Questions and Answers: 
OWOW 2.0 Project Solicitation

1. Round 1, the funds were divided evenly, are the funds going to be divided equally for Round 2? Round 1, we had no cap and no limit on number of projects per agency, and the money was allocated by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will again determine the allocation from all eligible projects.

2. The full Grant is $16M, and say you award 16 projects, and each get $1M, what if we apply for $2M, does that disqualify you? Under that scenario, you will not get penalized, nor will you get what you ask for.

3. Goals and Objectives for the IRWM section of the form – why is there so much repetition, and what should we really focus on? It is recommended that you be very thorough with your answers and describe each and every benefit.

4. Does the Steering Committee review the entire application submitted? The Steering Committee with the assistance of the project review committee will review all eligible projects relative to their merits.

5. How can our project be labeled as a Disadvantaged Community? All of the project benefits must accrue within a Disadvantaged Community. That determination is made based on Median Household Income data collected by census tract.

6. Is there a difference between using bullet points or paragraph narratives? Just as long as you are very thorough with your answers, you can display it any way you choose.

7. If you’ve applied for Prop 1E, can you also apply for Round 2 funding? Yes, you can.

8. I tried copying and pasting into the application form and it wouldn’t work? When copying and pasting into the application form, make sure you copy by using “Ctrl C” and when you paste use “Ctrl V”. Using your mouse won’t work.

9. Does spaces matter when I enter data on a form with a character limit? Yes, they do. It is important to be succinct when answering questions.

10. Between what dates will project review by the OWOW Round 2 project review committee take place? When will selected projects be announced (approximately)? The OWOW project review committee will meet between mid-October and mid-November 2012 and we anticipate announcement of selected projects by mid-December 2012.

11. What is the approximate date in spring 2013, when the package will be submitted to DWR? Project application packages from SAWPA are due to DWR in March 2013.
12. What is the approximate month/season that is expected that DWR will provide funding for the projects?  DWR will be making funding recommendations by August 2013, and has scheduled approval for final grant awards in September 2013. Funding will be provided after an executed agreement with DWR and SAWPA, estimated December 2013.

13. One of our project benefits is greenhouse gas reduction, but there is no check box for it in Section 4-Project Benefits. Since having more benefits checked makes the project more competitive, we would like to know which box to check in Section 4 for GHG reduction? All projects are ranked for their ability to reduce greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gas reduction is one of the five equally-ranked, selection criteria for this round of funding.

14. Do I need to report kilogram reductions of bacteria when reporting a water quality benefit?  Percent reduction of bacterial load at a point of compliance, especially for a TMDL and/or reduction of units of organisms/ ml relative to pre-project condition will document a measurable improvement in water quality. You should be able to demonstrate how you intend to measure and document the project’s benefit to water quality and how those improvements impact Beneficial Uses of that water body.

15. What is the size limit on attached files?  5 MB file size limit for all attachments.

16. Is there a place in the application to clarify whether we are a retail water agency or not?  All local public agencies and non-profit organizations as defined in Appendix B of the 2012 Guidelines are eligible to apply for Prop 84 IRWM Grant funding.

17. Can in-kind services conductor outside the proposed project area be considered acceptable at local match?  In-kind services must relate directly to the scope of work presented in the project proposal. To assure compliance with DWR standards, it is recommended that all in-kind services be performed in the proposed project area. This may mean the project proponent may wish to expand the boundaries of the project area benefited from the scoped project to ensure areas of in-kind support.

18. Is environmental mitigation associated with a proposed project reimbursable y the grant?  Yes, environmental mitigation is reimbursable by grant funds but should not be the sole benefit or purpose of the project.

19. Why are questions included in the form about Native American tribal benefits if grant funding has not been specifically designated or set aside to assist Native American tribes?  The OWOW Prop 84 Round 2 has established a 10% funding set-aside to assist disadvantage communities (DAC's) which often include Native American tribal lands. DWR has encouraged coordination and support to Native American Tribes in the OWOW Planning process but has only indicated that 10% of IRWM Implementation funding statewide should be used to support of DACs. No specific allocation under Prop 84 IRWM Implementation was established by DWR in support of Native American Tribes. Questions are included on the OWOW Call For Projects information form regarding Native American Tribal Lands as a project review factor.
20. What is the default or baseline of greenhouse gas emissions from imported water per AF that a project proponent can use to define greenhouse gas emissions reduction? The following defaults or baseline values can be used: SBVMWD - 0.91 metric tons/AF, MWDSC - 1.01 metric tons/AF, SWP - 0.62 metric tons/AF.

21. Since the form is asking for greenhouse gas emissions reduction vs. the baseline, what value should be entered if a project actually is not reducing but instead equaling or adding greenhouse gas emissions beyond the baseline? Should a negative value be entered? Just enter zero on the form where it asks for greenhouse gas emission reduction amount for any project that does not have a greenhouse gas emission reduction. Entering zero would reflect no credit or points in the rating and ranking process for this evaluation criteria category.

22. Under Total Project Cost, what is included? Does it include the present value of the O&M cost? The Total project cost includes land costs, planning and design costs, environmental compliance and documentation costs; construction or implementation costs and construction contingency for only the project seeking funding. It would not include costs from previous or future phases of the project. O&M costs are not included under “Total Project Cost”, but annual O&M cost information is also requested in the application form. This information will be used to calculate cost-effectiveness over the life of the project.

23. If a project is a non-structural project, would the cost to implement a program conducted annually be included under total project cost or O&M cost? The cost of setting up and implementing the program should be included under “Total Project Cost”. Any recurring annual expenditures should be included under “O&M (annual) cost”.

24. Does the MOU documenting collaboration need to include all participating agencies? Does the MOU have to be approved by all governing boards of the MOU parties? The MOU can be a subset of participating agencies as long as two or more parties are signing the MOU. The MOU needs to be approved by the governing board of the lead agency but can be signed by the general manager or chief executive officer for the other agencies who are party to the agreement.

25. Shouldn’t the criteria for $/AF reflect just the cost of project paid by grant funding to better reflect value of State grant funds? The $/AF, or any other measure of cost-effectiveness (e.g., $/acre) is based on the Total Project Cost and the amortization of the annual O&M cost. Since a grant amount per project has not been defined and since the Steering Committee may choose to define a grant maximum per project in the future to distribute the available grant monies among the top ranked projects, the use of just grant funding for project effectiveness is not deemed appropriate.

26. How far back in time are local project costs eligible as local match? Any project cost after October 1, 2008 are eligible as a local match. However, only project costs expended after the execution of the DWR grant funding agreement are eligible for grant reimbursement from DWR.
27. When calculating local share, how far back can you go when documenting on-going work in support of a project? Current project agreements for Round one projects allow proponents to count costs from October 1, 2008 as part of the local match. This date will also be used in determining eligibility of costs for round two. Remember that costs must be specifically related to the project outlined in the grant agreement.

28. How detailed of an MOU agreement need to be included to provide evidence of collaboration? An MOU or other agreement need not be detailed, however it should provide evidence that the decision makers (elected or board member level) have decided to develop and operate a project with their partner agencies. An ideal agreement would outline the benefits received by each agency and the financial or staff resources allocated to the implementation of the project.

29. When we are simply including a project for inclusion in the plan and not requesting funding, do we need to complete the entire form? Yes, complete the form to the best of your ability, but include as much information as possible. Other potential collaborators can make use of the information to identify partners for future projects. If you do not have sufficient information, simply enter “N/A” and move on. However, completing the entire form will serve as a check list to the project proponent to ensure that the most complete project description possible is provided. If the project was included in the first round of OWOW, the general project information can be included on the form by simply clicking on the hypertext labeled “update a round 1 project for round 2”. The project information form has changed substantially from round one. If you wish to use additional information provided in support of a round one application, Pete Vitt (pvitt@sawpa.org) can provide a text file of your previous application for your use.

30. If I have a project with multiple phases of implementation, should the quantification of benefits reflect the benefits of the entire project of all phases? No. If a project is being submitted for DWR grant funding, please reflect the quantification of benefits for only the phase of the project that is proposed to be implemented using the grant funds. For the other future phases of planning or implementation, show the project information and quantification of benefits, if available, as a separate project entry and indicate on the project information form that it is being submitted for inclusion in the OWOW Plan only and not for grant funding.

31. How is the project information data eventually translated into the rating and ranking process? The project information data will serve as input into a model tool called Decision Plus. It is a public domain model which allows one to put a scale on the responses and perform a rating and ranking of the projects. Details on the model will be discussed on September 6.

32. With the Forest First Program, is that going to be presented as a project for OWOW 2.0 or is that separate? We would like to see a project be submitted under this round if possible. We have been encouraging both the Forest Service to do outreach and the downstream agencies to work with the Forest Service to put something together. If interested you can contact Robert Taylor or Jody Noiron from the Forest Service or some of the downstream agencies that may benefit such as San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, East Valley Water District, or Cucamonga Valley Water District to name a few.
33. If a Forest First proposal is not shovel ready for this round, would it still be beneficial for us to put the proposal in and really strive to get it in for the third round? Yes, it’s worthwhile to submit it to have it in the plan itself. Even if it’s not ready to move forward, submitting this project will assure that project is considered for the next round.

34. If you’re submitting a project completion schedule, does the five year completion requirement include the project construction? Yes, the window that we’ve given for the five year completion requirement starts after the execution agreement with DWR.

35. Do you expect that the Agreements will take as long as they did in the first round to get them executed with DWR? We anticipate it will be shorter. They probably already have their agreement templates ready from Round 1 that will likely be applicable for Round 2.

36. On the MOU’s required to identify partnerships, do the partnerships need to be partners that provide monetary participation? No, if one partnering agency was willing to provide the full responsibility of the local match which is 25%, and there are other partners onboard who are providing some other resources that are in kind, that would work. The MOU doesn’t have to obligate all parties to the 25%, just define how they are partnering or what their participation is.

37. If my board already has an adopted resolution supporting the IRWM plan, do I need to do another resolution? If you have adopted it, then you should be good. Anybody that is short listed for Round 2 to be funded must adopt the IRWM Plan if they have not already.

38. Everybody that signs the MOU must adopt the IRWM plan as well, if it’s a city or a tribe or is it just a designated lead agency? Just a designated lead agency needs to formally adopt the plan but partnering agencies or organizations are encouraged to adopt the plan as well.

39. If you have a large project, is it reasonable to phase that project so that we’re just submitting for that particular first phase? You can go that route if you think that some level of benefits from that first phase are going to be realized, then I encourage that phase approach. If you aren’t going to get the benefits until a future phase of the entire project, it will not rank as well.

40. As a turf conservation project where you’re expanding the turf rebates to include commercial and residential as a water conservation project, do you see that as having much merit? Any programs that promote water use efficiency and in a cost effective manner can be very competitive. All projects must still be effective in thoroughly defining the project benefits and filling the project information form to be competitive.

41. Will you accept an “Income survey” report to support DAC? Yes, that is acceptable to both DWR and SAWPA if conducted in accordance to Exhibit E Disadvantaged Community Assistance of the DWR Round 2 PSP.

42. Are there people indicating that they have struggles filling out the application? We have not had any complaints so far. We believe that the online project information form is easier
for everyone. If anyone has a problem with the online access, we do have the project information form also available in Word and PDF format on our website where they can download the form.

43. **If you are anticipating adopting an MOU, though you don’t think you can make the October 1st deadline, can that be a moving target deadline?** At the time of the application, we would like to see the MOU’s or type of Agreement forms promoting collaboration. If you are finding it a problem and know that it won’t occur by the deadline, but you think that you can commit to a specific date prior to the formal review of projects you can go ahead and indicate that on the project information form.

44. **How do you qualify to be under the Disadvantaged Communities (DAC)?** DAC is defined as communities with an annual median household income that is less than 80 % of the statewide annual median household income; these guidelines have been established by the Department of Water Resources (DWR). There is a link on DWR’s website that will tell you if a community is considered disadvantaged as well as guidance on performing income surveys.

45. **Is there guidance in the Prop 84 PSP document for DAC types of projects?** There are now DAC project examples in Table 9 of Appendix G Disadvantaged Communities of the Draft Prop 84 IRWM Round 2 Guidelines. The projects must address critical water supply and water quality needs in a DAC. A recycled water project that is benefitting an area that has some DAC’s based on a reduced cost with providing water that does not appear to be reflective of a critical water supply improvement and would not really qualify for a target set-aside for DAC’s.

46. **What happened with the Fontana project that started as being ranked really high and then went down to one of the lowest ranking?** We went through a whole ranking criteria process and it might-have not benefitted for both water supply and water quality. Or the vetted numbers could have been incorrect for double counting. Please note that the projects that were submitted in the past could be re-submitted by updating data on the project information form.

47. **Could Round 1 Projects be posted on your website?** The Round 1 Project Summaries are posted on our SAWPA website. They are located in the OWOW 1.0 section.

48. **How many projects were awarded grant funding under the Santa Ana Prop 84 IRWM Round 1; how long was the project information form?** There was 297 projects submitted for rating and ranking in total, 13 of the top ranked projects were selected for Prop 84 IRWM Round 1 funding, and 11 of them received about one million dollars and two of them less than a million. The length of the application is about the same as the first one, there is a character limitation for some of the descriptive explanation questions.

49. **Is there a review committee?** Yes, there will be a review committee, though we do not have one yet. The Steering Committee will be approving whoever is selected.

50. **Was Round 1 granted 11M?** First Round was $12 M, this one is $16 M, and the third round will be between $50 to $60 M.
51. If we only want our project to be in the plan, do we really need to fill out the application form completely? Yes, DWR asked that all projects in the plan be rated and ranked.

52. What if you don’t have an MOU? To demonstrate collaboration, documentation such as an MOU, JPA or inclusion of the project in the budgets of the sponsoring agencies is necessary at the time of the application. Some allowance may be given if the project proponent can commit to providing the necessary documentation prior to the project review committee’s review.

53. The Project Solicitation Package; is there a way to tweak it and make changes to it? Yes, you can get it off our website as a Word 2003 or 2007 file.

54. Implementation Project for Monitoring Wells, would you agree that they would qualify as a project supporting water quality improvement? Yes, it will qualify, but there may be projects that are more competitive and ranked higher than others.

55. One of our projects is a multi-purpose project around an existing recharge Basin, there’s multiple benefits, a feasibility study, big stakeholder effort, and it has a professional facilitator. Would it qualify? To be competitive for Prop 84 IRWM Round 2 funding, the project must be ready to implement, integrated and regional in nature. It may qualify as a demonstration project but may be more competitive if similar demonstration projects were proposed in multiple agencies areas.

56. Can we find out the intricacies of how the points are awarded in the inter-plus model? The rating and ranking based on the established criteria will be accomplished by a public domain model called Decision Plus, the same model used under the previous funding round. For more details, SAWPA will consider providing a future workshop explaining the Decision Plus model and the weighting and ranking process.

57. Can we submit comments after the workshop in writing if something still isn’t clear? Will we be able to meet with SAWPA staff to discuss our projects? Yes. SAWPA has set up a weekly Q&A meeting time at SAWPA for every Thursday from 10 am – 11 am to answer questions. All comments and responses will be posted on the SAWPA website under OWOW FAQs. Questions can also be posed in writing to onewateronewatershed@sawpa.org.

58. In Round 2, will it be easier to get funding for a “small” water efficiency project or pilot-type project that doesn’t generate large total numbers of water savings, but has a good water savings per household and has other benefits such as LID and education (e.g., residential turf removal pilot project)? The Round 2 project evaluation criteria lists Cost Efficiency in units of $/AF representing 20% of the overall rating score. In addition, we encourage you to consider how your project may results in other benefits reflected by the ranking criteria. For example, by conserving water you might be able to reduce runoff and improve water quality, or you could reduce greenhouse gas emissions by using less water (thus using less energy). Consequently, even small efficient projects can be competitive with larger ones.

59. What are the cut-offs for project readiness, CEQA status, and is there a requirement that the project cannot be already past design, like in the bidding stage or beginning of
construction, at the time a funding agreement is actually signed? There is no requirement for any stage of implementation other than the project must be able to complete implementation within 5 years of DWR grant contract execution. Applicants must justify via a project schedule how the intend to complete the project within this timeframe. Project proponents are advised that due to detailed information required by DWR under the Prop 84 Round 2 Project Solicitation Package, a project should be well defined if seeking implementation funding.

60. Are budget-based water rates incorporated? Yes, as a funding set aside for development of budget based water rates. However, there is no requirement to have budget based rates to submit a project.

61. Do you have to already meet the 20x2020 goal to get extra points as a retail agency, or just have a plan you submitted to DWR and be on track to meet it? If a water retail agency is seeking bonus points for ranking, it must provide documentation at the time of application that it is currently meeting the Year 2020 conservation goal for their agency as defined under SBX7-7. A plan to meet and being on track to meet are insufficient. This requirement does not apply to sponsors that are not retail providers.

62. How will you level the playing field if retail agencies can get extra points for 20x2020 and you are not a retail agency? This will not affect non-retail agencies. There are several mathematical ways in which this can be done, such as automatically assigning the extra points to non-retail agencies for which this requirement is not applicable.

63. If a project is already in OWOW 1.0, but not a candidate for funding, do you have to resubmit an application or will there be a way to just update the data you input last time? We have a feature on the new online Project Information Form that allows a project proponent to just update information about projects submitted under Round 1. We do ask that if project proponents did have Round 1 projects to please update it to reflect some additional questions asked in the new form.

64. What explains the large difference between the 13 watershed-wide concepts and the 5 project ranking criteria, e.g., with regard to water supply benefits? The 13 watershed-wide concepts, if developed further, would rank competitively under the 5 project ranking criteria. As concepts, they reflect the integrated and multi-benefits system approach that OWOW planning is seeking, however, as concepts they need to be taken to the next stage of development to be competitive.

65. Several of the 13 concepts sound more like studies or agreements rather than construction/implementation projects. For example, an urban runoff management fund. What types of projects are eligible for a Round 2 implementation grant other than construction? Are there planning grant funds set aside we can apply for? The key word is concepts. As 13 watershed-wide concepts they do need further development to be ready as implementation projects. More development of the watershed-wide concepts is encouraged before being submitted as a project ready for funding under Prop 84. Non-structural projects are eligible for Prop 84 IRWM Round 2 funding such as say a water efficiency program that
implemented new water efficient sprinkler head across multiple agencies. Planning grants are not available at this time and are not eligible under Prop 84 IRWM Implementation.

66. For DAC, do 100% of the benefits have to go to DAC? What does that mean exactly? A project does not have to have 100% support to DACs, but if it is seeking funding under the DAC set aside or a waiver to the 25% minimum funding match, it does need to be a project that is solely in support of critical water supply or water quality improvement in a disadvantaged community with 100% of the benefits going to the DAC.