource efficient land use such as LID, LEED or Ahwahnee Principles and how the 80% of the project will implement resource efficient land use.

· Please explain how the water conservation benefit of 11,202 afy and water transfer and operational efficiency of 11,202 afy were determined.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1090 (USDA Forest Service – SB National Forest)

· Please provide contact names for the six listed project partners.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1166 (Costa Mesa Sanitary District)

· Please verify the source(s) of information for the stormwater capture benefit of 355,468 afy.

· Please explain how 100% of the project benefits disadvantaged communities.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1167 (City of Fontana)

· Please clarify the description of the proposed project. If this project includes only Phase I of a larger project, the benefits of the project should include only those that are accomplished by implementing Phase I.

· Explain how the proposed project employs resource efficient land use practices and has positive impacts to natural hydrology as claimed in Section G.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1190 (SBC Flood Control District)

· Please clarify how this project achieves the stated goals of providing a reliable water supply, preserve and enhance the environment, ensure high water quality, and maintain quality of life?

· The stated benefits of this project include 15,000 afy new storage capacity and 15,000 afy recharge capacity. Does this mean that 100% of the water captured in the flood control basins will be recharged into the groundwater basin?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1216 (Inland Empire Utilities Agency)

· Please explain the water supply energy estimate of 3,894,000 kWh/acre foot for this program.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1227 (West Valley Water District)

· Requested funding is 100% of project cost. How will matching funds be secured and how will O&M be funded?

· What is the plan to overcome the significant institutional/technical barriers identified in the project proposal?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1272 (Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority)

- Please explain the claim of desalination of 38,000 afy of water supply. If the construction of the desalter is not part of this construction project can the benefits of desalination be claimed?
- Please clarify that the claim of removal of 64,040 tons/year of salt/contamination is based solely on the increased capacity of the brineline.
- Clarify that repair and refurbishment projects meet the goals of the OWOW program.

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1288 (Shea/Baker Ranch, LLC.)

· Is this a project being constructed by a private entity on private property? If so, can state grant funds be used for this project?

Commenting Agency:	Orange County Water District
Comment Contact:	Marsha Westropp
Comments for Project ID:	1291 (California Resource Connections, Inc.)

- Explain how a GIS design tool addresses environmental justice concerns and implements resource efficient land use
- Please verify the source(s) of information for the water conservation benefit of 7,087 afy.

Commenting Agency:	SBV Water Conservation District
Comment Contact:	Daniel Cozad
Comments for Project ID:	1049 (SBV Water Conservation District)

The District's Upper Santa Ana Watershed Alluvial Scrub Habitat Restoration project has developed additional material pertinent to the project since the time of the original ranking – which is believed to merit review and possible higher ranking. The project's high level of "Project Commitment" is reflected in the form of "Availability of funds" through in-kind match and "Readiness for Implementation"(shovel ready status). This is based on the ranking criteria defined by the OWOW process. Attached to this letter are the following specific items to assist in rescoring that we hope will merit a Tier 1 ranking.

1. Letter of commitment from our restoration partners, the Inland Empire Resource conservation District and the Urban Conservation Corps of the Inland Empire which commit \$10,000 and \$40,000 in-kind funding, respectively.
2. Spreadsheet based on the specific OWOW criteria and suggests the appropriate ranking for each of the criteria in several areas mentioned.

We appreciate the enormous task this process entails and we appreciate the opportunity to best represent this important restoration project in the IRWM Plan for the Santa Ana Watershed.

Commenting Agency:	SBV Water Conservation District
Comment Contact:	Clare Henry Day
Comments for Project ID:	1160 & 1049 (SBV Water Conservation District)

The San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District adopted the Upper Santa Ana River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan on December 6, 2007. Since that time, District staff has participated in governance meeting for the IRWMP through the Basin Technical Advisory Committee.

The BTAC has identified and recommended two regional projects proposed by the District for implementation within the Upper Santa Ana River IRWMP. These two regionally important projects have been submitted to SAWPA for the inclusion in the OWOW IRWMP 2010 update. We recommend that the two projects be included in the updated IRWMP reflecting projects that meet the OWOW Tier 1a and 1b criteria.

The projects ranked 26 “Constructed Wetland Habitat Restoration and Water Reclamation Project for the Santa Ana River Borrow Pit” reflects a newer expression of the proposed project included in the 2009 IRWMP. The second project, ranked 67, “Upper Santa Ana Watershed Alluvial Scrub Habitat Restoration Project and Mitigation Banking Assessment” project may merit higher ranking due to its shovel readiness and higher than 50% of in-kind match. The District requests that SAWPA includes these projects in upcoming funding considerations.

Commenting Agency:	SBV Municipal Water District
Comment Contact:	Lisa Pierce
Comments for Project ID:	1049

- Regarding grant rank 67
- the project is small, only \$130K
- Encourages spread the wealth, which would be helpful to their project

Commenting Agency:	SBV Municipal Water District
Comment Contact:	Douglas D. Headrick
Comments for Project ID:	General Comments

The San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (Valley District) appreciates the OWOW Steering Committee's (Steering Committee) willingness to accept comments on the OWOW Project Ranking and Selection Process. Valley District recognizes the challenge of developing a process that is all inclusive, fair and objective. We have been an active participant in this process and would like to offer the following suggestions for your consideration:

1. We suggest setting a deadline for the start of construction projects that are selected. During the recent "vetting" process, project applicants were asked if they had the matching funds necessary to complete their projects. We would suggest that SAWPA take the next step and define a deadline for the start of construction for any projects that are selected. This deadline could then be made part of the grant funding contract with the applicant. This requirement will ensure that the agencies that get funding are serious about building their projects.
2. The project scoring criteria should match the requirements of the legislation. The Proposal Solicitation Package prepared by the Department of Water Resources for the first round of Proposition 84 funding includes weighting factors and scores that will be used to evaluate projects. It seems prudent that the rating and ranking system used by SAWPA match, as closely as possible, the rating and ranking system that will ultimately be used by the State. While we think there is some overlap between the two scoring systems, it seems that the State's scoring system should take precedence.
3. Provide the details on how projects are scored and accept comments on the scoring process. The OWOW process was very "open" when it came to developing criteria and assigning weights. However, these factors were then plugged into a sophisticated, "closed" model which output a score for each project. It would have been helpful to know exactly how this model worked by seeing a sample calculation(s) or, even better, by having the model posted on the SAWPA website. If the model is proprietary then we would suggest that the next process use a different approach which does not rely on proprietary software.

At the Project Ranking Workshop yesterday, the Inland Empire Utilities Agency suggested an alternate proposal which would limit the maximum award to \$1 million or ½ the total project cost. Should the Steering Committee choose this alternate proposal, we believe that Valley District's *Enhanced Stormwater Capture and Recharge Along the Santa Ana River* Project would still not be selected but would be the very next project outside of the Portfolio. Should that be the case, Valley District is willing to commit the resources necessary to complete the State application for funding in the event that one of the projects in the Portfolio was to "fall out".

Thank you again for the Steering Committee's desire for an open and transparent process. We appreciate the opportunity to provide these suggestions whether they are used during your deliberations for this round of funding or the next.

Commenting Agency:	Southern California Edison
Comment Contact:	Ray Hicks
Comments for Project ID:	1015 (City of Menifee)

The installation of the storm control project #1015 is extremely important to the SCE system, and the surrounding region.

During periods of flooding, we have had the run-off enter our Valley substation which we categorize as an "A" substation. This means it is the major substation in the area covering Moreno Valley, east to Banning, south to Temecula and west to Corona. This project would remove flooding which would increase safety to employees, increase the reliability to the maintenance of our transmission system, and reduce the risk for grounding and hazardous conditions in the substation. The reduction of run-off on state highway 74 and Menifee Road intersection will also increase traffic safety for SCE vehicles and the community driving through the area.

We have recently widened Menifee road installing curb and gutter, for an expansion of our service center to improve our service to the Inland Empire Region.

We ask for your most serious consideration be given to expedite this project.

Commenting Agency:	Urban Conservation Corps
Comment Contact:	Sandy Bonilla
Comments for Project ID:	1049 (SBV Water Conservation District)

Earlier this year, the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District staff (Lisa Pierce) approached the Urban Conservation Corps (UCC) to pursue a joint application for the SAWPA, One Water One Watershed (OWOW) Prop 84 Funding. The UCC is part of the San Bernardino National Forest Association (SBNFA), which is a primary non-profit partner of the U.S. Forest Service. Within the UCC there are several workforce-training programs for young adults that train them to perform environmental conservation and restoration services. In fact, most all of our training programs are taught by highly skilled professionals from land management agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service, the BLM or from the local city park services. This is done to ensure that the work performed by our young people meet professional land management standards, as well as provides them with exceptional mentors.

We believe the OWOW project that was submitted by the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District is an excellent fit for one of our most notable training programs called UCC AmeriCorps Training Initiative. The UCC AmeriCorps Training Initiative is a “shovel ready” program that focuses on restoration, especially within the San Bernardino National Forest Wildland Urban Interface communities. This program integrates mentoring, environmental education and workforce skills development (especially among disadvantaged young adults) that promotes stewardship of natural resources and sustainability. In fact, a primary component of the UCC AmeriCorps focuses on removing invasive plants that threaten habitat and are highly negative for water consumption. This year alone, our AmeriCorps program removed over 600 bags of invasive plants on the San Bernardino National Forest that threatened sensitive plant habitat within the Front Country Ranger District.

It pleases us to know that our ranking of 67 reflects its value to the watershed management goals of the region. To ensure that our standing may improve in being selected, I am sending you this letter to document our intent of committing our AmeriCorps members to serve on this project, which is an estimated \$40,000 in In-Kind match. We believe our “shovel ready” program and our in-kind donation brings much merit for program consideration.