



Statutes

Regulations

Guidelines

PSP

Current Activities

- ❖ Detailing needed program components
- ❖ Identifying “location” for components (e.g. regulations vs. guidelines)
- ❖ Developing concepts for revised guidelines
 - ❖ Using templates from other programs
 - ❖ Incorporating Proposition 1 requirements
- ❖ Developing conceptual model for solicitation process
- ❖ Developing concepts for revised regulations

Purpose of Each

❖ Statutes

- ❖ High level directives
- ❖ Proposition 1 sets a very high bar for clarifying amendments to statutory provisions of WSIP

❖ Regulations

- ❖ Statute establishes content requirement for WSIP regulations
 - ❖ Regulations may not be broader than statutory authority
- ❖ Provide more detail, specific requirements

❖ Guidelines

- ❖ Program processes and specifications
- ❖ Can be used to present requirements from other relevant statutes, etc.

❖ PSP

- ❖ Application level details such as deadlines and submittal requirements

Handout “Matrix”

- ❖ Looks at each individual WSIP code section
- ❖ Identifies additional tasks for Regulation Team
 - ❖ Issues for future discussion with the Commission, either decision/direction from the Commission
- ❖ Identifies areas that will need to be clarified
- ❖ Today – Highlight “early input” areas on WSIP Program Development
 - ❖ Program requirements from sources other than Proposition 1 (Page 1)
 - ❖ Funding for Environmental Documents and Permits (page 5 and 7)
 - ❖ Cost share requirements (Page 7)

Other Program Requirements

- ❖ Applied to Projects using State Funds

- ❖ Example: Labor Compliance for Public Works Projects
- ❖ Disbursement requirement; not an eligibility requirement

- ❖ Applied to State Grant and Loan Programs

- ❖ Example: Groundwater Management Plans

- ❖ Water Code §10753.7(b)(1)(A) requires a GWMP for groundwater project to receive DWR funds
- ❖ Proposition 1 requires Division 6 Section 10000 groundwater plans for Chapter 7 funds
- ❖ Water Code §10720.9 requires “all relevant state agencies” (SWRCB, RWQCBs, DWR, and DWF named) to consider the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014 in decision making
- ❖ GWMPs not explicitly required for groundwater or conjunctive use projects to receive WSIP funds
- ❖ Discretionary decision by the Commission

Funding for Documents and Permits

- ❖ §79704 General authorization for planning and monitoring funding
 - ❖ Up to 10% = \$270M
- ❖ §79755.(a) General restriction on allocating funds before December 15, 2016
- ❖ §79755.(c) Exception for completion of
 - ❖ Environmental Documentation
 - ❖ Permitting
- ❖ Would provide assistance to storage projects to complete or offset the costs of environmental documentation and permitting which can be an expensive process
- ❖ Would reduce the amount of funding available for construction of WSIP projects
- ❖ Does the Commission want to incorporate such funding into the WSIP?
 - ❖ If yes, will outline specific proposal at a future workshop

Review of Available Funds

Proposition 1 WSIP Funding	
Total Authorized	\$2,700,000,000
Statewide Bond Costs (2%)	\$54,000,000
Program Delivery (Up to 5% - Lifecycle)	\$135,000,000
Available to Award	\$2,511,000,000
Environmental Doc & Permits (Up to 10%)	\$270,000,000
Remaining for Project Construction	\$2,241,000,000

Cost Share

- ❖ §79756.(a) The WSIP cost share shall not exceed 50% of the total project costs
 - ❖ Except for Conjunctive Use and Reservoir Reoperation projects
 - ❖ For such projects could establish an alternative percentage (higher or lower)
- ❖ §79756.(b) 50% of the WSIP cost share must support ecosystem improvements
 - ❖ For example
 - ❖ 50% Non-Public Benefits + 25% Ecosystem Public Benefits + 25% All Remaining Public Benefits = 100% Project Funding
 - ❖ If the final evaluation of the public benefits finds that the ecosystem benefits are <50%
 - ❖ Adjust funding percentage to scale the WSIP funding to needed percentages – Issue Paper Recommendation
 - ❖ Disqualify the proposal
 - ❖ Allow applicant to revise proposal

Review Process Concepts

❖ “Case Worker”

- ❖ Commission (non-technical) staff assigned to prospective applicants to help guide through the process
- ❖ Scheduling , coordination, application readiness – needed documentation

❖ Technical Assistance

- ❖ Will provide training for use of tool developed for review process
 - ❖ Economical Analysis
 - ❖ Benefits Assessments

❖ Interactive Review

- ❖ Have structured process to allow review team to clarify questions
- ❖ Allow applicants opportunity to present project concepts

❖ Anticipated timeframes

- ❖ Could take from 9 to 17 months

Review Process = 9 to 17 months

- ❖ Outreach on application requirements and training on use of tools = 1-2 months
- ❖ Application prep period = 2-4 months
- ❖ Technical review period = 3-6 months
 - ❖ Eligibility & general technical reviews
 - ❖ Benefits and Economic assessments
 - ❖ Modeling – Individual projects and suites of projects
- ❖ Expert Panel = 2-3 months
 - ❖ Up to 1 month review technical evaluations
 - ❖ 1 month for meeting & prep reviews/recommendations
 - ❖ Up to 1 month
 - ❖ Prep materials for Commission
 - ❖ Address Expert Panel issues
 - ❖ Address any remaining issues with applicants
- ❖ Commission Decision = 1-2 months (2 meetings)
 - ❖ 1 meeting to discuss the proposals + 1 meeting to make decisions