

Jesse Claypool, Board Member  
Dan Newton, Board Member  
Joe Egan, Board Member  
Aaron Brazzonovich, Board Member

Dan Newton, Interim City Administrator  
Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

## **Lahontan Basins Regional Water Management Group ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

City of Susanville Council Chambers  
66 North Lassen Street, Susanville, CA 96130

**April 19, 2018 - 3:00 p.m.**

### Addressing the Board

- Any person desiring to address the Board shall first secure permission of the presiding officer.
- Matters under the jurisdiction of the Board listed on the agenda may be addressed.
- The Board of Directors will not take action on any subject that is not on the Agenda

**1 CALL TO ORDER**

**2 ROLL CALL BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**3 AGENDA APPROVAL**

**4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of minutes from the March 8, 2018 meeting.**

**5 CORRESPONDENCE: None.**

**6 PUBLIC COMMENT**

(any person may address the Board at this time to comment on any subject not on the agenda. However, the Board may not take action other than to direct staff to agendize the matter at a future meeting.)

**7. MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:**

- A. Matrix to identify DACI projects
- B. SIR Watershed
- C. Additional Sponsor money
- D. Prop 84 Update

**8 BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:**

**9 PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS (if any): Any person may address the Board at this time upon any discussion item under consideration during Closed Session.**

**10. CLOSED SESSION: None.**

I, Heidi Whitlock, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for April 19, 2018, in the areas designated on April 16, 2018.



Heidi Whitlock, Asst. to the City Administrator

**Submitted By:** Dan Newton, Interim City Administrator

**Action Date:** April 19, 2018

**AGENDA ITEM**

**SUBJECT:** Minutes of the RWMG March 8, 2018 meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Attached for the Board's review are the minutes of the March 8, 2018, RMWG special meeting.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** None.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Motion to waive oral reading and approve minutes of RWMG March 8, 2018 meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Minutes: March 8, 2018

---

**Regional Water Management Group  
Special Meeting Minutes  
March 8, 2018 – 3:00 p.m.  
City of Susanville Council Chambers  
66 North Lassen Street, Susanville CA 96130**

Meeting was called to order at 3:03 by Chairman Egan.

Roll Call of Board Members Present: Dan Newton, Joe Egan, Aaron Brazzanovich and Jesse Claypool.

Staff Present: Quincy McCourt, Project Manager and Heidi Whitlock, Assistant to the City Administrator.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Motion by Vice Chair Newton, second by Board member Brazzanovich, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion by Board member Claypool, second by Vice Chair Newton, to approve the minutes of August 2, 2017. Motion carried unanimously.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**4 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:**

**4A Consider Resolution No. 18-02, Setting Meeting Schedule**

Currently in Appendix A of the bylaws, in the first and second paragraph of the Meetings and Agenda section, meeting are to be scheduled quarterly on the third Thursday of the month at 3:00 p.m. Staff requested the approval to schedule a set meeting time within those parameters for the purpose of scheduling ease. The requested schedule to consider would be every third month (January, April, July and October), the third Thursday of the month at 3:00p.m with special meeting occurring when needed.

Motion by Board member Claypool, second by Board member Brazzanovich, to approve Resolution No. 18-02, setting the regular meeting schedule as the third Thursday of every third month (January, April, July and October) starting in April, at 3:00 p.m. at the City of Susanville Council Chambers, 66 North Lassen Street, Susanville, CA 96130. Motion carried unanimously.

**4B Discussion Regarding MOU and Bylaws**

Staff requested a discussion among the group with respect to clarification opportunities in the MOU and the Bylaws. One concern was the Bylaws not being officially adopted. Being that the RWMG is not focusing on the Plan Implementation, some of the proposed language can be modified.

Motion by Board member Brazzanovich, second by Board member Claypool, directing staff to prepare both the MOU and Bylaws for adoption. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **4C Discussion of RCD as DACI Lead**

Mr. McCourt stated that, as the MOU states, the lead agency for the implementation of the plan and creating project plans is the City of Susanville. The DACI responsibility lies within that framework. However, the RCD is in a position to assist with the project facilitation. This teamwork will prove useful in the overall success of the project. Staff proposed a discussion and the consideration of the RCD to act as the DACI Lead.

Motion by Vice President Newton, second by Board member Brazzanovich, to direct staff to prepare documents that will ratify the RCD as the DACI Lead. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **4D Discussion Regarding Prop 1 Grant**

Mr. McCourt offered the following update. Proposition 1 funding is intended to improve regional water self-reliance security and adapt to the effects on water supply arising out of climate change. Specifically, the purpose is to assist water infrastructure systems adapt to climate change; provide incentives for water agencies throughout each watershed to collaborate in managing the region's water resources and improve regional water self-reliance. There is \$510 million in IRWM grant funds that were allocated to the 12 hydrologic region-based Funding Areas as shown in the attached Figure 1.

DWR will administer three separate grant programs, DACI Program (\$51mm) on a non-competitive basis, Planning Grant Program (\$5mm) and Implementation Grant Program (\$418mm) which can be awarded on a competitive or non-competitive basis. A local cost share of not less than 50% of the total proposal cost is required. Eligibility criteria among many more are the region must have been accepted, project must be consistent with adopted IRWM plan, each sponsor must also adopt the IRWM plan and a clear and definite public purpose and addressing the risks to water supply and water infrastructure arising from climate change. One major intent is to encourage stakeholder involvement.

Staff requested the Board discuss the potential for proceeding with a call for projects and provide direction to staff.

Discussion occurred and direction was given to staff to bring back the matrix at the April meeting for further discussion and to identify DACI projects.

#### **5 BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:**

Board member Claypool requested information on the status of current projects.

Vice President Newton provided an update to the Board.

#### **6 CLOSED SESSION: None.**

**ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

---

Joe Egan, RWMG Board Chair

Respectfully Submitted by:

---

Heidi Whitlock, Assistant to the City Administrator

**Submitted By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**Action Date:** April 19, 2018

**AGENDA ITEM**

**SUBJECT:** Discuss Matrix to Identify DACI Projects.

**Presented By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**SUMMARY:** During the application process for the current Sponsor's projects, the attached matrix was used to gauge the best opportunity for funding. There have been upgrades to the eligibility criteria as shown in the attachments, however the project solicitation will not be available from the State until June or July. Please note, in order to apply for Prop 1 funding, the state is requiring a few updates to the IRWMP as noted in the attached 2016 Plan Standards. Prop 1 grants will be awarded in 2019, but the State is urging funding regions to submit their updated plans as early as possible.

As a recap, during the last project solicitation process, Dyer Engineering prepared the grant application for 50% up front and the remainder if the grant was awarded. They have expressed interest for this round as well.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** None

**ACTION  
REQUESTED:** For information only.

**ATTACHMENTS:** 2016 DACI Requests for Proposals  
2016 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines  
2014 Project Identification Matrix  
2016 Plan Standards - IRWMP updates in orange

Proposal Level Evaluation	For DWR to award a full score, the application must contain:	Points Available	COS Carroll Street Flood Wall Project	COS Susan River Parkway Project	COS Phase 1 & 2 Sustainable Water Supply and Conjunctive Use Project	COS Phase 3 Sustainable Water Supply and Conjunctive Use Project	Desmond Meadows Montana Fence Project	Duck Unlimited Dakin Unit-Honey Lake WA pipeline Project	Duck Unlimited Fleming Unit-Honey Lake WA pipeline Project	Lining of "Old Channel" Irrigation Canal Project	LIC Canal Project	LIC Johnstonville Dam Project	Madeline Municipal Water Assessment Project	Ravendale Municipal Water Assessment Project	SIR Water Use Efficient and Water Supply Rehabilitation Project	Spalding CSD Closing Wastewater Retention Pond Project
Is there a map of the IRWM Region that shows the location of the project(s) included in the Proposal?	A Proposal Map that contains the IRWM regional boundary and the location of each project included in the application.	1														
Does the Budget contain a summary budget for the Proposal?	A complete Table 9, which summarizes the Proposal Budget	1														
Does the Schedule contain a summary schedule for the Proposal?	A summary schedule for the Proposal.	1														
Collectively, do the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule demonstrate that all of the projects will be completed by October 31, 2020?	A proposal where all projects will be completed by October 31, 2020.	2														
Does the proposal contain projects that assist the IRWM region in meeting the goals of the Human Right to Water Policy?	An explanation of how a project assists the IRWM region in meeting the goals of the Human Right to Water Policy (safe, affordable water for drinking, bathing, sanitation, and cooking for all). The applicant will receive one point for each project, to a maximum of two points.	2				1						1	1	1		
<b>Project Level Evaluation</b>	<b>For DWR to award a full score, the application must contain:</b>	<b>Points Available</b>														
Does the applicant provide a description of the project that summarizes the major components and the intended purpose of the project?	A description of the project that summarizes the: - anticipated physical benefits of the projects - intended outcomes, and - major physical components (i.e., what the project is installing, retrofitting, replacing, etc.)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Is there a project map that shows the location of the project and the areas and water resources affected by the project?	A map of the project that includes the location of the project, the areas affected by the project, and the water resources affected by the project.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Are the anticipated primary and secondary physical benefits of the project described and quantified with the units specified in Table 5? (1)	A properly completed Table 5 for at least the primary and secondary benefit of each project. If the primary and secondary physical benefits were not clearly identified or quantified for each year of the project's lifecycle using the specific units provided in the instructions for Table 5, a response of "na" will be given. For DAC projects that do not include construction, benefits do not need to be quantified, but must be qualitatively described.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Does the technical analysis support the claimed physical benefits? (1)	A demonstration that the benefits were quantified correctly: 1. An explanation of project need 2. An explanation of without project conditions 3. A description of how benefits were derived For DAC projects that do not include construction, only #1 (project need) must be described.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
If applicable, does the applicant describe the potential adverse impacts of the project? If none, does the applicant properly explain why there are no impacts?*	- A description of all potential adverse impacts of the proposed project. A reasonable claim of no adverse impacts. For example, if applicant claims a well installation project will have no adverse impacts, it must explain how this is possible.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Does the proposed project effectively address long-term drought preparedness?	A demonstration that the project contributes to sustainable water supply and reliability during water shortages and will achieve one or more of the following: - Promote water conservation, conjunctive use, reuse and recycling - Improve landscape and agricultural irrigation efficiencies - Achieve long-term reduction of water use - Efficient groundwater basin management - Establish system interties - Solutions that yield a new water supply such as seawater desalination	3	0	0	2-3*	3	0-1*	3	3	3	3	1-2*	3	3	3	3
Does the project provide a direct water-related benefit to a DAC?	- Proof that at least 25% of the area served by the project (by population or geography) meets the definition of a DAC. - A description of the water-related need(s) of a DAC. - Demonstration that the proposed project addresses the described need of the DAC.	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1-2*	2	2	0	0
Is the proposed project performance monitoring plan expected to track progress towards meeting the claimed physical benefits?*	- Monitoring targets identified that will assist the implementing agency achieve the claimed benefits. Monitoring tools that are appropriate for measuring the project's performance.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Is the proposed project the least cost alternative? If not, does the applicant sufficiently explain why it was selected instead of the least cost alternative?*	A completed Table 7 that explains why the proposed project is the preferred alternative even if it is not the least cost alternative.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Does the applicant discuss the necessary tasks in the Work Plan that will result in a completed project?	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Does the Work Plan include a project status that indicates the current stage of each task (e.g., % complete)?	A summary of the work that has been completed to date.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
If applicable, does the Work Plan include a listing of required permits and their status, and the appropriate environmental documentation for the proposed project? (N/A = Yes)	- A list of required permits. - Description of appropriate environmental documentation. - Status of required permits and environmental documentation (as applicable). - If permits/environmental docs are not required, an explanation of why they are not required.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Are the tasks shown in the Budget consistent with the tasks discussed in the Work Plan?	A budget that is organized/outlined identical to the Work Summary.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Are the costs presented in the Budget reasonable for the project type and the current stage of the project?	A budget that contains costs that are reasonably supported and not significantly higher or lower than industry standard	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Are the tasks in the schedule consistent with the tasks described in the Work Plan?	A schedule that is organized/outlined identical to the Work Summary	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Does the schedule demonstrate that it is reasonable to expect that the project will start construction/implementation by April 1, 2016?	Reasonable timeframes for the proposed tasks - A project ready to start by April 1, 2016 (For construction projects, ready to start means construction bids will be awarded by April 1, 2016)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Will the project be completed by October 31, 2019?	A schedule that demonstrates the project will be completed by October 31, 2019.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Is there sufficient detail in the Work Plan to demonstrate the proposed schedule can be met?	Supporting documentation for the proposed schedule that demonstrates the project could be implemented as promised.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Total Project Level Score for all projects</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21-22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18-19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17-19</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Project Level Criterion Score</b>																
<b>Insert Average Total by Project = (Total Project Score/# of Projects); rounded to nearest whole number</b>																
<b>Projected Project Cost</b>			\$400,000	\$3,900,000	\$1,951,750	\$3,250,000	\$212,500	\$513,000	\$433,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,100,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$650,000	\$56,250
<b>Maximum Possible Score</b>																
<b>Enter Proposal Level Criterion Score</b>		<b>7</b>														
<b>Enter Project Level Criterion Score</b>		<b>22</b>														
<b>Grand Total (Sum Above Two Rows)</b>		<b>29</b>														
<b>Possible Additional Tie-Breaker Points from Program Preferences Section</b>		<b>4</b>														
<b>Maximum possible points in the event of a tie</b>		<b>33</b>														
<b>*More information needed</b>																
1) Projects intending to provide direct water-related benefits to a project are entirely comprised of a DAC that are in the planning or design phase and not intending to complete construction with this solicitation are not required to complete this section. These projects will be given full points for this question.																
2) Projects that DWR are looking for in this round fulfill the following major criteria (amongst many others):																
Project is shovel ready																
Project is close to permitted																
Project will address long-term drought preparedness in a measurable way (across-It)																
Project will directly affect a DAC																
Project has multiple benefits																
Project will be able to start construction by April 2016 and end October 2019																
3) Many of Project Level Evaluation criteria is assumed as completed although there is still significant work needed to satisfy all criteria. More accurate assumptions are with the project specifics.																

**Table 1 – Statewide Priorities**

Action #	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Provide funding for conservation and efficiency</li> <li>◆ Increase water sector energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction capacity</li> <li>◆ Promote local urban conservation ordinances and programs</li> </ul>
<p>2. Increase Regional Self-Reliance and Integrated Water Management Across All Levels of Government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Ensure water security at the local level, where individual government efforts integrate into one combined regional commitment where the sum becomes greater than any single piece.</li> <li>◆ Support and expand funding for Integrated Water Management planning and projects</li> <li>◆ Improve land use and water alignment</li> <li>◆ Provide assistance to disadvantaged communities</li> <li>◆ Encourage State focus on projects with multiple benefits</li> <li>◆ Increase the use of recycled water</li> </ul>
<p>3. Achieve the Co-Equal Goals for the Delta</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ This action is directed towards State and federal agencies; however, consideration will be afforded to eligible local or regional projects that also support achieving the co-equal goals providing a more reliable water supply for California and to protect, restore, and enhance the Delta ecosystem.</li> </ul>
<p>4. Protect and Restore Important Ecosystems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Continue protecting and restoring the resiliency of our ecosystems to support fish and wildlife populations, improve water quality, and restore natural system functions.</li> <li>◆ Restore key mountain meadow habitat</li> <li>◆ Manage headwaters for multiple benefits</li> <li>◆ Protect key habitat of the Salton Sea through local partnership</li> <li>◆ Restore coastal watersheds</li> <li>◆ Continue restoration efforts in the Lake Tahoe Basin</li> <li>◆ Continue restoration efforts in the Klamath Basin</li> <li>◆ Water for wetlands and waterfowl</li> <li>◆ Eliminate barriers to fish migration</li> <li>◆ Assess fish passage at large dams</li> <li>◆ Enhance water flows in stream systems statewide</li> </ul>
<p>5. Manage and Prepare for Dry Periods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Effectively manage water resources through all hydrologic conditions to reduce impacts of shortages and lessen costs of state response actions. Secure more reliable water supplies and consequently improve drought preparedness and make California’s water system more resilient.</li> <li>◆ Revise operations to respond to extreme conditions</li> <li>◆ Encourage healthy soils</li> </ul>
<p>6. Expand Water Storage Capacity and Improve Groundwater Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Increase water storage for widespread public and environmental benefits, especially in increasingly dry years and better manage our groundwater to reduce overdraft.</li> <li>◆ Provide essential data to enable Sustainable Groundwater Management</li> <li>◆ Support funding partnerships for storage projects</li> <li>◆ Improve Sustainable Groundwater Management</li> <li>◆ Support distributed groundwater storage</li> <li>◆ Increase statewide groundwater recharge</li> <li>◆ Accelerate clean-up of contaminated groundwater and prevent future contamination</li> </ul>
<p>7. Provide Safe Water for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Provide all Californians the right to safe, clean, affordable and accessible water</li> </ul>

Table 1 – Statewide Priorities	
Action #	Description
All Communities	adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Consolidate water quality programs</li> <li>◆ Provide funding assistance for vulnerable communities</li> <li>◆ Manage the supply status of community water systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Additionally, as required by Water Code §10545, in areas that have nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination, consideration will be given to grant proposals that included projects that help address the impacts caused by nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination, including projects that provide safe drinking water to small disadvantaged communities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
8. Increase Flood Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Collaboratively plan for integrated flood and water management systems, and implement flood projects that protect public safety, increase water supply reliability, conserve farmlands, and restore ecosystems.</li> <li>◆ Improve access to emergency funds</li> <li>◆ Better coordinate flood response operations</li> <li>◆ Prioritize funding to reduce flood risk and improve flood response</li> <li>◆ Encourage flood projects that plan for climate change and achieve multiple benefits</li> </ul>
9. Increase Operational and Regulatory Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ This action is directed towards State and federal agencies; however, consideration will be afforded to eligible local or regional projects that also support increased operational of the State Water Project or Central Valley Project.</li> </ul>
10. Identify Sustainable and Integrated Financing Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ This action is directed towards State agencies and the legislature.</li> </ul>

## E. Grant Award Process

IRWM grants will be awarded using specific criteria contained in the individual PSPs and RFP.

If there are multiple IRWM regions in a Funding Area, those IRWM regions are competing for the funding allocated to that Funding Area. DWR will make funding decisions based on application scores within a Funding Area, as described in Section V below. In order to ensure wise investments of State general obligation bond funds, minimum scores for various criteria may be established to ensure that quality proposals are awarded funding.

## II. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

### A. Eligible Grant Applicants

Water Code §79712 identifies the following entities as eligible grant applicants:

- ◆ Public agencies
- ◆ Non-profit organizations
- ◆ Public utilities
- ◆ Federally recognized Indian Tribes
- ◆ State Indian Tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission’s Tribal Consultation list
- ◆ Mutual water companies

See Appendix B for definitions of these terms.

## APPENDIX H

### CHANGES TO 2012 IRWM PLAN STANDARDS

IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Plan Standards: Updates to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number
Region Description	2012 Guidelines (GL) Requirement (if applicable): Describe and explain how the plan will help reduce dependence on the Delta supply regionally. Updated code citation for the requirement: Public Resources Code §29700-29716.	37
	2012 GL Requirement: Describe water quality conditions.  Same requirement with the following additional detail pertaining to AB 1249: "If the IRWM region has areas of nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination, the Plan must include a description of location, extent, and impacts of the contamination; actions undertaken to address the contamination, and a description of any additional actions needed to address the contamination (Water Code §10541.(e)(14))."	37
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Describe likely Climate Change impacts on the region as determined from the vulnerability assessment <sup>1</sup> .	42
Plan Objectives	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge.	38, 42
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	38, 42
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.	38, 42
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: In evaluating different ways to meet IRWM plan objectives, where practical, consider the strategies adopted by CARB in its AB 32 Scoping Plan.	38, 42
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Consider options for carbon sequestration and using renewable energy where such options are integrally tied to supporting IRWM Plan objectives.	38, 42
Resource Management Strategies (RMS)	2012 GL Requirement: Consider all 29 California Water Plan (CWP) RMS criteria listed in Table 3 from the CWP Update 2009. Identify RMS incorporated in the IRWM Plan.  Same requirement with the following updates: CWP Update 2013 referred to instead of 2009. Additional RMS's in the 2013 update are Sediment Management, Outreach and Engagement, and Water and Culture (for a total of 32 requirements).	38

IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Plan Standards: Updates to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Consideration of climate change effects on the IRWM region must be factored into RMS.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: Identify and implement, using vulnerability assessments and tools such as those provided in the Climate Change Handbook, RMS and adaptation strategies that address region-specific climate change impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how the effects of climate change on its region are factored into its RMS.</li> <li>• Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.</li> <li>• An evaluation of RMS and other adaptation strategies and ability of such strategies to eliminate or minimize those vulnerabilities, especially those impacting water infrastructure systems.</li> </ul>	38, 42
Project Review Process	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Project's contribution to climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include potential effects of Climate Change on the region and consider if adaptations to the water management system are necessary.</li> <li>• Consider the contribution of the project to adapting to identified system vulnerabilities to climate change effects on the region.</li> <li>• Consider changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge.</li> <li>• Consider the effects of sea level rise on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.</li> </ul>	37, 43
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Contribution of project in reducing GHGs compared to project alternatives.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives</li> <li>• Consider a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over the 20-year planning horizon.</li> <li>• Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.</li> </ul>	39, 42
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Specific benefits to critical water issues for Native American Tribal communities.	52
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Contain policies and procedures that promote adaptive management and, as more effects of Climate Change manifest, new tools are developed, and new information becomes available, adjust IRWM Plans accordingly.	39, 43

IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Plan Standards: Updates to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number
Local Water Planning	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Discuss how the plan relates to these other planning documents and programs.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail:</p> <p>"It should be noted that Water Code § 10562 (b)(7) (i.e. SB 985) requires the development of a stormwater resource plan and compliance with these provisions to receive grants for stormwater and dry weather runoff capture projects. Upon development of the stormwater resource plan, the RWMG shall incorporate it into IRWM Plan. The IRWM Plan should discuss the processes that it will use to incorporate such plans. This requirement does not apply to DACs with a population of 20,000 or less and that is not a co-permittee for a municipal separate stormwater system national pollutant discharge elimination system permit issued to a municipality with a population greater than 20,000." Minor wording differences - e.g. Groundwater Sustainability Plan example in the 2016 Guidelines instead of Groundwater Management Plan in the 2012 Guidelines.</p>	62
	<p>Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Consider and incorporate water management issues and climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies from local plans into the IRWM Plan.</p>	41, 43
Local Land Use Planning	<p>Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Demonstrate information sharing and collaboration with regional land use planning in order to manage multiple water demands throughout the state, adapt water management systems to climate change, and potentially offset climate change impacts to water supply in California.</p>	30, 43
Stakeholder Involvement	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Contain a public process that provides outreach and opportunity to participate in the IRWM Plan.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "Native American Tribes – It should be noted that Tribes are sovereign nations, and as such coordination with Tribes is on a government-to-government basis."</p>	40
Climate Change	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Evaluate IRWM region's vulnerabilities to climate change and potential adaptation responses based on vulnerabilities assessment in the DWR Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "<b>At a minimum</b>, the vulnerability evaluation must be equivalent to the vulnerability assessment contained in the Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning, Section 4 and Appendix B."</p>	42, 69 - 71
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Provide a process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "At a minimum, that process must determine a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over a 20-year planning horizon and consider energy efficiency and reduction of GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives."</p>	39, 66 - 68
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Include a list of prioritized vulnerabilities based on the vulnerability assessment and the IRWM's decision making process.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "A list of prioritized vulnerabilities which includes a determination regarding the feasibility for the RWMG to address the priority vulnerabilities."</p>	40, 42 - 43, 54

IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Plan Standards: Updates to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality, and variability of runoff and recharge.	38 - 39, 42 - 43
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Areas of the State that receive water imported from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, the area within the Delta, and areas served by coastal aquifers must also consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	42

1. The vulnerability assessment contained in the Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning, Section 4 and Appendix B in 2016 Guidelines.

**Table 3 – Addressing Climate Change Within Existing IRWM Plan Standards**

<p>Climate Change</p>	<p><u>Adaptation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ A discussion of the potential effects of climate change on the IRWM region, including an evaluation of the IRWM region’s vulnerabilities to the effects of climate change and potential adaptation responses to those vulnerabilities. At a minimum, the vulnerability evaluation must be equivalent to the vulnerability assessment contained in the <i>Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning</i>, Section 4 and Appendix B<sup>1</sup>.</li> <li>◆ Consider changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge.</li> <li>◆ Consider the effects of SLR on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.</li> <li>◆ A list of prioritized vulnerabilities which includes a determination regarding the feasibility for the RWMG to address the priority vulnerabilities.</li> <li>◆ A plan, program, or methodology for further data gathering and analysis of the prioritized vulnerabilities.</li> <li>◆ Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality, and variability of runoff and recharge.</li> <li>◆ Areas of the State that receive water imported from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, the area within the Delta, and areas served by coastal aquifers must also consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mitigation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ A process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives. At a minimum, that process must determine a project’s ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over a 20-year planning horizon and consider energy efficiency and reduction of GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives.</li> </ul>
<p>Region Description</p>	<p>Describe likely Climate Change impacts on their region as determined from the vulnerability assessment.</p>
<p>Plan Objectives</p>	<p><u>Adaptation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge.</li> <li>◆ Consider the effects of SLR on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mitigation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.</li> <li>◆ In evaluating different ways to meet IRWM plan objectives, where practical, consider the strategies adopted by CARB in its AB 32 Scoping Plan<sup>1</sup>.</li> <li>◆ Consider options for carbon sequestration and using renewable energy where such options are integrally tied to supporting IRWM Plan objectives.</li> </ul>
<p>Resource Management Strategies</p>	<p>Identify and implement, using vulnerability assessments and tools such as those provided in the Climate Change Handbook, RMS and adaptation strategies that address region-specific climate change impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Demonstrate how the effects of climate change on its region are factored into its RMS.</li> <li>◆ Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.</li> <li>◆ An evaluation of RMS and other adaptation strategies and ability of such strategies to eliminate or minimize those vulnerabilities, especially those impacting water infrastructure systems.</li> </ul>

Table 3 – Addressing Climate Change Within Existing IRWM Plan Standards

Project Review Process	<p><u>Adaptation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Include potential effects of Climate Change on the region and consider if adaptations to the water management system are necessary.</li> <li>◆ Consider the contribution of the project to adapting to identified system vulnerabilities to climate change effects on the region.</li> <li>◆ Consider changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge.</li> <li>◆ Consider the effects of SLR on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mitigation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Consider the contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives</li> <li>◆ Consider a project’s ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over the 20-year planning horizon.</li> <li>◆ Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.</li> </ul>
Relation to Local Water Planning	Consider and incorporate water management issues and climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies from local plans into the IRWM Plan.
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	Demonstrate information sharing and collaboration with regional land use planning in order to manage multiple water demands throughout the state, adapt water management systems to climate change, and potentially offset climate change impacts to water supply in California.
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Contain policies and procedures that promote adaptive management and, as more effects of Climate Change manifest, new tools are developed, and new information becomes available, adjust IRWM plans accordingly.

1) Links to the above-referenced documents are listed in Volume 1, Appendix A of these guidelines.

### III. GUIDANCE FOR IRWM PLAN STANDARDS

#### Governance

Governance plays an important role in determining how many organizations function. A definition of governance is the processes, structures and organizational traditions that determine how power is exercised, how Native American Tribes and stakeholders have their say, how decisions are taken and how decision-makers are held to account. The intent of the Governance Standard is to ensure that an IRWM Plan has the structures and procedures that maximize functionality, participation in the Plan, and plan longevity.

DWR is not advocating any one governance structure or mechanism; rather it is up to the RWMG to determine what governance structure is best for the region. Existing IRWM Plans have used various governance forms, such as Joint Powers Authorities (JPA), MOU, Resolutions, and Consensus. Some governance structures are housed within a local government agency, which fulfills the coordinating role, while others are driven by committees that are comprised of individuals from multiple agencies or interests. Regardless of the governance structure configuration, participation in IRWM planning does not affect any powers granted to a local agency by any other law (IRWM Planning Act – Water Code §10548). Access to contacts for IRWM Plans to examine a variety of governance models can be found at the following link: <http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/contacts.cfm>

Regardless of form, governance should be effective in updating and implementing the IRWM Plan, while safeguarding and supporting collaboration among Native American Tribes and stakeholders. The IRWM Plan must include:

- ◆ Group responsible for development of Plan: RWMGs can include, but are not limited to, local public agencies, non-profit organizations, privately owned water utilities regulated by the Public Utilities Commission, Native American Tribes, and other stakeholders that are necessary to develop and implement the IRWM Plan. The description should include a listing of all entities responsible for development of the Plan and discuss their relationship to water management issues in the IRWM Region; in particular, the membership of the RWMG should be listed and those with statutory authority for water management (i.e. water use, water delivery, natural waters, water supply, water quality, flood waters, etc.) identified.

Many IRWM Plans present and discuss tables of the potential impacts and benefits of Plan implementation. Often times the building blocks of this information are the potential impacts and benefits anticipated from implementing projects. RWMGs may want to organize potential impacts and benefits to emphasize different aspects of their Plan, such as regional benefits, local benefits, by resource management strategy, or objective.

In presenting impacts and benefits information in an IRWM Plan, RWMGs should consider using tables to convey the potential impacts and benefits in an organized, understandable fashion. Table 4 provides an example that shows impacts and benefits specific to the IRWM Plan:

Program	Within IRWM Region		Inter-regional	
	Potential Impacts	Potential Benefits	Potential Impacts	Potential Benefits
Water Supply Enhancement				
Water Quality Improvement				
Groundwater Improvements				
Water Conservation and Reuse				
Watershed Rehabilitation				
Habitat Improvement				
Flood Management				
DAC and EJ Concerns				
Native American Tribal communities				

*NOTE: Level of impacts or benefits can be discussed as primary and secondary, by qualitative indicators, using monetary values, or other methods to show relative degree of impact or benefit.*

In the example above, RMS, project types, objectives, or other similar categories that are named in the IRWM Plan could be used to replace “Program.” IRWM Plans have various approaches on how to discuss impacts and benefits. These updates should reflect changes to the Impacts and Benefits section from any data gathered, and any changes to the implementation projects listed in the IRWM Plan.

The following text provides examples of impacts and benefits for the programs used in the example table above.

***WATER SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT***

A program to increase water supply may include projects, such as:

- ◆ Rehabilitation of diversion structures
- ◆ Water supply pipelines and water systems
- ◆ Additional water system tie-ins/interconnections
- ◆ Construction of groundwater treatment and extraction facilities
- ◆ Conjunctive water management
- ◆ Aquifer storage and recovery
- ◆ New or upgrades to existing reservoirs
- ◆ Water storage facilities
- ◆ Production well construction

Possible impacts may include reduced in-stream flow, water quality degradation, habitat removal, species removal, flooding, loss of farmland, and construction related impacts. Some of the proposed projects may have impacts on communities, including DACs. If so, these impacts should be discussed. If there are any EJ impacts, they should be addressed as well. Water supply benefits may be characterized as increased water supply or range in water supply (i.e. acre-feet per year). Other anticipated benefits, such as improved water quality, increased recreational opportunities, decreased reliance on imported water, reduced groundwater overdraft, creation of wetlands and riparian habitat, and decreased operational costs.

# V. IRWM PLAN STANDARDS REVIEW FORM

IRWM planning regions must have an IRWM Plan that has been reviewed and deemed consistent with the IRWM Plan Standards by DWR for eligibility to receiving Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant funding. DWR will use this IRWM Plan Standards Review Form, which can be found at the link in Volume 1, Appendix A and represented in Table 7, to ensure a consistent assessment of whether the 2016 IRWM Guidelines are being addressed in the IRWM Plan. The form contains a checklist for each of the 16 Plan Standards and narrative evaluations where required. The evaluation is pass/fail; there is no numeric scoring. Each Plan Standard is either sufficient or not, based on its associated requirements. Each Standard consists of between one and fifteen requirements. A Yes or No is automatically calculated in each Plan Standard header based on the individual requirement evaluations. In general, a passing score of "C" (i.e. 70% of the requirements for a given Plan Standard) is required for a Standard to pass. Standards with only one or 2 requirements will need one or both of those requirements to pass. Standards with 3 requirements will need at least 2 of the requirements to pass. Standards with 4 or 5 requirements will need at least 3 to pass. Some plan elements are legislated requirements. Such plan elements must be met in order to be considered consistent with plan standards. A summary of the sufficiency of each Standard is automatically calculated on the Standards Summary worksheet. A "No" evaluation indicates that a Standard was not met due to insufficient requirements comprising the Standard. The evaluation for each Plan Standard and any associated insufficiencies is automatically compiled on the Standards Summary page. Additional reviewer comments may be added at the bottom of each standards work sheet.

Note: This review form is meant to be a tool used in conjunction with the relevant IRWM Grant Program Guidelines document to assist in the evaluation of IRWM plans. It is not designed to be a substitute for the guidelines document itself. Reviewers must use the relevant guidelines in determining plan consistency.

Table 7 Plan Standards Review Tool Content			
DEFINITION OF TABLE HEADINGS			
<b>IRWM Plan Standard:</b>	As named in the 2016 IRWM Guidelines.		
<b>Overall Standard Sufficient:</b>	This field is either "YES" or "NO" and is automatically calculated based on the "Sufficient" column described below. If all fields are "y", the overall standard is deemed sufficient. Any entry other than a "y" in the Sufficient column (i.e. "n", "?", not sure, more detail needed, etc.) results in a NO.		
<b>Plan Standard Requirements Which Must Be Addressed</b>	Fields with an asterisk * are required by legislation to be included in an IRWM Plan.		
<b>Requirement</b>	Requirements are taken directly from the 2016 IRWM Guidelines.		
<b>Included</b>	Is the Guideline Requirement included in the IRWM Plan? The options are: y = yes, requirement is included in the IRWMP; or n = no, requirement is not included in the IRWMP. If only y or n then presence/absence of the requirement is sufficient for evaluation. If there is a "q" (qualitative) then add a brief narrative, similar to a Grant Application Review public evaluation or supporting information.		
<b>Plan Standard Source</b>			
<b>2016 IRWM Guidelines/Source Page(s)</b>	Page(s) in the Guidelines (2016 IRWM Guidelines) which pertain to the Requirement.		
<b>Legislative Support and/or Other Citations</b>	The CWC or other regulations that pertain to the Requirement, if applicable. This is for reference purposes. The cell links to a weblink of the regulatory code.		
<b>Evidence of Sufficiency</b>			
<b>Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan</b>	The page(s) or sections in the IRWM Plan where information on the Requirement can be found. This can be specific paragraphs or entire chapters for more general requirements.		
<b>Brief Qualitative Evaluation Narrative</b>	Supporting information for the Requirement if a "q" is in the Included column. This can be just a few sentences or a paragraph and can be taken directly from the IRWM Plan. Comments or supporting information may be entered regardless of whether required.		
<b>Sufficient</b>	Is the Guidelines requirement sufficiently represented in the IRWM Plan (y/n).		
<b>IRWM Plan Standards Review Form</b>			
<b>Regional Acceptance Process Planning Region:</b>			
<b>Regional Water Management Group:</b>			
<b>IRWM Plan Title: DWR Reviewer:</b>			
<b>ONE OR MORE PLAN STANDARDS NOT SUFFICIENT</b>			
<b>IRWM Plan Standard</b>	<b>Overall Sufficient</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>Requirement(s) Insufficient</b>
Governance	Yes/No		

Table 7 Plan Standards Review Tool Content		
Region Description	Yes/No	
Objectives	Yes/No	
Resource Management Strategies	Yes/No	
Integration <sup>1</sup>	Yes/No	
Project Review Process	Yes/No	
Impact and Benefit	Yes/No	
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Yes/No	
Data Management	Yes/No	
Finance	Yes/No	
Technical Analysis	Yes/No	
Relation to Local Water Planning	Yes/No	
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	Yes/No	
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes/No	
Coordination	Yes/No	
Climate Change	Yes/No	
Additional Comments:		
1. If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per the relevant IRWM Program Guidelines.		

## VI. REGION ACCEPTANCE PROCESS

DWR uses the RAP to evaluate and accept an IRWM region into the IRWM Grant Program, pursuant to Water Code §10541(f). Acceptance of a region through the RAP process is necessary for IRWM regions that anticipate applying for DWR's IRWM grant funding programs.

This section discusses When to Submit, Who Should Submit, What to Submit, How to Submit, and the RAP Review Steps.

DWR will conduct RAP evaluations on an as needed/on request basis in order to provide an opportunity to those regions that have not been accepted into the IRWM Grant Program or that have addressed any prior conditional approval requirements to be evaluated for acceptance into the IRWM Grant Program.

Events that may cause a region to have their previously approved region acceptance status suspended by DWR include but are not limited to: changes in the regional boundary, loss or addition of signatory agencies of the RWMG, continued and prolonged inactivity, and inability to self-sustain IRWM efforts, changes in statutory requirements, or changes in state water management policy. DWR will evaluate any above-listed changes on a case-by-case-basis and will make a suitable determination of the region acceptance status. In the event that DWR suspends a region's acceptance status, DWR will provide the RWMG with written notice of their suspension and the basis for that suspension.

The RWMG may also use the RAP process to formally document more ministerial actions, such as changes to the region name or minor alterations to the regional boundary.

### When to Submit

An IRWM region seeking acceptance into the IRWM Grant Program may submit a complete RAP application to DWR at any time.

### Who Should Submit

The RWMG, or an entity representing an IRWM, region that meets one of the following conditions should submit RAP materials on behalf of the proposed IRWM region:

- ◆ Has not already been granted region acceptance
- ◆ Has made significant modifications to the region's characteristics that necessitate reevaluation of the region

Any entity submitting RAP materials on behalf of the RWMG must have been granted specific consent by the RWMG.

## What to Submit

The RWMG shall submit RAP materials in the form of written text, maps, figures, and tables that demonstrate that the IRWM region is the most comprehensive, contiguous area defined by common water management issues related to the water system(s), both natural and man-made, including water supply, water quality, environmental stewardship, and flood management.

DWR understands that some regions may be in the initial developmental process and other regions may have more fully developed IRWM planning efforts. A developing IRWM region and an established region may have differing abilities to provide information about their IRWM region. In such cases as appropriate, the developing region may only be able to provide a conceptual discussion and limited supporting information regarding the composition of the IRWM region. The RAP materials must provide the information necessary to justify and support the proposed region boundary. The RAP materials should thoroughly support the basis for the proposed region boundary. The information submitted should be clear and succinctly written. Please do not submit non-essential information. Table 8 describes the specific information a RWMG must submit for the RAP. Corresponding evaluation criteria is provided to clarify how the submitted material will be assessed. If the IRWM region was conditionally accepted in a previous RAP and is submitting information in a subsequent RAP to remove the condition, the entity submitting RAP materials should contact DWR before preparing the RAP submittal. In such cases a full RAP submittal may not be necessary.

In the case of minor alterations to a previously approved IRWM region, the RWMG may submit a letter report documenting the proposed change(s). DWR will review the letter and either make a decision based on the letter or request additional information if deemed necessary.

**Table 8 – Submittal Materials and Reviewer Information**

WHAT TO SUBMIT	EVALUATION CRITERIA
<p><u>Submitting Entity:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contact information (name, address, phone, fax, and e-mail) of the person with whom DWR should coordinate.</li> <li>Information on the submitting entity including why the RWMG has selected the entity to submit the RAP materials.</li> </ol>	<p>Ensure that contact information was provided. Is it clear that the submitting agency has been given permission to submit on behalf of the RWMG?</p>
<p><u>RWMG Composition:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A description of the composition of the RWMG. Identify RWMG members, including their statutory authority over water supply or water management, their role in the IRWM effort, regional water management responsibilities, and the level of IRWM participation. For each entity, state whether they have adopted, plan to adopt, or will not adopt the IRWM Plan. For the purposes of this document “statutory authority over water supply or water management” may include, but is not limited to, water supply, water quality management, wastewater treatment, flood management/control, or storm water management. This should include a discussion of whether or how Native American Tribes will participate in the RWMG.</li> <li>A description of the difference between RWMG members and stakeholders in terms of development, participation, decision-making, and adoption of the IRWM Plan.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have all the RWMG members indicated that they have adopted or plan to adopt the completed IRWM plan?</li> <li>Does the RWMG consist of at least 3 agencies with at least 2 local agencies having statutory authority over water supply, water quality, water management, or flood protection?</li> <li>Was a discussion provided about the participation of Native American Tribe in the RWMG?</li> <li>Is there diversity in the water management responsibilities of the RWMG members?</li> <li>For entities that are not currently participating in the IRWM effort, are any of these not adequately represented by other RWMG members or stakeholders holding similar water management interests?</li> </ul>

**Table 8 – Submittal Materials and Reviewer Information**

WHAT TO SUBMIT	EVALUATION CRITERIA
<p><u>Stakeholder Inclusiveness:</u></p> <p>5. A listing of the stakeholders participating in the IRWM Plan including each stakeholder’s tie to water management within the IRWM region.</p> <p>6. Describe the procedures, processes, or structures that promote access to information and collaboration among people or agencies, including DAC and EDAs with diverse water management views within the region.</p> <p>7. A listing of agencies or entities that are not currently participating in the IRWM efforts but could possibly in the future. Also list each of these agencies’ or entities’ ties to water management within the IRWM region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the submitted material demonstrate a diverse range of stakeholders including DACs and other interests in water management and use?</li> <li>• Are stakeholders given an opportunity to participate?</li> <li>• Does it appear that the IRWM region is inclusive and utilizes a collaborative, multi-stakeholder process that provides mechanisms to assist and involve DAC and EDAs in addressing water management issues?</li> <li>• Do the RWMG members and stakeholders have access to and exchange information on water management issues?</li> <li>• Are processes and procedures in place that outreach to and allow participation by those entities currently not participating?</li> </ul>
<p><u>Public Involvement:</u></p> <p>8. A description of the process being used that makes the public both aware of and part of IRWM efforts.</p> <p>9. Discuss ways for the public to gain access to the RWMG and IRWM Plan for information and how the public is allowed to provide input.</p> <p>10. Discuss how the RWMG evaluates and responds to public input.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the RWMG allow the public to participate in regular meetings?</li> <li>• Is there an established method of making meeting agendas, notices, and minutes accessible?</li> <li>• Are the items above posted with sufficient lead-time for the public to participate in meetings?</li> <li>• Is it clear who the public should contact within the RWMG if they have questions regarding regional water management efforts or IRWM planning and implementation in the region?</li> <li>• Are there public meetings held to solicit public comments ahead of major decisions to be made by the RWMG?</li> <li>• What is the process for the public to provide input to the RWMG on regional water management and on the IRWM Plan?</li> <li>• What is the process being used by the RWMG to evaluate and respond to public input?</li> </ul>
<p><u>Governance:</u></p> <p>11. Describe the RWMG governance structure and how it will facilitate the sustained development of regional water management and the IRWM process, both now and beyond the state grant IRWM funding programs.</p> <p>12. Describe how decisions are made. Identify the steps by which the RWMG arrives at decisions and how RWMG members and stakeholders participate in the decision-making process. Examples of RWMG decisions to consider in the discussion include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Establishing IRWM Plan goals and objectives</li> <li>b. Prioritizing projects</li> <li>c. Financing RWMG and IRWM Plan activities</li> <li>d. Implementing plan activities</li> <li>e. Making future revisions to the IRWM Plan</li> </ol> <p>13. Describe how the RWMG will incorporate new members into the governance structure. Explain the manner in which a balance of interested persons or entities representing different sectors and interests have been or will be engaged in the process, regardless of their ability to contribute financially to the plan.</p> <p>14. Describe any conflict resolution processes and any known existing conflicts regarding water management in the region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how decisions are made, including establishing plan goals and objectives, prioritizing projects, financing RWMG activities, implementing plan activities, and making future revisions to the IRWM Plan?</li> <li>• Who participates in the decision making process?</li> <li>• Are all of the RWMG members involved or are there designated committees?</li> <li>• Does the governance structure allow only certain RWMG members to vote on decisions?</li> <li>• Does the decision making process allow for the participation of stakeholders and smaller entities?</li> <li>• Can stakeholders influence RWMG decisions?</li> <li>• Do members have to contribute financially to the RWMG to be allowed a voice?</li> <li>• Can the RWMG governance structure facilitate the sustained development of the IRWM region now and beyond the current IRWM funding programs?</li> <li>• Do conflict resolution processes exist in the governance structure?</li> <li>• Will the processes and procedures as described result in the promotion of integrated, multi-benefit, regional solutions that incorporate environmental stewardship toward development and implementation of the IRWM</li> </ul>

**Table 8 – Submittal Materials and Reviewer Information**

WHAT TO SUBMIT	EVALUATION CRITERIA
<p>15. Explain how the governance structure results in an IRWM planning effort that is inclusive and utilizes a collaborative, multi-stakeholder process that provides mechanisms to assist DAC and EDAs; addresses water management issues; and promotes integrated, multi-benefit, regional solutions that incorporate environmental stewardship toward the development and implementation of the IRWM Plan.</p>	<p>Plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the RWMG demonstrate a reasonable and effective governance structure for development and implementation of the IRWM Plan?</li> </ul>
<p><u>Region:</u></p> <p>16. Present the features that dictate and describe how the IRWM regional boundary was determined, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Political/jurisdictional boundaries</li> <li>b. Groundwater basins as defined in DWR Bulletin 118, Update 2003 – California’s Groundwater</li> <li>c. Watersheds</li> <li>d. RWQCB boundaries</li> <li>e. Physical, topographical, geographical, and biological features</li> <li>f. Surface water bodies</li> <li>g. Major water-related infrastructure</li> </ol> <p>17. Explain how the IRWM region encompasses the service areas of multiple local agencies and will maximize opportunities to integrate water management activities related to natural and manmade water systems, including water supply reliability, water quality, environmental stewardship, and flood management.</p> <p>18. Please include a map of the IRWM boundary.</p> <p>19. Please include a GIS shapefile on CD showing the IRWM region boundary. The GIS file must be NAD83, UTM 10 or UTM11.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it appear that the IRWM region boundary was based solely on jurisdictional boundaries?</li> <li>• Is the basis and rationale clear for the IRWM region boundary?</li> <li>• Does the region make sense for long-term water management? How?</li> <li>• Does the IRWM region boundary consider multiple water management boundaries such as watersheds and groundwater basins?</li> <li>• Does the IRWM region encompass the service areas of multiple local agencies?</li> <li>• Does it appear that the IRWM region is structured: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To maximize opportunities to integrate water management activities related to natural and man-made water systems, including water supply reliability, water quality, environmental stewardship, and flood management?</li> <li>○ Such that the water management portfolio in the region is strengthened and diversified?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><u>Water Management History:</u></p> <p>20. Describe the history of IRWM efforts in the region.</p> <p>21. Describe the regional water management issues and any water-related conflicts in the region. Include a discussion of any progress towards resolution of any water-related conflicts. Issues and conflicts may relate to water supply, water rights, water quality, flood management, environmental stewardship, imported water, waste water, conjunctive use, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the history of the IRWM efforts in the region discussed?</li> <li>• Are the water management issues and water-related conflicts presented clearly?</li> <li>• If applicable, how has water conflict been managed in the region?</li> <li>• Does the region boundary appear appropriate given the context of the region’s unique water management issues?</li> <li>• Do the listed stakeholders (See Stakeholder Inclusiveness, above) provide a balanced representation of the water issues in the region?</li> </ul>

**Table 8 – Submittal Materials and Reviewer Information**

WHAT TO SUBMIT	EVALUATION CRITERIA
<p><u>Inter-regional Coordination:</u></p> <p>22. A description of the IRWM region's relationship and coordination with adjacent IRWM regions.</p> <p>23. Identify any overlapping areas and explain the basis for the overlap. Discuss whether there is a clear relationship and acknowledgement by both regions that the overlap is acceptable.</p> <p>24. Describe any areas within the IRWM region boundary that are excluded or create a void area with adjacent IRWM regions and explain why this is reasonable and appropriate.</p> <p>25. Describe any distinct water management differences between adjacent or overlapping IRWM regions that support being separate IRWM regions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the RWMG successfully managed overlaps or gaps within and outside of the region boundary?</li> <li>• If there are overlapping IRWM regions, is there a clearly defined relationship between the IRWM planning efforts?</li> <li>• Are there indications that the overlapping regions have discussed and will continue to discuss their water management issues and coordinate on activities occurring in overlapping areas?</li> <li>• If there are inter-regional water management issues across adjacent IRWM regions, is there a clearly defined relationship between the IRWM planning efforts?</li> <li>• Are there indications that the adjacent regions have committed to a process to address their inter-regional water management issues and coordinate on interrelated water management activities?</li> <li>• Does the submittal describe any areas within the region that are excluded or create a void area, and if so, explain why this is reasonable and appropriate?</li> <li>• Has the boundary been drawn such that the region leaves uncovered areas immediately outside the boundary?</li> <li>• Based on the justification for the region boundary, the water management issues, and coordination with adjacent areas, does the proposed region represent the largest defined contiguous geographic area that maximizes opportunities to integrate water management activities related to natural and man-made water systems?</li> </ul>

## How to Submit

Applicants may e-mail the complete RAP application to DWR at [DWR\\_IRWM@water.ca.gov](mailto:DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov) or may submit information with their Planning Grant application. Please see the 2016 Planning Grant PSP for further information on submitting a RAP application as part of a planning grant application.

## IRWM RAP Review Steps

### **STEP 1 – SUBMISSION OF RAP MATERIAL**

RWMG submits materials to DWR, as described in “What to Submit” column of Table 8.

### **STEP 2 – DWR REVIEWS RAP MATERIAL**

DWR reviews the RAP material using evaluation criteria from Table 8, and makes one of the following determinations:

1. Application not accepted. The information presented does not support the concepts and basis for the proposed IRWM region, including the region boundary and governance structure of the RWMG. Following this review, DWR will identify for the applicant the reasons why the application does not support the basis for the IRWM region.
2. Application potentially accepted. Based on the information presented, DWR may schedule an interview with the RWMG. DWR will prepare a list of questions or discussion points to clarify the questionnaire responses. An e-mail with the questions/discussion points will be sent to the point-of-contact indicated in the RAP materials submitted by the RWMG. The e-mail will also provide the date, time, and location of the interview.

# 2016 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposals

Integrated Regional Water Management  
July 2016



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY  
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF  
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT



# FOREWORD

This document contains the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program.

This document is not a standalone document and the applicant will need to refer to the 2016 IRWM Program Guidelines (2016 IRWM Guidelines) for additional information (see link below).

## **Grant Program Website**

DWR will use the internet as a communication tool to notify interested parties of the status of the grant funding opportunities and to convey pertinent information. Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program related information, including the 2016 IRWM Guidelines, can be found at the following website:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/prop1index.cfm>. DAC Involvement Program information and resources can be found from this link by clicking on the link at the right-hand side of the screen.

See the 2016 Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines (2016 IRWM Guidelines), Volume 1, Appendix A for other useful web links, Appendix B for common usage of terms and definitions, Appendix E for information on Disadvantaged Communities, and Appendix F for the criteria and terms related to Economically Distressed Areas.

## **Mailing List**

In addition to the above-referenced website, DWR will distribute information via e-mail. If you are not already on the IRWM e-mail distribution list and wish to be placed on it, please visit the following site:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/subscribe.cfm>.

## **Contact Information**

For questions about the 2016 IRWM Guidelines, how to submit a proposal, or other issues, please contact DWR's Financial Assistance Branch at (916) 651-9613 or by e-mail at [DWR\\_IRWM@water.ca.gov](mailto:DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov).

## I. INTRODUCTION

This document contains the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR) Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (Program) authorized by the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act (Proposition 1). The 2016 IRWM Guidelines can be found at the link listed in the Foreword.

Water Code §79745 requires DWR to expend not less than 10 percent of the Proposition 1, Chapter 7 funds authorized for the IRWM Grant Program, \$51 million, for the purpose of ensuring involvement of disadvantaged communities (DACs), economically distressed areas (EDAs), or underrepresented communities (in this document collectively referred to as DACs) in IRWM planning efforts. DWR is establishing this Program to support the following objectives:

- 1) Work collaboratively to involve DACs, community-based organizations, and stakeholders in IRWM planning efforts to ensure balanced access and opportunity for participation in the IRWM planning process
- 2) Increase the understanding, and where necessary, identify the water management needs of DACs on a Funding Area basis
- 3) Develop strategies and long-term solutions that appropriately address the identified DAC water management needs

It is DWR's intent to move forward efficiently with the RFP process so that the water management needs of DACs can be more fully included in IRWM planning efforts and future funding opportunities through the IRWM Grant Program or other financial assistance programs.

## II. PROGRAM SCHEDULE

The schedule in Table 1 outlines the timeframe for this Program. Updates for the events listed in this schedule may be required. Any schedule updates will be posted on the website listed in the Foreword.

<b>Table 1 - DAC Involvement Program Schedule</b>	
<b>Milestone or Activity</b>	<b>Schedule</b>
Release of final DAC Involvement RFP	August 1, 2016
DAC Involvement Call for Proposals Workshop ( <i>web broadcast</i> ) Byron Sher Auditorium 1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95812 This meeting will be web broadcast via the following link: <a href="https://video.calepa.ca.gov/">https://video.calepa.ca.gov/</a>	August 18, 2016 at 10:00am
Accept proposals	<i>Between September 2016 and January 2017</i>
Grant awards	<i>Upon proposal approval</i>

*Italics denote time that may vary.*

## III. FUNDING

DWR requires a single Funding Area-wide proposal from each of the 12 Proposition 1 Funding Areas. DWR will work with the regional water management groups (RWMGs) within each Funding Area, to develop proposals to perform activities that involve DACs in IRWM planning efforts, including helping define, understand, and address DAC water management needs through a collaborative approach. The funding dispersed by this RFP will be allocated and awarded with not less than 10 percent by Funding Area, as shown in the minimum available funds column of Table 2. Local cost share is not required for this Program.

Table 2 - Proposition 1 Funding Allocation for the DAC Involvement Program	
Funding Areas	Minimum Available Funds
North Coast	\$2,650,000
San Francisco Bay Area	\$6,500,000
Central Coast	\$4,300,000
Los Angeles	\$9,800,000
Santa Ana	\$6,300,000
San Diego	\$5,250,000
Sacramento River	\$3,700,000
San Joaquin River	\$3,100,000
Tulare/Kern	\$3,400,000
Lahontan	\$2,450,000
Colorado River	\$2,250,000
Mountain Counties	\$1,300,000

#### IV. PROPOSAL SUBMITTALS

Applicants must submit the following information to DWR. Additionally, if phases of work are anticipated, provide that level of detail in the proposal.

##### A. Applicant

Provide the applicant contact information and a short statement (500 characters or less) of how the applicant was selected by the DACs, RWMG(s), community based organizations, and stakeholders within the Funding Area. The proposal must contain a letter from each RWMG in the Funding Area discussing whether the RWMG supports the selection of the applicant or provide an explanation if a letter is not included from specific IRWM regions.

##### B. DAC Background

Provide a baseline understanding of DAC water management needs from the Funding Area's perspective. This section must not exceed 5,000 characters and shall include the following:

- ◆ A description of the known DAC water management needs in the Funding Area.
- ◆ An outline of the existing Funding Area strategy(ies) to address DAC water management needs across the Funding Area.
- ◆ A discussion as to the level IRWM regions in the Funding Area have involved or engaged DAC members in IRWM planning efforts; if there has been no DAC involvement, identify possible barriers.
- ◆ A map that identifies all known DAC, EDA, and underrepresented communities within the Funding Area. Please show on the map all IRWM region boundaries and all proposed involvement activity boundaries. DWR's DAC and EDA mapping tools may be useful references and can be found at the links listed in the 2016 IRWM Program Guidelines, Volume I, Appendix A.
- ◆ A discussion of the underrepresented communities within the Funding Area.

##### C. Activity Descriptions

Provide a detailed description of the proposed activities. There is no page or character limit on this section, but applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise. The description should include the following:

- ◆ Provide a title, description, and task outline for the proposed activities
- ◆ Justify how the proposed activities meet one or more of the desired outcomes in Table 3; or other potential outcomes
- ◆ Include a list of deliverables that will result from the proposed activities, including required final reporting obligations (see below in Section VII. Grant Agreement and Appendix A of this RFP)
- ◆ A description of the key milestones of proposed activities and any related assumptions for the proposal schedule

## D. Statement of Qualifications

The proposal must include a discussion of the entities that are anticipated to be tasked to undertake the proposed activities. The discussion must include a statement of qualifications for each activity that demonstrates that each entity tasked possesses the appropriate qualifications to interface and work with DAC members. This section must not exceed 5,000 characters and should include the following:

- ◆ List the necessary qualifications of staff, community-based organizations, or consultants that are needed to work on the proposed activities
- ◆ Identify participants, if known, including the applicant, RWMG representatives, community-based organizations, or consultants who currently work with DACs. If known, describe the existing participant's qualifications with the following criteria:
  - Past performance on similar projects at a regional, community or local level
  - Qualifications in and knowledge of DAC involvement activities listed in Table 3
  - Ability to proactively manage the proposed activities to ensure a timely and successful completion

## E. Schedule

Provide a schedule of the key milestones for the proposed activities. Gantt charts, bar charts, or other graphic displays are acceptable. Proposed activities should be completed within three years of grant award. The schedule should show the anticipated overall start date and end date of each proposed activity and also show quarterly and final reporting obligations. Activity sub-task schedule dates are not required.

## F. Budget

Provide a budget in tabular form for the proposal. This budget must include the anticipated overall budget for each proposed activity and the basis of estimate for the activities described within the budget. The budget must also include the estimate for all grant administrative costs, if any.

## V. ELIGIBILITY

### A. Eligible Applicants

The Funding Area applicant must be an eligible applicant as defined in the 2016 IRWM Guidelines Sections II.A and B, Appendix B, and shown below:

- ◆ Public agencies
- ◆ Non-profit organizations
- ◆ Public utilities
- ◆ Federally recognized Indian Tribes
- ◆ State Indian Tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's Tribal Consultation list
- ◆ Mutual Water Companies

### B. Eligible Costs

Costs incurred after award date are eligible for reimbursement. Eligible costs include, but are not limited to, expenditures for involvement activities as discussed below and travel costs at the state rate. Grantees are encouraged to limit grant administrative costs. Grant administrative costs include coordinating contractual obligations with DWR, quarterly reporting, and submitting invoices. DWR encourages grant administrative costs are no more than 5 percent of the total grant amount.

### C. Eligible Activities

Table 3 provides guidance to applicants on the types of activities that are eligible for State reimbursement under this Program. Proposed activities submitted that fall outside of this guidance will need to be justified in the proposal for DWR to approve of the proposed activity and intended outcome. Applicants are encouraged to review previous DAC pilot projects funded by the IRWM Grant Program and other DAC Reports and Studies as cited in Appendix A of the 2016 IRWM Guidelines. Applicants are encouraged to review the documents and build off the prior works and general recommendations to the extent feasible.

Ineligible activities and costs are not reimbursable by this Program and include, but are not limited to, the following items:

- ◆ Application preparation costs for funding opportunities not consistent with the purposes of the Proposition 1 IRWM funding
- ◆ Meals not directly related to travel
- ◆ Payment of stipends

<b>Table 3 – Eligible DAC Involvement Activities</b>		
<b>General Activity</b>	<b>Examples of Activity</b>	<b>Desired Outcome</b>
Needs Assessments (required)	Surveys or meetings with community members to identify water management needs	Needs Assessments provide better understanding of water management needs to help direct resources and funding
Education	Translation or interpretive services for information sharing, water campaigns for community, RWMGs education on DAC needs	Education and interpretive services provide better understanding by community members or RWMGs of water management needs
Community Outreach	Public meetings open to DAC community members, door-to-door outreach	Outreach increases participation in IRWM planning or project development activities
Engagement in IRWM Efforts	DAC regional engagement coordinator role, DAC Advisory Committee to RWMG, DAC representatives in governance	Engagement activities increases activity and roles of DACs in RWMG decision making and increased participation in IRWM efforts
Facilitation	Facilitated RWMG meetings, facilitated project development meetings	Facilitation services encourage participation and stakeholders resolving or overcoming obstacles in communicating needs
Technical Assistance	Service provider trainings, local circuit rider programs to train water and wastewater staff	Technical, financial, or managerial assistance results in community staff able to support local decision making, knowledge, and skills
Governance Structure	Evaluation of governance structures and related plan financing, assessment of DAC involvement in decision making processes	Evaluation of RWMG governance to ensure DAC participation in IRWM regardless of ability to contribute financially
Site Assessment	Water quality assessments, median household income surveys, data and mapping activities	Site assessment results in knowledge gained by community staff on water management needs and data for project development
Enhancement of DAC aspects in IRWM plans	Development of Funding Area-wide DAC plan to be utilized as a unified approach for all IRWM plans	IRWM plan DAC-related changes result in IRWM plan updates that support the RWMG's understanding of DAC needs
Project Development Activities or Construction	Planning activities, environmental compliance, pre-construction engineering/design activities, or construction activities	Project development activities for future implementation/construction funding or construction activities

## **VI. PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESS**

### **A. Funding Area Coordination**

Prior to submitting a proposal to DWR, prospective applicants should, at a minimum, undertake the following actions, in conjunction with DACs, RWMG(s), community based organizations, and stakeholders:

- ◆ Discuss interest in being the Grantee for execution and management of the agreement
- ◆ Develop an initial list of potential involvement activities
- ◆ Evaluate whether the initial list of potential involvement activities aligns with the eligible activities listed below or whether those activities are ineligible

DWR will host a DAC Involvement “Call for Proposals” Workshop(s) prior to proposal submittals to discuss with Funding Area stakeholders the level of detail to be included in the proposals and expectations of this Program. The workshop information will be listed on the Upcoming Events on the website listed in the Foreword.

### **B. Proposal Review and Approval**

Applicants should prepare and submit a proposal as based on the information requested in Section IV of this RFP. Complete proposals must be submitted in Microsoft Word format to DWR via email listed in the Foreword. Once proposals are submitted, DWR, in coordination with the State Water Resources Control

Board (SWRCB), will review the materials for its responsiveness to this RFP and then contact the Funding Area applicant to schedule a coordination meeting, if necessary. At this meeting, DWR may ask general questions regarding the proposal development process and discuss comments pertaining to the submittal. The Funding Area applicant and DWR may have additional meetings regarding any needed proposal changes to ensure the proposed activities are appropriate for this Program. Throughout proposal development and implementation, DWR expects broad participation by the applicant, members of DACs or community-based organizations, RWMG representatives, and stakeholders.

#### **Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

Each proposal will be evaluated based on the following criteria as being sufficient or not sufficient pertaining to responsiveness to the RFP.

- ◆ **Applied Nature of the Proposal.** The extents to which the proposed activities are structured to assist DACs, identify community water management needs, and meet the objectives of this Program.
- ◆ **Relevance and Importance.** The extent to which the regions develop the DAC involvement activities to adequately address the most relevant and important community needs, consistent with the intent of this RFP.
- ◆ **Feasibility.** (1) The extent to which the proposal objectives, methodologies, designs, and involvement activities are adequately and completely articulated; and (2) the likelihood of success given the methods and time frame proposed.
- ◆ **Past Performance.** The extent to which the proposal (1) provides an explanation of past IRWM practices of involving DACs; and (2) builds upon existing DAC involvement and engagement.
- ◆ **Qualifications of the Staff/Consultants.** The extent to which the qualifications of the staff/consultants are commensurate with the proposed activities and are experienced in regional, community, and local knowledge of DAC needs. The use of facilities and equipment must be justified.

#### **Proposal Approval and Grant Award**

Once all requirements of the RFP are met and DWR approves the proposal, DWR will announce awards by issuing a commitment letter on a per Funding Area basis. If an acceptable proposal is not developed in a timely manner, DWR may directly expend the funds to support DAC involvement actions within the relevant Funding Area or the Funding Area funds will remain un-awarded until such time that a responsive proposal is submitted. For this program only, the approval of grant awards has been delegated from DWR's Director to the Chief of the Division of IRWM; thereby modifying Section IV.D, Volume I of the 2016 IRWM Guidelines .

## **VII. GRANT AGREEMENT**

After the grant award is approved, an agreement will be developed and executed between the DWR and the Grantee; funds will not be disbursed until there is an executed agreement. An agreement template will be posted on the DAC Involvement website as referenced in the Foreword.

As part of the grant agreement, the Funding Area Grantee will be required to submit quarterly progress reports, invoices, and deliverables. As part of reporting results on activity performance, DWR will host semi-annual coordination conference calls with the 12 Grantees. DWR will also request formal visits or meetings to monitor activities through the duration of the agreement. As part of the grant agreement, deliverables and a Final Report that includes a Funding Area-wide Needs Assessment will be required (see Appendix A). Funding Areas shall be requested by DWR to provide a presentation of completed activities near the end of the activities, prior to termination of the agreement.

## APPENDIX A

Appendix A includes the templates for the Final Report and the Funding Area-wide Needs Assessment. The Funding Area may modify the Needs Assessment template based on the specific needs identified by the Funding Area in consultation with DWR.

### FINAL REPORT TEMPLATE

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Stakeholder Summary
  - a. General description of water management needs of DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities at the Funding Area learned from the activities performed in this program
  - b. General summary of DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities involved in IRWM efforts through this Program
  - c. Map(s) identifying all DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities with IRWM regions learned from the activities performed in this program
- III. Involvement Activity Summary
  - a. General description of involvement activities performed in this Program, including both successful and unsuccessful involvement activities
  - b. Identification of projects developed from the DAC involvement activities, if applicable
- IV. Findings
  - a. Needs Assessment
    - i. Narrative summary of community characteristics identified and specific community water management needs and resources (technical, managerial, and financial) to address the needs of DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities
    - ii. Needs Assessment template table filled in (at the community level)
  - b. Identification of ongoing barriers for DAC involvement in IRWM efforts
  - c. Recommendations for water managers on future DAC involvement activities in IRWM efforts
- V. Looking into the Future
  - a. Next steps for the IRWM regions to continue DAC involvement efforts
- VI. References

**NEEDS ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE**

*Example Tables - May be modified to best fit specific needs*  
**Identify the following for DAC communities within the Funding Area:**

Community Characteristics				Drinking Water							Wastewater		Stormwater	Other	Water System Financing				
Community	County	IRWM region	Describe community characteristics (i.e. MHU, population, or other DAC indicators)	Describe involvement with local IRWM Governance	Source(s) of water	Estimate number of private wells	Estimate number of public wells	Water supply treatment (i.e. carbon, RO, etc.)	Accessible for community (y/n)	Affordable for community (y/n)	Identify any drinking water system issues	Type of system	Describe any insufficient wastewater system issues	Identify stormwater/urban water runoff/ flood management issues	Identify drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater regulatory/compliance issues	Identify other conditions/issues (drought, etc.)	Identify the rate structure (i.e. block, tiered)	Describe system financing needs (i.e. operation and maintenance costs)	
1																			
2																			
3																			
4																			
5																			
6																			
7																			
8																			
9																			
10																			

*\*Note: Multiple rows can be used to describe the current characteristics of a community*

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY  
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT

<b>IRWM PLAN REVIEW FORM</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
<p>IRWM planning regions must have an IRWM Plan that has been reviewed and deemed consistent with the IRWM Plan Standards by DWR for eligibility to receiving Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant funding. DWR will use this IRWM Plan Standards Review Form, which can be found at the link in Volume 1, Appendix A of the 2016 Guidelines and represented in Table 7 of the Guidelines, to ensure a consistent assessment of whether the 2016 IRWM Guidelines are being addressed in the IRWM Plan. The form contains a checklist for each of the 16 Plan Standards and narrative evaluations where required. The evaluation is pass/fail; there is no numeric scoring. Each Plan Standard is either sufficient or not, based on its associated requirements. Each Standard consists of between one and fifteen requirements. A Yes or No is automatically calculated in each Plan Standard header based on the individual requirement evaluations. In general, a passing score of "C" (i.e. 70% of the requirements for a given Plan Standard) is required for a Standard to pass. Standards with only one or 2 requirements will need one or both of those requirements to pass. Standards with 3 requirements will need at least 2 of the requirements to pass. Standards with 4 or 5 requirements will need at least 3 to pass. Some plan elements are legislated requirements. Such plan elements must be met in order to be considered consistent with plan standards. A summary of the sufficiency of each Standard is automatically calculated on the Standards Summary worksheet. A "No" evaluation indicates that a Standard was not met due to insufficient requirements comprising the Standard. The evaluation for each Plan Standard and any associated insufficiencies is summarized on the Standards Summary page. Additional reviewer comments may be added at the bottom of each standards work sheet.</p>	
<p><b>Note:</b> This review form is meant to be a tool used in conjunction with the 2016 IRWM Guidelines document to assist in the evaluation of IRWM plans. It is not designed to be a substitute for the Guidelines document itself. Reviewers must use the Guidelines in determining plan consistency.</p>	
<b>DEFINITION OF TABLE HEADINGS</b>	
<b>IRWM Plan Standard:</b>	As named in the 2016 IRWM Guidelines.
<b>Overall Standard Sufficient:</b>	This field is either "YES" or "NO" and is automatically calculated based on the "Sufficient" column described below. If all fields are "y", the overall standard is deemed sufficient. Any entry other than a "y" in the Sufficient column (i.e. "n", "?", not sure, more detail needed, etc.) results in a NO.
<b>Plan Standard Requirements Which Must Be Addressed:</b>	Fields with a footnote ( ) are required by legislation to be included in an IRWM Plan.
<b>Requirement</b>	Requirements are taken directly from the 2016 IRWM Guidelines.
<b>2016 IRWM Guidelines Source Page(s)</b>	Page(s) in the 2016 IRWM Guidelines which pertain to the Requirement and include the regulatory or other citations where applicable.
<b>Included</b>	Is the Guideline Requirement included in the IRWM Plan? The options are: y = yes, requirement is included in the IRWMP; or n = no, requirement is not included in the IRWMP. If only y or n then presence/absence of the requirement is sufficient for evaluation. If there is a "q" (qualitative) then add a brief narrative, similar to a Grant Application Review public evaluation or supporting information.
<b>Evidence of Plan Sufficiency</b>	
<b>Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan</b>	The page(s) or sections in the IRWM Plan where information on the Requirement can be found. This can be specific paragraphs or entire chapters for more general requirements.
<b>Brief Qualitative Evaluation Narrative</b>	Supporting information for the Requirement if a "q" is in the Included column. This can be just a few sentences or a paragraph and can be taken directly from the IRWM Plan. Comments or supporting information may be entered regardless of whether required.
<b>Sufficient</b>	Is the Guidelines requirement sufficiently represented in the IRWM Plan (y/n).

<b>IRWM Plan Review Form</b>		
(Per 2016 Plan Standards)		
IRWM Planning Region:		
Regional Water Management Group:		
IRWM Plan Title:		
DWR Reviewer:		
<b>RESULT: ONE OR MORE PLAN STANDARDS NOT SUFFICIENT</b>		
<b>IRWM Plan Standard</b>	<b>Overall Standard Sufficient (yes/no)</b>	<b>One or More Requirement(s) Insufficient</b>
<u>Governance</u>	No	X
<u>Region Description</u>	No	X
<u>Objectives</u>	No	X
<u>Resource Management Strategies</u>	No	X
<u>Integration *</u>	No	X
<u>Project Review Process</u>	No	X
<u>Impact and Benefit</u>	No	X
<u>Plan Performance and Monitoring</u>	No	X
<u>Data Management</u>	No	X
<u>Finance</u>	No	X
<u>Technical Analysis</u>	No	X
<u>Relation to Local Water Planning</u>	No	X
<u>Relation to Local Land Use Planning</u>	No	X
<u>Stakeholder Involvement</u>	No	X
<u>Coordination</u>	No	X
<u>Climate Change</u>	No	X
* If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per 2016 Guidelines, p. 52.		
<b>Additional Comments:</b>		

IRWM Plan Standard: Governance				Overall Standard Sufficient		No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
The IRWMG and individual project proponents who adopted the Plan"	37	y/n				
A description of the IRWM governance structure including a discussion of whether or how Native American tribes will participate in the IRWMG.	37	y/n				
A description of how the chosen form of governance addresses and insures:						
Public outreach and involvement processes	37	y/n/q				
Effective decision making	37	y/n/q				
Balanced access and opportunity for participation in the IRWM process	37	y/n/q				
Effective communication – both internal and external to the IRWM region	37	y/n/q				
Long term implementation of the IRWM Plan	37	y/n/q				
Coordination with neighboring IRWM efforts and State and federal agencies	37	y/n/q				
The collaborative process(es) used to establish plan objectives	38	y/n/q				
How interim changes and formal changes to the IRWM Plan will be performed	38	y/n/q				
Updating or amending the IRWM Plan	38	y/n/q				
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.						

IRWM Plan Standard: Region Description					Overall Standard Sufficient	No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n	
If applicable, describe and explain how the plan will help reduce dependence on the Delta supply regionally.	38	y/n				
Describe watersheds and water systems	38	y/n				
Describe internal boundaries	38	y/n				
Describe water supplies and demands for minimum 20 year planning horizon	38	y/n				
Describe social and cultural makeup, including specific information on DACs and tribal communities in the region and their water challenges.	38	y/n/q				
Describe major water related objectives and conflicts (1).	38	y/n/q				
Explain how IRWM regional boundary was determined and why region is an appropriate area for IRWM planning.	38	y/n/q				
Describe neighboring and/or overlapping IRWM efforts	38	y/n				
Explain how opportunities are maximized (e.g. people at the table, natural features, infrastructure) for integration of water management activities	38	y/n				
Describe water quality conditions. If the IRWM region has areas of nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination, the Plan must include a description of location, extent, and impacts of the contamination; actions undertaken to address the contamination, and a description of any additional actions needed to address the contamination (2).	38	y/n				
Describe likely Climate Change impacts on their region as determined from the vulnerability assessment.	38	y/n				
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.						
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(3).						
(2) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(14).						

IRWM Plan Standard: Plan Objectives					Overall Standard Sufficient	No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n	
Through the objectives or other areas of the plan, the 7 items on pg 49 of GL are addressed (1).	49	y/n				
Describe the collaborative process and tools used to establish objectives: - How the objectives were developed - What information was considered (i.e., water management or local land use plans, etc.) - What groups were involved in the process - How the final decision was made and accepted by the IRWM effort	48 - 50	y/n				
Identify quantitative or qualitative metrics and measurable objectives: Objectives must be measurable - there must be some metric the IRWM region can use to determine if the objective is being met as the IRWM Plan is implemented. Neither quantitative nor qualitative metrics are considered inherently better (2).	49	y/n/q				
Explain how objectives are prioritized or reason why the objectives are not prioritized	50	y/n/q				
Reference specific overall goals for the region: RWMGs may choose to use goals as an additional layer for organizing and prioritizing objectives, or they may choose to not use the term at all.	50	y/n				
Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge	39	y/n				
Consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	39	y/n				
Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.	39	y/n				
In evaluating different ways to meet IRWM plan objectives, where practical, consider the strategies adopted by CARB in its AB 32 Scoping Plan.	39	y/n				
Consider options for carbon sequestration and using renewable energy where such options are integrally tied to supporting IRWM Plan objectives.	39	y/n				



IRWM Plan Standard: Resource Management Strategies (RMS)				Overall Standard Sufficient		No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/n, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
Address which RMS will be implemented in achieving IRWM Plan Objectives (1).	39	y/n				
Identify RMS incorporated in the IRWM Plan. Consider all California Water Plan (CWP) RMS criteria (29) listed in Table 3 from the CWP Update 2013	39	y/n				
<p>Consideration of climate change effects on the IRWM region must be factored into RMS. Identify and implement, using vulnerability assessments and tools such as those provided in the Climate Change Handbook, RMS and adaptation strategies that address region-specific climate change impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate how the effects of climate change on its region are factored into its RMS.</li> <li>• Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.</li> <li>• An evaluation of RMS and other adaptation strategies and ability of such strategies to eliminate or minimize those vulnerabilities, especially those impacting water infrastructure systems (2).</li> </ul>	39	y/n				
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.						
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10540 (e)(1).						
(2) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10540 (e)(10).						

IRWM Plan Standard: Integration					Overall Standard Sufficient		No
Requirement		Included			Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
Contains structure and processes for developing and fostering integration <sup>1</sup> : - Stakeholder/Institutional - Resource - Project implementation	39	y/n/q					
1. If not included as an Individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per 2016 IRWM Guidelines, p. 52.							

IRWM Plan Standard: Project Review Process				Overall Standard Sufficient		No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Process for projects included in IRWM plan must address 3 components: - procedures for submitting projects - procedures for reviewing projects - procedures for communicating lists of selected projects	39 - 40	y/n				
Does the project review process in the plan incorporate the following factors:						
How a project contributes to plan objectives	40	y/n				
How a project is related to Resource Management Strategies Identified in the plan.	40	y/n				
The technical feasibility of a project.	40	y/n				
A projects specific benefits to a DAC water issue.	40	y/n				
Environmental Justice considerations.	40	y/n				
Project costs and financing	40	y/n				
Address economic feasibility	40	y/n				
Project status	40	y/n				
Strategic implementation of plan and project merit	40	y/n				
Status of the Project Proponent's IRWM plan adoption	40	y/n				
Project's contribution to reducing dependence on Delta supply (for IRWM regions receiving water from the Delta).	40	y/n				
Project's contribution to climate change adaptation. • Include potential effects of Climate Change on the region and consider if adaptations to the water management system are necessary (1). • Consider the contribution of the project to adapting to identified system vulnerabilities to climate change effects on the region. • Consider changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge. • Consider the effects of SLR on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	40	y/n				

<p>Contribution of project in reducing GHGs compared to project alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives</li> <li>• Consider a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over the 20-year planning horizon.</li> <li>• Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.</li> </ul>	40	y/n					
Specific benefits to critical water issues for Native American tribal communities.	53	y/n					
	IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline						
	Requirements. See Appendix II in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.						
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10540 (e)(10).							

IRWM Plan Standard: Impact and Benefit					Overall Standard Sufficient	No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	Sufficient	
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Discuss potential impacts and benefits of plan implementation within IRWM region, between regions, with DAC/EJ concerns and Native American Tribal communities	40	y/n				
State when a more detailed project-specific impact and benefit analysis will occur (prior to any implementation activity)	55	y/n				
Review and update the impacts and benefits section of the plan as part of the normal plan management activities	55 - 56	y/n				

IRWM Plan Standard: Plan Performance and Monitoring					Overall Standard Sufficient	No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	Sufficient	
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n	
Contain performance measures and monitoring methods to ensure that IRWM objectives are met (1).	40	y/n				
Contain a methodology that the RWMG will use to oversee and evaluate Implementation of projects.	40	y/n				
Each project in the IRWM Plan is monitored to comply with all applicable rules, laws, and permit requirements.	58	y/n				
Contain policies and procedures that promote adaptive management and, as more effects of Climate Change manifest, new tools are developed, and new information becomes available, adjust IRWM plans accordingly.	40	y/n				
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline						
Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.						
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(7).						

IRWM Plan Standard: Data Management				Overall Standard Sufficient		No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard In Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
Describe data needs within the IRWM region	59 - 60	y/n				
Describe typical data collection techniques	59 - 60	y/n				
Describe stakeholder contributions of data to a data management system	59 - 60	y/n				
Describe the entity responsible for maintaining data in the data management system	59 - 60	y/n				
Describe the QA/QC measures for data	59 - 60	y/n				
Explain how data collected will be transferred or shared between members of the RWMG and other interested parties throughout the IRWM region, including local, State, and federal agencies (1).	59 - 60	y/n				
Explain how the Data Management System supports the RWMG's efforts to share collected data	59 - 60	y/n				
Outline how data saved in the data management system will be distributed and remain compatible with State databases including CEDEN, Water Data Library (WDL), CASGEM, California Environmental Information Catalog (CEIC), and the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES).	59 - 60	y/n				
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(12).						

IRWM Plan Standard: Finance					Overall Standard Sufficient		No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient	
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard In Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n	
Include a programmatic level (i.e. general plan for implementation and financing of identified projects and programs (1) including the following:	41	y/n					
List known, as well as, possible funding sources, programs, and grant opportunities for the development and ongoing funding of the IRWM Plan.	41	y/n					
List the funding mechanisms, including water enterprise funds, rate structures, and private financing options, for projects that implement the IRWM Plan.	41	y/n					
An explanation of the certainty and longevity of known or potential funding for the IRWM Plan and projects that implement the Plan.	41	y/n					
An explanation of how operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for projects that implement the IRWM Plan would be covered and the certainty of operation and maintenance funding.	41	y/n					

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(8).

IRWM Plan Standard: Technical Analysis				Overall Standard Sufficient		No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard In Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Document the data and technical analyses that were used in the development of the plan (1).	41	y/n				
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(11).						

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Water Planning				Overall Standard Sufficient	No
Requirement	Included	Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient	
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Identify a list of local water plans used in the IRWM plan	41	y/n			
Describe the dynamics between the IRWM plan and other planning documents	41	y/n			
Describe how the RWMG will coordinate its water mgmt planning activities	41	y/n			
Discuss how the plan relates to these other planning documents and programs. Same as 2012 GL with the following addition: "It should be noted that Water Code § 10562 (b)(7) requires the development of a stormwater resource plan and compliance with these provisions to receive grants for stormwater and dry weather runoff capture projects. Upon development of the stormwater resource plan, the RWMG shall incorporate it into IRWM plan. The IRWM Plan should discuss the processes that it will use to incorporate such plans." Minor wording differences - e.g. Groundwater Sustainability Plan example in the 2016 Guidelines instead of Groundwater Management Plan in the 2012 Guidelines.	63 - 64	y/n			
Consider and incorporate water management issues and climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies from local plans into the IRWM Plan.	63 - 64	y/n			
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.					

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Land Use Planning				Overall Standard Sufficient	
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	No Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present In the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard In Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Document current relationship between local land use planning, regional water issues, and water management objectives	41	y/n			
Document future plans to further a collaborative, proactive relationship between land use planners and water managers	41	y/n			
Demonstrate information sharing and collaboration with regional land use planning in order to manage multiple water demands throughout the state, adapt water management systems to climate change, and potentially offset climate change impacts to water supply in California.	41	y/n			
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.					

IRWM Plan Standard: Stakeholder Involvement					Overall Standard Sufficient	No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	Sufficient	
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n	
Discuss involvement of DACs and tribal communities in the IRWM planning effort	41 - 42	y/n				
Describe decision-making process and roles that stakeholders can occupy	41 - 42	y/n				
Discuss how stakeholders are necessary to address objectives and RMS	41 - 42	y/n				
Discuss how a collaborative process will engage a balance in interest groups	41 - 42	y/n				
Contain a public process that provides outreach and opportunity to participate in the IRWM plan (1). Per 2016 GL: "Native American tribes – It should be noted that tribes are sovereign nations, and as such coordination with tribes is on a government-to-government basis."	41 - 42	y/n				
Identify process to involve and facilitate stakeholders during development and implementation of IRWM plan regardless of ability to pay; include description of any barriers to involvement (2). "Stakeholder involvement" in the 2012 GL is referred to "Native American Tribe and Stakeholder Involvement" in the 2016 GL and Tribes are referred to specifically.	41 - 42	y/n				
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.						
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (g).						
(2) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (h)(2).						

IRWM Plan Standard: Coordination					Overall Standard Sufficient	No
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	Sufficient	
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/ n, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard In Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		
Identify the process to coordinate water management projects and activities of participating local agencies and stakeholders to avoid conflicts and take advantage of efficiencies (1).	42	y/n				
Identify neighboring IRWM efforts and ways to cooperate or coordinate, and a discussion of any ongoing water management conflicts with adjacent IRWM efforts	42	y/n				
Identify areas where a state agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of IRWM Plan components, processes, and projects, or where State or federal regulatory decisions are required before implementing the projects.	42	y/n				
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(13).						

IRWM Plan Standard: Climate Change				Overall Standard Sufficient	
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	No Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Contain a plan, program, or methodology for further data gathering and analysis of prioritized vulnerabilities.	42 - 44	y/n			
Include climate change as part of the project review process.	42 - 44	y/n			
Evaluate IRWM region's vulnerabilities to climate change and potential adaptation responses based on vulnerabilities assessment in the DWR Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning (1). Addition in 2016 GL - "At a minimum, the vulnerability evaluation must be equivalent to the vulnerability assessment contained in the Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning, Section 4 and Appendix B."	42 - 44	y/n			
Provide a process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives (1). Addition in 2016 GL - "At a minimum, that process must determine a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over a 20-year planning horizon and consider energy efficiency and reduction of GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives."	42 - 44	y/n			
Include a list of prioritized vulnerabilities based on the vulnerability assessment and the IRWM's decision making process. Addition in 2016 GL - "A list of prioritized vulnerabilities which includes a determination regarding the feasibility for the RWMG to address the priority vulnerabilities."	42 - 44	y/n			
Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality, and variability of runoff and recharge.	42 - 44	y/n			
Areas of the State that receive water imported from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, the area within the Delta, and areas served by coastal aquifers must also consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	42 - 44	y/n			
IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 Guideline					
Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.					
(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(9).					

**Submitted By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**Action Date:** April 19, 2018

**AGENDA ITEM**

**SUBJECT:** Susanville Indian Rancheria (SIR) is developing best management practices (BMPs) for their watershed. Informing RWMG of potential overlap.

**Presented By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**SUMMARY:** On March 30, the SIR hosted a watershed meeting. They are looking to prepare BMPs for their watershed. As this is a strong goal of the DWR, it is pertinent to place on the radar of the RWMG. Staff is requesting a brief discussion to offer any advice towards preparing BMPs for the SIR watershed and to consider its impact on potential sponsor projects and others alike.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** None

**ACTION REQUESTED:** For information and discussion on BMPs.

**ATTACHMENTS:** None

**Submitted By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**Action Date:** April 19, 2018

**AGENDA ITEM**

**SUBJECT:** Spalding project came in under budget. Staff is proposing avenues to expend the available money while accomplishing the intent of the grant.

**Presented By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**SUMMARY:** The Spalding project has an additional \$62,529. The money needs to be expended within the same time frame. At this point, the contract will require an amendment. Staff has discussed options with the State, and both Spalding and Lassen Land and Trails Trust (LLTT) and has come up with the following options. The request is for the money to be split between Spalding and the Trust. About \$10,000 will go to Spalding for a weather station and the remainder will go to further the study that the LLTT is currently working on. Staff is requesting direction to prepare the justification forms based on sharing the remaining funding between the two sponsors and to proceed with requesting the contract amendment from the DWR.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** None.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Direction to prepare the justification forms based on both LLTT and Spalding sharing the remaining money in a disproportionate ratio and to proceed with requesting the contract be amended from the State.

**ATTACHMENTS:** None.

**Submitted By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**Action Date:** April 19, 2018

**AGENDA ITEM**

**SUBJECT:** Making available the Prop 84 Progress Report #5 submitted to the State.

**Presented By:** Quincy McCourt, Project Manager

**SUMMARY:** During the last meeting, Mr. Newton provided a brief project update. For information purposes, the Progress Report #5 has been attached for a more formal presentation.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** None.

**ACTION  
REQUESTED:** For information only.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Project Progress Report #5

## Progress Report 5

Date: March 23, 2018

Project Title: 2015 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Implementation Grant DWR Agreement Number 4600011520

Reporting Period: November 18, 2017 - March 23, 2018

### Project 1: City of Susanville Sustainable Water Supply and Conjunctive Use

Budget Category (a): Direct Project Administration Costs - approximately 44% complete.

Task 1a: Grant Agreement Administration, Invoicing and Reporting to DWR

Work Accomplished During This Reporting Period:

The following summarizes the key activities accomplished this reporting period:

1. Review and compile progress reports for all projects
2. Financial tracking compiling backup documents

Task 1b: Project Management

The following summarizes the key activities accomplished this reporting period:

1. Preparation of Progress Report 4

Task 1c: Labor Compliance Program

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 1d: Reporting

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (b): Land Purchase/Easement

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (c): Planning/Design Engineering and Environmental Documentation - approximately 39% complete.

Task 3a: Feasibility Studies - 100% Complete

The following summarizes the key activities accomplished this reporting period:

1. Dyer Engineering completed the feasibility study and submitted to The City Susanville.
2. Staff has begun negotiating phase two of the process with the Consultant. So far, the estimate is more than the original place holder. Staff is exploring options to assist the Consultant sharpen their pencil. Staff is researching the possibility of moving some of the Construction Budget over to the Design Budget in order proceed.

Task 3b: CEQA Documentation

Public Works has been making progress on clarifying the exemption.

Task 3c: Permitting

No activities under the Final Design task have been completed this reporting period.

Task 3d Final Design

Task 3d.1: Final Design

No activities under the Final Design task have been completed this reporting period.

Task 3d.2: 5% design for Johnstonville Road and Harris Road Tank Mains

Public Works has working on the design and engineering for the Johnstonville Water Main replacement.

Task 3e: project Monitoring Plan

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (d): Construction/Implementation

No activities under this task have been completed this reporting period.

**Project 2: Spalding Community Services District Waste Water Pond Closure** - 35% complete.

Spalding Community Services District has completed their project and came in approximately \$5,000 below budget. They are curious if they can use the remainder for additional efforts.

Budget Category (a): Direct Project Administration Costs

Task 1a: Project Management

No activities under this task have been completed this reporting period.

Task 1b: Labor Compliance: The contractor complied with Federal Prevailing Wage law except where the State Wage Determination is higher, than that amount has to be paid. Lassen County is working on doing Labor Compliance on the CDBG portion of the project. California Labor Code requirements have been met.

Task 1c: Reporting

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (b): Land Purchase/Easement

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (c): Planning/Design/Engineering and Environmental Documentation

Task 3a: Feasibility Studies

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 3b: CEQA Documentation

No activities under this task have been completed this reporting period.

Task 3c: Permitting

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 3d: Design

No activities under this task have been completed this reporting period.

Task 3e: Project Monitoring Plan

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (d): Construction/Implementation

Task 4a: Construction Contracting

The project has been completed and all construction has been complete and paid for by Spalding.

Task 4b: Construction Administration

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 4c: Construction /Implementation Activities

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

**Project 3: Lassen Land and Trails Trust Municipal Water Assessment - 10% complete.**

Budget Category (a): Direct Project Administration

Task 1a: - Project Management:

During this project period, Lassen Land & Trails Trust (LLTT) worked with City of Susanville staff to develop MOU between City and LLTT in order to utilize DWR grant funds on the Municipal Water Assessment portion of the IRWM grant. MOU has been drafted and LLTT and City's Attorney have reviewed and commented on draft. Final version expected by end of February, to be reviewed and approved by LLTT Board of Directors and Susanville City Council in March 2016.

LLTT finalized a Request for Qualifications for engineering assessment work, distributed this RFQ, and received 3 responses from qualified engineering firms. LLTT staff and Board reviewed these RFQs and selected Dyer Engineering Firm, which demonstrated a strong understanding of municipal water issues, as well as the best familiarity with DWR grant programs, in particular, the IRWM program.

LLTT has been working with Dyer Engineering to develop a detailed Scope of Work and project schedule, and a proposed Scope and Contract are currently being reviewed for approval by LLTT Board of Directors, with approval expected by March 15, 2018.

The majority of the engineering assessment work is planned for Spring 2018, with final reports from Dyer Engineering expected in June 2018.

Also during this project period, LLTT submitted an invoice to the City of Susanville to be included in the next invoice to DWR. This invoice was for all staff time expended so far on this project. Monthly or bi-monthly invoices are expected once engineering assessment work begins.

Lassen Land & Trails Trust (LLTT) reviewed executed grant contract between DWR and City of Susanville, updated work plan and project schedule, and set up meeting to discuss project with City Administrator in order to develop MOU between City and LLTT in order to implement the Municipal Water Assessment portion of the grant.

During this project period, the project fell behind schedule as the City Project Manager, who was the project lead, took another position, delaying the development of the MOU. Meeting is scheduled with City staff to get this process underway, plan to have MOU signed early in 2017.

LLTT provided an updated work plan and schedule to City staff, and requested an extension of the proposed ending date included in the original grant contracts. The new final completion date proposed is August 31, 2018, which is still within the Grant Contract with the State, which has an end date of no later than January 31, 2019.

LLTT staff also developed a draft Request for Qualifications for engineering assessment work, which is under review by City staff and LLTT Board of Directors.

Task 1b: Labor Compliance Program

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 1c: Reporting

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (b): Land Purchase/Easement

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (c): Planning/design/Engineering and Environmental Documentation

Task 3a: Feasibility Studies

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 3b: CEQA Documentation

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 3c: Permitting

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 3d: Design

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Task 3e: Project Monitoring Plan

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.

Budget Category (d): Construction/Implementation

No items are scheduled to be completed under this budget category.