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Meeting Agenda

• Schedule Revisions

• Round 4 Draft Funding Recommendations
  • Discuss the Review Process
  • Present Funding Recommendation

• Round 4 Application Summaries

• Accept Public Comments

• Continuous Application Process Guidance
Submit workshop questions and comments through Skype. They will be addressed at the applicable time.

We will be monitoring the site throughout the workshop.
Individual Application Comments

- Comments or questions on individual applications will not be discussed during the workshop

- DWR staff are available to talk about individual applications at a pre-arranged time
Schedule Revisions

- Review Summaries will be available by Tuesday evening
- Comments are due to DWR by 5 pm PST on February 16
- Release of Final Funding in late February or early March
- Continuous Application Process to begin at 8 am on March 9
Desal Team

- Rich Mills, Section Chief
- Nancy King
- Toni Pezzetti
- Manucher Alemi, Policy Advisor
Round 4
Review Process
and Recommendation
1.3 Overview

The objective of the Program is to use grant funds to facilitate the use of desalinated water to meet the water resources needs of the state. The focus of the Program is on the development of potable water for municipal uses.
Review Process - 1

• **30 Applications were received**
  • Construction: 15 applications
  • Design Pilot: 2 applications
  • Environmental Documentation: 1 application
  • Feasibility Studies: 7 applications
  • Research Pilot: 5 applications

• **Received applications were numbered sequentially**
  • FS-2017-06
  • ED-2017-07
Review Process - 2

• Applications were put into 4 groups
  - 2 Construction
  - 1 Design Pilot and Research Pilot
  - 1 Feasibility Study and Environmental Documentation

• Projects were screened for completeness
  - 1 project was not considered eligible and was not reviewed further
  - Several projects were questionable but were given the benefit of the doubt and reviewed
Review Process - 3

• 1 project was withdrawn by the applicant before application review began

• Reviewers were assigned to teams
  • Expertise within category
  • Experience in project review
  • Expertise diversity
  • Multiple state and federal agencies
  • 6 to 9 members

• Each reviewer independently reviewed their team’s group of projects
Review Process - 4

• Each Review Team met
  • For the most part, consensus was achieved
  • If not, a majority opinion was determined and dissenting opinions noted

• Team Leads met to support consistency between teams and identify common issues

• Review summaries were prepared

• Recommendations reviewed by management
Several applications had numerous citations of a previously completed document but did not include it in their application. Usually, we were not able to access the document online.

Several projects that were not funded showed good water supply potential, but the application did not meet certain PSP criteria for funding.
General Comments About the Applications - 2

• Some applications provided minimal information on overall water supply issues and how the project would integrate with existing supplies

• Some applications were unclear about what work had already been completed

• Some applications were vague about funding match status
# Applications Recommended for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Grant Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>South Coast Water District</td>
<td>Doheny Ocean Desalination Phase 1 Project</td>
<td>$107,108,400</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Antioch</td>
<td>City of Antioch Brackish Water Desalination Project</td>
<td>$62,217,732</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Camarillo</td>
<td>North Pleasant Valley Desalter</td>
<td>$31,930,663</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Pilot</td>
<td>Eastern Municipal Water District</td>
<td>Enhanced Brine Concentration Design Pilot Project</td>
<td>$5,965,078</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olivenhain Municipal Water District</td>
<td>San Dieguito Valley Brackish Groundwater Desalination Design Pilot</td>
<td>$1,340,856</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Indian Wells Valley Water District</td>
<td>Indian Wells Valley (IWV) Brackish Groundwater Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$1,518,389</td>
<td>$1,083,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Replenishment District of Southern California</td>
<td>Feasibility Study for the West Coast Basin Brackish Water Reclamation Project</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Pilot</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>System Configurations and Cooling Technologies for Waste-Heat-Driven Membrane Distillation in Desalination Applications with High Water Recovery</td>
<td>$1,007,852</td>
<td>$503,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,437,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Summaries
Review Summaries

- Brief 2 to 3 page summaries
- Score and comments by question
- Prepared by Team Leads
- Prepared to support resubmittal of non-funded applications, but were prepared for each application
- Will be released to the applicant upon request
## Review Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Sheet Question</th>
<th>Max Pts</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Review Team Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the project have benefits described in Attachment 14 such as those identified in Section 2 of the PSP?</td>
<td>V/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the proposed project as a Construction Project given in Section 3.6 of the PSP and is the application complete?</td>
<td>V/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant must receive a total of 36 points from Questions 1, 2, and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Sheet Question</th>
<th>Max Pts</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. To what degree does the proposed project provide information that the project will result in public health benefits? (PSP Section 3.6(C)(3)(a)(ii))</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what degree does the proposed project provide information that the project will result in public health benefits from improved drinking water quality or supply (PSP Section 3.6(C)(3)(b)?)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will the project employ new or innovative technology or practices in desalination treatment, water intake, or brine management? (Objectives of the technology may be improved cost-effectiveness, energy efficiency, reduced water quality, reduce adverse environmental impacts or other benefits) (PSP Section 3.6(C)(3)(a)(iii))</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant must receive at least 50% of the available points in each of Questions 4 through 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Sheet Question</th>
<th>Max Pts</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Are the necessary project documents complete to the point that it could commence within 12 months of completing state contracting? (Necessary project documents could include CDA documents, permits, access agreements, interagency, reservations, and/or agreements)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the project have the experience, applicable license, ability, and availability to complete the project as described in the application? For Ilopitals that are newly received State or Federal funding, no performance of the agreement and the project completed satisfactorily?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are the project alternatives directly weighed against others in the application of the proposed project?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the project have support and/or established public outreach program?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Scoring Criteria**

1. Is Project Total greater than 70% of maximum possible points? **FAIL**
2. Are Questions #1 and #2 both yes? **PASS**
3. Is the Total of Questions #3 through #5 greater than 50% of the maximum possible points for the sum of those questions? **PASS**
4. Are the results of each of Questions #7 through #10 greater than 50% of the possible score for each question? **FAIL**

### Project Advantages

The project has good local water supply aspects.

### RECOMMENDATIONS/CONDITIONS

- Key issues to be addressed in a re-submittal:
  - Point
  - Point
  - Point

### Overall Recommendation

- **Do not fund**
Review Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Funding</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Review Sheet Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Sheet Question</th>
<th>Max Pts</th>
<th>Score¹</th>
<th>Review Team Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the project have benefits described in Attachment 14 such as those identified in Section 3 of the PSP?</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the proposal typified as a Construction Project as given in Section 3.3 of the PSP and is the application complete?</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant must receive a total of 16 points from Questions 3, 4, and 5.

3. To what degree does the proposal provide information that the project will result in a water supply reliability improvement per PSP Section 3.4 (CWC §79767(a))? | 15     | 9      |
4. To what degree does the proposal provide information that the project will result in water quality and ecosystem benefits related to decreased reliance on diversions from the Delta or instream flows per PSP Section 3.4 (CWC §79767(b), §12946)? | 8       | 7      |
5. To what degree does the proposal provide information that the project will result in public health benefits from improved drinking water quality or supply per PSP Section 3.4 (CWC §79767(c))? | 8       | 2      |
6. Will the project employ new or innovative technology or practices in desalination treatment, water intake, or brine management? Objectives of the technology may be improved cost-effectiveness, energy efficiency, treated water quality, reduce adverse environmental impacts, or other benefits? | 10     | 6      |

### SCREENING QUESTIONS
- May or may include comments

### PROP 1 BENEFITS QUESTIONS

### TECHNOLOGY QUESTION
- Not applicable to each project type
- 50% not required
### Review Summaries

The applicant must receive at least 50% of the available points in each of Questions 7 through 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Sheet Question</th>
<th>Max Pts</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Review Team Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Are the necessary project documents complete to the point that it could commences within 3 to 6 months of completing state contracting? Necessary project documents could include CEQA documents, permits, access agreements, interagency resolutions and/or agreements.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the project team have the experience, applicable licenses, ability, and availability to complete the project as described in the application? For Applicants that previously received State or federal funding, was performance of the agreement and the project completed satisfactorily?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Have the project alternatives been clearly weighed against others to support the selection of the proposed project?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the project have community support and an established public outreach program? Does the Public Outreach Plan indicate continuous public involvement?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONS 7 TO 16**
- Specific application questions
- Box colored to show above or below 50% threshold
- Question 9 does not apply to Research Pilot projects

**50% not required**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**
- May or may not be included
- No bearing on score
Review Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS (varies by project type)</th>
<th>APPLICATION POINTS</th>
<th>PROJECT TOTAL POINTS PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary of Scoring Criteria</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is Project Total greater than 70% of maximum possible points?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are Questions #1 and #2 both yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the Total of Questions #3 through #5 greater than 50% of the maximum possible points for the sum of those questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the results of each of Questions #7 through #16 greater than 50% of the possible score for each question?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Advantages:</th>
<th>The project has good local water supply aspects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATIONS/CONDITIONS:** Key issues to be addressed in a re-submittal:
- Point
- Point
- Point

**Overall Recommendation:**
- [ ] Fund
- [ ] Do not fund
Round 4 Comments
Process

• Request Review Summaries by email (DesalPSP@water.ca.gov)

• Comments can be submitted at this workshop, either orally or in writing

• Comments can also be submitted by February 16 at 5 pm to:
  • By e-mail to: DesalPSP@water.ca.gov
  • By mail to: Richard Mills
    Water Use and Efficiency Branch
    Department of Water Resources
    P. O. Box 942836
    Sacramento, California 94236-0001
Continuous Application Process
Overview

- Application submittal process is as described in the Round 4 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP, June 16, 2017)
- Additional information in the Continuous Application Process Guidance (January 24, 2018)

*Funds will be available on a continuous basis and will be awarded on a first ready, first served basis until all grant funds are exhausted.*
Key Dates

• **March 9, 2018**: Applications accepted beginning at 8 am through GRanTS

• **March 5, 2018**: GRanTS available to begin preparing applications

*These dates differ from those in the Continuous Application Process Guidance (January 24, 2018)*
Key Issues

- If an application is being resubmitted from an earlier round, the Status of Attachments resubmitted under the Continuous Application Process is to be included in Attachment 21.
Eligible Projects

An application may be submitted for work related to a project previously funded by the Program if the new proposal:

- Is a stand-alone, operationally independent project
- Is not part of the Eligible Project in the previously funded grant.
Ineligible Projects

- Research Pilot projects are not eligible
- Projects either within the previously funded Eligible Project scope of work or needed to make a previously funded incomplete project functional or operational.
To Officially Submit for Review:

- Submit application through GRanTS
- Send an email to DesalPSP@water.ca.gov to notify staff that an application is ready to review.
- Email with time stamp will be considered the application submittal date and time
- Application modifications after that time will not be considered until DWR completes review and submitted comments to the applicant
Review and Award

- Applications reviewed in the order in which received, with priority to Round 4 submissions
- Applications recommended for funding will be submitted to DWR management for approval on a quarterly basis
- A draft funding recommendation will be publicly released, using the same process as the previous funding rounds.
QUESTIONS??
Contact Information

• Main Email
  • DesalPSP@water.ca.gov

• Website
  • Water.ca.gov/desalination

• Phone Numbers
  • Richard Mills (916) 651-0715
  • Nancy King (916) 651-7200
  • Toni Pezzetti (916) 651-7024