

Inyo-Mono IRWMP

Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

2010 Request for Proposals

IRWM Program Implementation

Round 1 Grants

November 19, 2010

Thank you for your interest in the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program. This document provides you with detailed instructions for how to provide the information necessary for your project to be reviewed for potential inclusion in the Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan and/or Round 1 Implementation funding grant, as well as a project review process timeline.

Steps for completing project review process:

1. Complete Worksheet A and submit to Holly Alpert (holly.alpert@gmail.com) **by 5:00 pm, Friday, November 5, 2010**. If you have questions regarding Worksheet A or the content therein, contact Holly Alpert at the email address above or Mark Drew (mdrew@caltrout.org).
2. Staff will review completed applications and will inform project applicants whether project has been deemed eligible for the first round of Implementation funding. **Project proponents will be contacted by November 9, 2010.**
3. The list of eligible/non-eligible projects will be reviewed by the governing bodies of the Planning Committee Members, and final determination of eligible projects will be made at the November 17, 2010, Planning Committee meeting.
4. By November 18, 2010, eligible project proponents will be contacted and asked to complete Worksheet B.
5. Project proponents will submit Worksheet B to Holly Alpert **by 12:00 (NOON) pm, Monday, November 29, 2010**. IRWMP staff will provide completed project applications to Planning Committee Members for review and ranking.
6. Planning Committee Members will submit their project rankings to Holly Alpert by **5:00 pm Monday, December 6**. IRWMP staff will tally ranking results and develop an overall ranking list for discussion and approval at the December 6 afternoon Planning Committee meeting. At this time, the top-ranked project proponents will be asked to prepare full project proposals for inclusion in the Implementation grant proposal.
7. Full project proposals are due to Holly Alpert by **9:00 am, Monday, January 3, 2011**.
8. The Implementation grant proposal will be submitted to the Department of Water Resources **on or before January 7, 2011**.

Note: Materials explaining eligibility review (for Worksheet A) and Planning Committee project review and ranking (Worksheet B) are included in Appendix C and D at the end of this document.

Inyo-Mono IRWMP Project Review Process Timeline

Date	Activity
Wednesday, October 27, 9 am – 12 pm: Planning Committee Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss project review process • Discuss project RFP • Circulate RFP with formal request
Friday, November 5, 5:00 pm	Worksheet A of project applications due to IRWMP staff
Monday-Tuesday, November 8-9	Project staff reviews applications and develops eligibility list, which is then sent to Planning Committee
Monday, November 15	Planning/implementation MOU takes effect
Wednesday, November 17: Planning Committee Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve project review process • Approve eligible project list • Request completion of second half of applications
Thursday, November 25	Thanksgiving
Monday, November 29, 12:00 pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worksheet B of project applications due to project staff • Project staff will send out completed applications and forms for evaluation and ranking
Monday, December 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranked Worksheet B of project applications due to staff at 5:00 pm; staff will add up scores and determine rankings
Wednesday, December 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Committee meeting 9:00 – 12:00 to determine final ranking of projects • Project proposal workshop in afternoon for project proponents and other interested entities
Saturday, December 25	Christmas
Saturday, January 1	New Year's
Monday, January 3, 9:00 am	Final project proposals due to IRWMP staff for inclusion in Implementation Grant proposal
Friday, January 7, 2011	Submission of Implementation Grant proposal to DWR

**Worksheet A
Inyo-Mono IRWMP Project Application
Round 1 Implementation**

To be completed by all project proponents and submitted to Holly Alpert by 5:00 pm, Friday, November 5. This will be evaluated by Inyo-Mono IRWMP project staff to determine eligibility of project.

1. Project Description

Project proponent:

Is the project proponent a signatory of the planning/implementation MOU? If not, are there plans in place to become an MOU signatory on or before November 15, 2010?

Contact person:

Phone:

E-mail:

Name of project:

County(ies) where the project will be implemented:

Watershed(s) where the project will be completed:

Project description/narrative (500 words maximum, Times New Roman 12-point font). This should include: 1) Brief problem statement, 2) Objectives of the project, 3) Project design, 4) Deliverables and expected outcomes, 5) Beneficiaries of project, and 6) Partners on the project.

Budget. * Please refer to Guidelines for eligible costs for DWR reimbursement through the IRWM program (available from the www.inyomonowater.org). These expenses can be part of the match. Provide as much information about the budget as possible at this time, including expected amounts and sources of funding matches. Refer to Plan Guidelines and Implementation PSP for more information.

Estimated project duration:

2. State Water Plan Objectives. Please indicate which of the following objectives from the Water Plan Update 2009 this project addresses (check all that apply). Project proponent must meet at least one of these objectives in order to be eligible for Round 1 Implementation grants.

Reduce Water Demand: Yes No

Improve operational efficiency and transfers: Yes No

Increase water supply: Yes No

Improve water quality Yes No

Practice resource stewardship Yes No

Improve flood management Yes No

3. Prop. 84 Requirements. For each Yes answer, provide a one-sentence description justifying your answer.

Yes No Does the project improve water supply reliability, water conservation and water use efficiency?

Yes No Does the project involve storm water capture, storage, clean-up, treatment, and management?

Yes No Does the project remove invasive non-native species, create or enhance wetlands, or protect and restore open space and watershed lands?

Yes No Does the project involve non-point source pollution reduction, management and monitoring?

Yes No Does the project involve groundwater recharge and management projects?

Yes No Does the project involve contaminant and salt removal through reclamation, desalting, and other treatment technologies and conveyance of reclaimed water for distribution to users?

Yes No Does the project involve water banking, exchange, reclamation and improvement of water quality?

Yes No Does the project involve planning and implementation of multipurpose flood management programs?

Yes No Does the project involve watershed protection and management?

Yes No Does the project involve drinking water treatment and distribution?

Yes No Does the project involve ecosystem and fisheries restoration and protection?

4. Project Status/Project Readiness

Technical and economic feasibility

1. Is this a project under CEQA?

Yes No

If yes, what level of CEQA is required?

What will be the status of completing CEQA by June, 2011? What is the proposed schedule for completing CEQA?

2. Is this a project under NEPA?

Yes No

If yes, what level of NEPA is required?

What will be the status of completing NEPA by June, 2011? What is the proposed schedule for completing NEPA?

3. What are the local and regional permitting requirements (if any), and have they been met? If not, what is the current status of compliance and/or plan for complying with the requirements? If permits are required, when do they expire?

4. Will there be staff available for project implementation, or will they need to be hired?

5. What kinds of planning documents, outside of permitting, are necessary for the project, and are they complete? For example, engineering designs or blueprints, work plan, etc.

6. What other financial resources (internal and/or external) will be available to undertake the project and sustain it beyond the IRWM grant?

7. Does the project proponent have the authority or approval to implement the project (such as landowner approval; approval from governing board; or fee, easement, or license rights)? What will be the status of achieving the appropriate approvals by June, 2011? If approvals have not been granted by June, 2011, what is the proposed schedule for achieving such approvals?

Worksheet B
Inyo-Mono IRWMP Project Application
Round 1 Implementation

To be completed by project proponents deemed eligible for Round 1 Implementation funding. Completed worksheets should be submitted to Holly Alpert by 9:00 am, Monday, November 29, 2010. This part of application will be evaluated and ranked by Planning Committee Members.

1. Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan Requirements

1. Does the project support one or more IRWM Plan objectives? See Appendix A for list of objectives.

Yes No

If yes, list applicable objectives (indicate number/letter combinations from Appendix A).

2. Does the project support one or more IRWM Plan Resource Management Strategies? See Appendix A for list of RMS.

Yes No

If yes, list applicable Resource Management Strategies (indicate number/letter combinations from Appendix A).

3. Will this project benefit disadvantaged communities? If yes, list DACs that will benefit. (If uncertain which communities qualify as DACs, refer to RAP, Planning Grant application, or project staff.)

4. Will this project involve or benefit Native American Indian Tribes? If yes, list Tribes and locations.

2. Subjective Evaluation Narratives (limit responses to 100 words or fewer)

1. Will this project result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions? If yes, explain how.

2. Will this project contribute to developing or implementing adaptation strategies to respond to climate variability impacts on water resources? If yes, explain how.

3. Are there any expected negative economic or environmental impacts of the project? Please describe.

4. Does the project address public health and safety concerns? Please describe.
5. Will this project contribute to achieving compliance with regulatory requirements?
6. Will this project provide short-term and/or long-term economic benefits? If yes, quantify in terms of how much and for what duration with respect to jobs and local spending.
7. Does the project mitigate existing negative environmental conditions? Please explain.

Appendix A Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan Objectives and Resource Management Strategies

Overview: In the IRWMP process, development of objectives is a key step, as objectives provide a basis for selecting and evaluating projects. As a result, the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Committee undertook extensive outreach within the planning region to identify pressing water-related issues and challenges. In response, the following objectives and resource management strategies were developed and adopted by the Planning Committee to address the identified issues. The planning objectives and strategies provide targeted outcomes that will benefit the region. When implementing regional projects, project partners will strive to meet as many objectives as possible while also recognizing that some objectives may not be fully achieved.

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
1. Protect, conserve, optimize, and/or augment water supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Improve water supply reliability B. Improve system flexibility and/or efficiency C. Support compliance with current and future state and/or federal water supply standards D. Address local water supply issues through various techniques, including, but not limited to: groundwater recharge projects, conjunctive use of water supplies, water recycling, water conservation, water transfers, and precipitation enhancement E. Advance understanding of regional groundwater issues (including monitoring) and provide for solutions F. Optimize existing storage capacity G. Conserve and/or adapt water uses to future conditions H. Capture and manage runoff I. Incorporate and/or implement low-impact development design features, techniques, and/or practices to reduce water demand J. Support appropriate recreational activities

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
2. Protect, restore, and/or enhance water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Support compliance with current and future state and/or federal water quality standards B. Improve the quality of urban runoff, storm water, and/or wastewater C. Reduce erosion and sedimentation D. Protect public and/or aquatic ecosystem health E. Match water quality to water use F. Support appropriate recreational activities
3. Provide stewardship of our natural resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Protect, restore, and/or enhance natural processes, habitats, and/or threatened and endangered species B. Protect, restore, and/or enhance ecosystems such as upland forests and meadows dependent on surface/shallow water supply C. Enhance recreational and/or educational opportunities D. Identify, develop, and implement efforts to better control invasive species E. Assess ecosystem health of watersheds in the region
4. Maintain and enhance water, wastewater, and/or power generation infrastructure efficiency and reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Systematically and strategically rehabilitate and replace aging water, wastewater delivery and/or wastewater treatment facilities in rural communities, including tribal lands B. Ensure fire protection capacity C. Improve energy efficiency of water systems and uses D. Promote use of water efficiency in power generating facilities
5. Address climate variability and/or reduce greenhouse gas emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Increase understanding of water related greenhouse gas emissions B. Manage and modify water systems to respond to increasing climate variability C. Use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water
6. Increase participation of small and disadvantaged communities in IRWM process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Engage regional communities in collaborative water and natural resource related efforts B. Provide assistance for tribal and DAC consultation, collaboration, and access to funding for water programs and projects

Appendix B

Project review process for Round 1 Implementation Grants

- DWR has stated that a priority for funding projects in Round 1 Implementation is for disadvantaged communities and Tribes.
- This RFP provides information and materials to allow initial screening by project staff as well as Planning Committee evaluation and ranking
 - This reflects Inyo-Mono goals/objectives/resource management strategies
 - This reflects Prop. 84 requirements
 - It is strongly suggested to read DWR Prop. 84 Plan Guidelines and Implementation PSP (can download from project website: <http://www.inyomonowater.org/index.php?page=Documents>)
 - Entities that are not signatories to the MOU must either submit through a County (for public entities) or partner with another MOU signatory in order to be eligible to submit a project.
- Worksheet A
 - Will be evaluated by IRWMP staff for project readiness
 - Objective is to develop list of eligible projects for 1st round
 - Identify relative readiness of projects to be incorporated in the Phase I Plan
- Worksheet B
 - Information provided to Planning Committee for project ranking
- Appendix A: List of objectives and resource management strategies for Inyo-Mono IRWM region
- Appendices C&D: Evaluation forms to be used by IRWMP staff and Planning Committee for Worksheets A and B, respectively.
 - Project rankings in Appendix D should start at 1 for the highest-ranked project and then descend sequentially
 - This will result in an individual preference /ranking list that will then be averaged across evaluators to determine overall ranking of reach project.
- Rules for Planning Committee evaluation of project proposals:
 - Anybody is welcome to read project proposal and contribute to relevant discussions. However, only MOU signatories will be able to formally evaluate project proposals.
 - Entities wanting to review proposals must commit to reviewing ALL proposals
 - If project evaluator does not complete all evaluations, none of that evaluator's reviews will be considered.
 - Only planning/implementation MOU signatories can vote on final ranking of projects. Furthermore, only those that evaluate projects can vote on final ranking and have veto rights.
 - Should an evaluation result in a veto, discussion during the proposed early December meeting will result in a final project ranking decision or to place it in a "parking lot." The December 6 meeting is the last opportunity to veto a project.
 - There will be 2-3 project alternates after the final ranking process so that if a top-ranked entity cannot complete the full proposal, another entity can take its place.

**Appendix C
Inyo-Mono IRWMP
Project Eligibility Worksheet for Staff**

I-M IRWMP project staff will undertake an initial analysis to determine whether a project proposal meets the requirements necessary to be put forth as “ready” for ranking by the Planning Committee as part of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan.

Note: The Planning Committee reserves the right to overrule staff recommendations.

Criterion #1: State Water Plan objectives. Project proponent must meet at least one of the State Water Plan objectives.

Reduce Water Demand Yes No

Improve operational efficiency and transfers Yes No

Increase water supply Yes No

Improve water quality Yes No

Practice resource stewardship Yes No

Improve flood management Yes No

Criterion #2: Prop. 84 Requirements. For each Yes answer, provide a one-sentence description justifying your answer. Project proponents must address at least one Prop. 84 criterion.

Yes No Does the project improve water supply reliability, water conservation and water use efficiency?

Yes No Does the project involve storm water capture, storage, clean-up, treatment, and management?

Yes No Does the project remove invasive non-native species, create or enhance wetlands, or protect and restore open space and watershed lands?

Yes No Does the project involve non-point source pollution reduction, management and monitoring?

Yes No Does the project involve groundwater recharge and management projects?

Yes No Does the project involve contaminant and salt removal through reclamation, desalting, and other treatment technologies and conveyance of reclaimed water for distribution to users?

Yes No Does the project involve water banking, exchange, reclamation and improvement of water quality?

Yes No Does the project involve planning and implementation of multipurpose flood management programs?

Yes No Does the project involve watershed protection and management?

Yes No Does the project involve drinking water treatment and distribution?

Yes No Does the project involve ecosystem and fisheries restoration and protection?

Criterion #3: Project Status/ Project Readiness

Technical and economic feasibility

1. Is this a project under CEQA?

Yes No

If yes, what level of CEQA is required?

What will be the status of completing CEQA by June, 2011? What is the proposed schedule for completing CEQA?

2. Is this a project under NEPA?

Yes No

If yes, what level of NEPA is required?

What will be the status of completing NEPA by June, 2011? What is the proposed schedule for completing NEPA?

3. What are the local and regional permitting requirements (if any), and have they been met? If not, what is the current status of compliance and/or plan for complying with the requirements? If permits are required, when do they expire?

4. Will there be staff available for project implementation, or will they need to be hired?

5. What kinds of planning documents, outside of permitting, are necessary for the project, and are they complete? For example, engineering designs or blueprints, work plan, etc.

6. What other financial resources (internal and/or external) will be available to undertake the project and sustain it beyond the IRWM grant?

7. Does the project proponent have the authority or approval to implement the project (such as landowner approval; approval from governing board; or fee, easement, or license rights)? What will be the status of achieving the appropriate approvals by June, 2011? If approvals have not been granted by June, 2011, what is the proposed schedule for achieving such approvals?

Appendix D
Inyo-Mono IRWMP
Project Review and Ranking Worksheet for Planning Committee
Round 1 Implementation Projects

Criterion #1: Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan Requirements

1. Does the project support one or more IRWM Plan objectives? See Appendix A for list of objectives.
Yes No
If yes, list applicable objectives (indicate number/letter combinations from Appendix A).

2. Does the project support one or more IRWM Plan Resource Management Strategies? See Appendix A for list of RMS.
Yes No
If yes, list applicable Resource Management Strategies (indicate number/letter combinations from Appendix A).

3. Will this project benefit disadvantaged communities? If yes, list DACs that will benefit. (If uncertain which communities qualify as DACs, refer to RAP, Planning Grant application, or project staff.)

4. Will this project involve or benefit Native American Indian Tribes? If yes, list Tribes and locations.

Criterion #2: Subjective Evaluation Narratives (limit responses to 100 words or fewer)

1. Will this project result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions? If yes, explain how.

2. Will this project contribute to developing or implementing adaptation strategies to respond to climate variability impacts on water resources? If yes, explain how.

3. Are there any expected negative economic or environmental impacts of the project? Please describe.

4. Does the project address public health and safety concerns? Please describe.

5. Will this project contribute to achieving compliance with regulatory requirements?

6. Will this project provide short-term and/or long-term economic benefits? If yes, quantify in terms of how much and for what duration with respect to jobs and local spending.

7. Does the project mitigate existing negative environmental conditions? Please explain.

8. Please indicate your final ranking of this project, considering its position with respect to the other project applications (1 is the highest rank, 25 is the lowest rank):

A large empty square box with a black border, intended for the user to enter their final ranking of the project.