

SEP 13 1994

9-8



**MWD**

METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Karen E. DeWitt', written over the printed name of the Executive Secretary.

August 30, 1994

To: Board of Directors (Water Problems Committee--Information)  
(Finance & Insurance Committee--Information)

From: General Manager

Subject: Federal Funding for Metropolitan Member Agency Conservation  
Programs from the United States Bureau of Reclamation for Federal  
Fiscal Year 1994-95

Report

As a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Urban Water Conservation in California, the United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) has committed to accelerating the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMP) in Southern California. In federal fiscal year (FY) 1993-94 (October to September), Reclamation provided \$1 million to Metropolitan to support a variety of member and subagency water conservation projects. Metropolitan has executed the FY 1993-94 agreement with Reclamation, and the projects are in process. Staff has negotiated an additional commitment from Reclamation for \$2.5 million for federal FY 1994-95.

Since approval by your Board of the Conservation Credits Program (CCP) in 1989, Metropolitan has supported numerous member agency projects and developed innovative turn-key programs that have accelerated BMP implementation. However, due in part to financial constraints, several member agencies and many subagencies have been unable to initiate projects even with CCP support of up to 50 percent of project cost. Reclamation's funding generously supplements agency shares. Costs will be shared 10 percent by member and subagencies, 40 percent by Reclamation, and 50 percent by Metropolitan except in the case of ultra-low-flush (ULF) toilet projects. In this case, Metropolitan will pay \$60 per ULF toilet, agencies will pay 10 percent, and Reclamation will pay the balance.

In March 1994, a letter was sent to member agency managers announcing the availability of \$2.5 million in Reclamation funding and requesting submission of proposals for federal FY 1994-95. The letter also outlined the criteria used in the selection of proposals for federal FY 1993-94 and restated the financial co-participation arrangements.

Metropolitan received proposals from 24 member agencies totaling more than \$22.3 million. Of the 83 proposals submitted,

62 were deemed eligible, and 37 were selected. The selected proposals were submitted by 20 member agencies, several of which had not previously participated in Metropolitan's CCP (Attachment A).

On August 1-2, 1994, a panel of representatives from Metropolitan, Reclamation, Marin Municipal Water District, the Mono Lake Committee, and the Natural Heritage Foundation (panel) met to reach consensus on both proposal eligibility and selection for Reclamation funding. Prior to evaluating the proposals, the panel established eligibility and selection criteria (Attachment B) based upon Reclamation's guidelines for proposal selection. In the evaluation process, agency projects were first subjected to meeting eligibility criteria. Only those projects that successfully met all eligibility criteria were scored according to seven selection criteria. Reclamation funds were then allocated beginning with the highest scoring proposals and continuing in descending order until all funds were committed. At Reclamation's request, \$200,000 in funding was reserved for the Executive Partnership for Environmental Resources Training Program, leaving \$2.3 million to be allocated among the remaining proposals. Should additional Reclamation funds become available, and should Metropolitan have adequate matching funds, other projects may be funded later.

Staff is awaiting formal approval by Reclamation of the selected proposals and finalization of the funding agreement with Reclamation. Staff anticipates additional Reclamation funding will be available for further regional water conservation efforts in federal FY 1995-96.

Recommendation

For information only.

John R. Wodraska  
General Manager

By   
Debra C. Man  
Chief of Planning and  
Resources

Concur:

  
~~John R. Wodraska~~  
General Manager

KAS:cl

Attachments

**Selected USBR Proposals  
FY 1994-95  
Attachment A**

<b>PROJECTS SELECTED FOR RECLAMATION FUNDING FY 1994-95</b>			
<b>Member</b>	<b>Subagency</b>	<b>Program Description</b>	<b>USBR</b>
Coastal	San Clemente	Interest Free/ Rebate Fund	\$16,000
SDCWA		200 Clothes Washers	\$8,000
SDCWA		2,661 ULFT Non-home owner Voucher Program	\$127,730
Long Beach		2,661 ULFT CBO Program	\$127,730
Coastal MWD	South Coast	1,000 ULFT Direct Installation/retrofit	\$48,000
MWDOC		2,661 ULFT "County Block Program"	\$127,730
San Fernando		Residential Indoor Surveys w/retrofit	\$112,800
Calleguas		2,000 ULFT CBO	\$96,000
West Basin		Low-income residential audit & ULFT	\$152,000
Calleguas	Camarillo	1,500 ULFT Rebate w/ Audit	\$72,000
Compton		1,000 ULFT High School	\$48,000
Western	Jurupa	1,000 ULFT High School	\$48,000
Glendale		ULFT CBO Program (approx. 2000)	\$96,250
City of Anaheim		Large Recreational Facility ULFT/urinal	\$56,000
Upper San Gabriel Valley		Skilled Nursing Facilities Surveys / retrofit	\$72,800
LADWP		Large Landscape Water Audit Pilot	\$96,800
City of Santa Monica		Central Computer Control System	\$158,900
MWDOC	El Toro	769 ULF Toilet and LF showerheads	\$60,150
Three Valleys	City of Covina	CII Analyst Surveys	\$8,000
Compton		Compton School District Irrigation Audit	\$60,000
Eastern MWD		Large Landscape Water Audit Program	\$11,450
Upper San Gabriel Valley		Large Landscape Water Audit Pilot	\$28,000
Calleguas MWD		Purchase of Leak Detection Device	\$30,000
Upper San Gabriel Valley		2661 ULFT High School	\$127,730
Three Valleys	Rowland	500 ULFT Rebate Program	\$24,000
Burbank		800 ULFT CBO Program	\$38,400
Eastern MWD		2661 ULFT High School	\$127,730
West Basin		1,000 ULFT CBO Program	\$48,000
Central Basin		1,000 ULFT CBO Program	\$39,000
Three Valleys	Walnut Valley	CII Analyst and Consultant Survey Program	\$5,200
Three Valleys	La Verne	CII Analyst Survey Program	\$16,000
Upper Dist	So. Cal Water	CII Analyst Survey Program	\$7,000
Calleguas		CII Intern Surveys	\$9,000
3 Valleys	City of Covina	Large Landscape Water Audit Program	\$8,000
Las Virgenes		Irrigation Scheduling Pilot Program	\$40,000
City of Anaheim		Park Irrigation Audit and Central Computer	\$112,000
City of Pasadena		Landscape Irrigation Audit and Incentive	\$35,600

<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$2,300,000</b>
---------------	--------------------

**Attachment B****ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

For a project to be eligible, it must receive a "yes" for each of the six criteria. A "no" for any one criterion makes the project ineligible.

**1. Applicability to BMP's**

Submitted proposals must apply to one or more of the 16 BMPs (although not all 16 are eligible for selection due to other constraints).

**2. Water Savings**

A. Submitted proposals must be able to demonstrate that quantifiable water savings can be achieved by implementing the project. Fulfillment of this criterion is based on either:

1. Reliable water savings data from similar programs
  2. Calculations based on reliable data regarding water savings;
- or**

B. Pilot programs must be designed to assure quantifiable water savings.

**3. Signatory to MOU**

Self explanatory.

**4. Agency Funding Commitment**

Agencies that submit proposals must be able and willing to commit to providing funding for 10 percent of the total program costs.

**5. Previously Planned Implementation without Reclamation Funds**

If the agency has already committed to conducting the project either by submitting a proposal to Metropolitan for CCP funding or by beginning a contract with Metropolitan to conduct the project without Reclamation funding secured, then the project is ineligible for the Reclamation co-participation.

**6. Project Meets Criteria of Metropolitan's Conservation Credits Program**

Self-explanatory.

## SELECTION CRITERIA

Once eligibility is determined then the following selection criteria will be used:

### **1. Variety of Programs (0-3 points):**

This criterion looks at the submitting agency's present mix of conservation programs. Higher point values will be assigned to projects that add new component(s) to an agency's conservation program rather than expanding on existing programs.

### **2. Completeness of the Proposal (0-2 points):**

Scores will be weighed in favor of those projects containing more elements indicating that the project design is thoroughly designed with solid logic including elements of planning, implementation, and evaluation.

### **3. Innovation of Concept (0-3 points):**

This criterion would rate the uniqueness of a project and its ability to add new knowledge to the existing field. This criterion is designed to reward agencies desiring to take on new challenges, experiment with new methods or strategies, or test new water conservation technologies.

### **4. Assessment of the value of project to water utilities and the water conservation field (0-3 points):**

Is the project or information to be obtained by conducting the project important to water agencies and/or does it move the field beyond the current field of knowledge.

### **5. Cost-Effectiveness (0-3 points):**

If an agency proposes to conduct a project similar to other conservation programs that have been conducted in the past and have a history or track record of costs, the project costs must fall within an average range of costs, or if the project is unique, the costs must appear reasonable and only include applicable costs.

### **6. Focus on Community or Low Income Population (0-2 points):**

Programs with a community-based-organization (CBO) or similar community (i.e., elderly community) focus will receive a score of 1; programs targeting low-income communities will receive a score of 2.