

Agency	West Valley Water District
Contact	Thomas J. Crowley
Project ID	General Comments

As our representative Jon Rohrer mentioned, we are hoping that SAWPA-OWOW staff strongly consider Portfolio 3 in your recommendation to the Steering Committee for their September 30th meeting.

Regardless of the decision on which Portfolio is selected, we really want to reiterate that the entire project ranking/prioritization process was excellent, and the attentiveness of Salvador and the technical review team, even at the end of 3-days and 25 project presentations, was impressive. Although not everyone can ever be satisfied in such an involved and high-stakes process, SAWPA and the OWOW-team did the best job we have seen at handling, and evaluating such a large volume and variety of projects efficiently and effectively, and this strong process should result in minimal issues at the DWR-review level.

As mentioned in our public comments and generally echoed I believe also by both IEUA and OCWD in their verbal comments, the main reasons we believe Portfolio 3 is preferred are: 1) Portfolio 3 spreads the benefits further in terms of the variety of projects, organizations funded and geography covered, while still allowing a moderate and meaningful level of funding to those requesting more than \$1.2M; and, 2) although the OWOW vetting process was detailed and very thorough, there still is the somewhat subjective/interpretive DWR scoring ahead, and a wider variety of projects will decrease the sensitivity for the entire Santa Ana-region package to any unanticipated outlier projects.

Agency	Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Contact	Ronald E. Young
Project ID	General Comments

EVMWD would like to thank you and SAWPA for the opportunity to apply for Department of water Resources grant funding. We appreciate all of SAWPA’s efforts to make the process fair and transparent and believe that because of those efforts, the region will be able to submit several very strong projects to the state. We also appreciate the opportunity to make suggestions on how to improve the process going into the next round of funding.

The process to divide up limited funds for a large number of projects is understandably difficult as there are many deserving projects. EVMWD appreciates the effort to place a cap on the amount given to any one project or agency and understand the reluctance to merely divide up the funding equally among all projects.

EVMWD supports the suggestions from other agencies for capping awards at a certain percentage of the project and the suggestion of funding no more than 50% of a project. We would also suggest that for the next round of funding (and this round if possible) that a higher weighting be given to whether an award of \$1M would be a benefit to a \$75M project as opposed to more fully funding multiple smaller projects. This would achieve SAWPA’s goals of funding multiple projects across the watershed.

Agency	City of Menifee
Contact	Don Allison
Project ID	General Comments

The City of Menifee is pleased to be in the Portfolio 3 listing of projects. We are ready to move ahead with SAWPA and the other proponents in Portfolio 3 to secure funding for the entire team and their list of outstanding projects.

We have reviewed our project parameters and we have improved our project's performance in salt removal and bio-remediation by modifying the Juniper Flats Detention Basin to include 12 acres of salt absorbing/removal plant species in Phase 1 of our project. Attached is a letter from our Project Engineer outlining our approach to modify our project to improve effectiveness.

We are aware of the importance of this project in achieving the TMDL goals for Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore. We are prepared to team with other Portfolio 3 agencies to insure the effectiveness of this project along with theirs.

Attached letter: At the City of Menifee's request, Webb Associates has reviewed the possibility of enhancing the Juniper Flats Detention Basin with a bio-remediation area that emphasizes the use of plant material that absorbs salt in an effort to reduce salts being transported downstream within the watershed which is consistent with the objectives from the Dept. of Water Resources.

The Juniper Flats Detention Basin was designed as a multi-use facility. While the primary function of the basin is to provide flood control protection and to eliminate the regional floodplain for the area downstream of the basin, the basin was also sized to provide groundwater recharge capability as well as debris/contaminant removal and to provide opportunities for passive recreation/open space.

In reviewing the basin design, we have identified approx. 12 acres, shown on the attached exhibit that can be used as passive recreation and as a bio-remediation area. The basin is located at the base of the Juniper Flats foothills, and the 12 acres identified on the attached exhibit can be established with a system of trails within the 12 acres that can connect to the trail system within the foothills as well as the regional trail system planned for the surrounding area. It is anticipated that this trail system would be used by hikers, bicycle riders, and equestrian riders. The trail system would only utilize a portion of the 12 acres. The balance of the area would be used as a bio-remediation area that would focus on the contaminants that are associated with storm water runoff and soil erosion.

Understanding that salt removal is one of the objectives that DWR is focused on, we have researched plant materials that remove salt. As part of this research we identified two species that would be appropriate.

Agency	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Contact	Thomas A Love
Project ID	General Comments

Regarding the proposed portfolio alternatives, we have a funding recommendation that would provide the watershed with a more diverse portfolio and greater benefits. We urge the steering committee to modify portfolio 3 so that: (1) there is a cap of \$1M instead of \$1.2 M; (2) no project would receive more than half of the project cost. If adopted, this would allow about 4 additional projects to receive funding, including some sponsored by non governmental agencies. It would also add consistency in the sense that no project would receive more than 50% of total project cost, whereas under Portfolio 3, one project would receive 80% and the rest would average around 10%.

IEUA also recommends that there be a feedback loop earlier in the process by which questions can be raised about application rankings and answered, so that there is a better understanding of why the ranking results came out the way they did. Candidates with projects that are being considered for funding need an opportunity to participate in the fact checking and interpretation of the application data. Some of the results were not transparent. It left open the very strong possibility that the data was incorrectly interpreted when it went into the computer, which would lead to incorrect results. (gave example)

Another concern is the way in which the “One project per agency” rule was applied in the application process. In OWOW, considerable emphasis has been placed on the importance of having multiple agencies participating in the proposed projects. However, the application process focused on the identification of those that had been listed as “lead” agencies, even if they were only serving as coordinators for multi-agency, multi-benefit projects. In the end, this meant that projects that could have been considered for funding were eliminated from this round based on the interpretation of the “lead agency” information. In the future, the application process needs to provide clearer information about multiple partner grant proposals and how they will be evaluated and ranked. In this case, the meeting handout materials provided to the Steering Committee only listed on agency/sponsor per project, which, while unintentional, was misleading. Also the project applicants did not know at the time they filled out the applications about the “one project per agency” rule. Clearly, for Round 2, the participants need to understand the evaluation rules at the outset.

A similar situation existed with regard to the applicants not understanding the rules regarding match share requirements. It was not known at the time of application submittal that the proposed match share would be converted into a quantitative ranking criterion or what would be considered an appropriate match share. DWR guidelines required a minimum 25% match share and no other guidance was given by OWOW. We suggest that the initially proposed match share is not a fair project ranking criterion, unless the rules are known from the outset. As a further point to support this conclusion, it should be noted that, in the final portfolio development stage, the steering committee established cutoffs which in effect reduced the funding shares for almost all projects to something much less than what was initially proposed, so the initial request did not have much relevance to the outcome.