

# Handout 4: Describing Financing of Westside IRWM Plan Update/Implementation

Draft February 8, 2013

# **Background**

The 2012 IRWM Plan Guidelines<sup>1</sup> require that financing of an IRWM Plan has been considered at a programmatic level by the RWMG and that a snapshot of financing be documented for stakeholders. The guidelines further state that most of the cost of developing, maintaining, and implementing an IRWM Plan must be borne by local entities with State grant funding providing a necessary, but relatively small, supplement in funds. Since there are potentially multiple sources of funding being accessed to formulate, maintain, and implement an IRWM Plan, documentation of how the funding pieces fit together is necessary for the RWMG and its stakeholders to understand how the plan will be implemented.

The IRWM Plan must contain the following items:

- A program-level description of the sources of funding, which will be utilized for the development and ongoing funding of the IRWM Plan.
- The potential funding sources for projects and programs that implement the IRWM Plan.

In addition to demonstrating potential funding for project construction, the IRWM Plan should also contain a discussion of the potential sources of funding for project O&M. Funding sources to be considered could include:

- Ratepayers
- Operating funds
- Water Enterprise funds
- Special taxes, assessments, and fees
- State or federal grants and loans
- Private loans
- Local bonds

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 2012 Guidelines p. 56

# Handout 4: Describing Financing of Westside IRWM Plan Update/Implementation for February 14, 2013 Stakeholder Mtg

# **Proposed Financing of IRWM Plan Update/Implementation**

Table 1 is intended to provide a starting point to describe and budget for Coordinating committee activities as discussed in Handout 2 – Plan Recommendations. Table 2 summarizes financing information provided by project proponents for high urgency/high importance projects and those included in the implementation grant application in March 2013. Both tables are intended to foster discussion with the Coordinating Committee and stakeholders to document how IRWM Plan update and implementation are expected to occur in the future.

Table 1: Coordinating Committee Activities Financing Summary (activities are suggested and to be refined)

Activity	Approximate	Funding	Funding:	O&M Finance	O&M Finance
Description	Total Cost	Source and %	Certainty/Longevity	Source	Certainty
		of Total Cost			
MOU Update					
CC Leadership					
including					
Meeting					
Preparation					
Evaluate Data					
and Develop					
Monitoring Plan					
Reporting on					
IRWM					
Objectives and					
Project					
Implementation					
IRWM Plan					
Review					
Other					
Coordination					

<sup>\*</sup>These include the activities described in the governance handout.



### DRAFT 2/8/2013

### Table 2: High Importance/High Urgency and Near-Term Implementation Projects

	Proposed for							
	Round 2				Funding Source	5 . II . O		
Activity Description	Implementation Grant	Lead Agency /Organization	Project Title	Approximate Total Cost	and % of Total Cost	Funding Certainty/ Longevity	O&M Finance Source	O&M Finance Certainty
IRWM Planning		/Organization	Project fille	TOTAL COST	Cosi	Longevity	Source	Oaw Finance Certainty
Efforts*								
Implementation		Woodland-Davis Clean	Davis-Woodland Water Supply		Ratepayer	Secure - Part of Agency	Ratepayer	Secure - Part of Agency
Project #110	X <sup>1</sup>	Water Agency	Project	\$258,000,000	Revenue; 100%	Budget	Revenue	Budget
110,000 #110	Α	Water Agency	i roject	Ψ250,000,000	revenue, 10070	Dauger	revenue	_
					Ratepayer		Ratepayer	Secure - Part of cities of Woodland and Davis
					Revenue; 93%	Not specified	Revenue	existing rates
					110701100, 0070		110101140	Oxioting rates
Implementation Project # 95		Reclamation District 2035	Conservato Birro Inich Intelia Basicat	£40.040.000	USBR & DFG; 7%	Security of funding not specified	N/A	N/A
Implementation		Napa Berryessa Resort	Sacramento River Joint Intake Project NBRID Wastewater Treatment Plant	\$42,646,000	USBK & DFG, 1%	specified	IN/A	IN/A
Project # 92		Improvement District	Replacement	\$1,500,000	None	Unsecure	None	Unsecure
Implementation		Napa Berryessa Resort	NBRID Water Treatment Plant				Ratepayer	Secure - Part of water and
Project # 90		Improvement District	Replacement	\$2,500,000	None	Unsecure	Revenue	sewer rates
Implementation		RWMG with selected Lead						
Project # 76		Agency	Regional Invasives Management Plan	\$0				
		· ,	ů ů				Ratepayer	Secure - Rate payer
					N/A	N/A	Revenue	adopted rates
					Existing Funds;	Secure - Existing Agency		
					35%	Funding	N/A	N/A
Implementation			Wastewater Treatment Plant			Applied or will apply for		
Project # 54		City of Davis	Secondary and Tertiary Improvements	\$85,000,000	SRF; Unknown	funding through SRF	N/A	N/A
					LAFE			
					account/USDA			
Implementation Project # 55		Clearlake Oaks County Water District	Plant Intake	60	funding; Not specified	Secured	None	Unsecure
Filipect # 55		Water District	Fidit ilitake	\$0	specified	Secured	None	Unsecure
Implementation		Crossest Boy Improvement						
Project # 48		Crescent Bay Improvement Company	Crescent Bay Improvement Company	\$1,000,000	None	Unsecure	None	Unsecure
110,000 # 10		Company	Croccom Bay improvement company	ψ1,000,000	110110	Chicodaro	110.10	Chicocare
Implementation		Solano County Water	Research on Improving Water					
Project # 34		Agency	Treatment for Delta Sources	\$100,000	None	Unsecure Medium Security -	None	Unsecure
						SCWA to potentially fund		
						50% Project Cost		
Implementation		Solano County Water				through rate payer		
Project # 32		Agency	Solano Invasive Species Program	\$100,000	SCWA; 50%	revenues Medium Security -	None	Unsecure Medium Security - SCWA
						SCWA to fund 50%		to fund 50% Project Cost
Implementation		Solano County Water	Aquatic Nuisance Vegetation			Project Cost through rate		through rate payer
Project # 23		Agency	Management	\$100,000/yr	SCWA; 50% O&M	payer revenues	SCWA	revenues
Implementation	X <sup>2</sup>	Lake Berryessa Resort	LBRID Wastewater Storage Pond and	#2 000 000	NI	Unsecure	Ratepayer Revenue	Secure - Part of Agency
Project # 87 Implementation	^	Improvement District Rural Community	Disposal Improvements Rural Disadvantaged Community	\$3,000,000	None	Unsecure	Revenue	Budget
Project # 93		Assistance Corporation	(DAC) Partnership Project	\$127,753	None	Unsecure	N/A	N/A
Implementation		Solano County Water	Water Savings Incentive Program for		Not Specified;			
Project # 24	X <sup>3</sup>	Agency	Commercial Accounts	\$245,000		Unsecure	None	Unsecure
					Napa County			
Implementation			Regional Collaborative Water		Measure A			
Project # 72	Х	Napa County	Conservation Program	\$125,000	Funding; 25%	Secured	None	Unsecure
			Middle Creek Flood Damage					
Implementation		Lake County Water	Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration		LCWRD/DWR;			
Project # 59	X <sup>4</sup>	Resources Department	Project	\$55,426,000		Secured	N/A	N/A
Implementation		Dixon Regional Watershed	Dixon Main Drain / V-drain		City of Dixon/Dixon		JPA Member	Secure - Part of Agencies
Project # 49	x	Joint Powers Authority	Enlargement Project	\$3,100.000	RCD/DWR; 25%	Secured	Revenue	Budget
Implementation		Lake Berryessa Resort	5 1 1,711	,,			Ratepayer	Secure - Part of Agency
Project # 88	X	Improvement District	Water Tank Replacement Project	\$1,500,000	Not Specified; 9%	Secured	Revenue	Budget
Implementation		Solano County Water	Lower Putah Creek Restoration :					
Project # 5&7	X	Agency	Monticello Dam to Dry Creek	\$1,455,000	DFG/LPCCC; 26%	Secured	None	Unsecure
Implementation	_	Scotts Valley Band of Pomo	Eight Mile Valley Meadow					
Project # 79	X <sup>5</sup>	Indians	Rehabilitation Project	\$1,250,000		Secured	None	Unsecure
Implementation		Yolo County Flood Control			Local			
Implementation Project # 85	X <sub>6</sub>	and Water Conservation District	Abandoned Well Incentive Program	\$2.200.000	Agencies/Farm Bureau; 17%	Secured	N/A	N/A
. 10,001 // 00				ψ <u></u> , <u></u> , <u></u> , <u></u> , 200,000			l ,	

## $\ensuremath{^\star}$ These include the activities described in the governance handout.

Note: Projects with superscripts represent those projects for which only a portion of the project was listed as a part of the proposed projects for the Round 2 Implementation Grant.

Acronyms

DFG-Department of Fish and Game

Dixon RCD - Dixon Resource Conservation District LCWRD - Lake County Water Resources Department LPCCC- lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee

N/A - Not Applicable

USBR - United States Bureau of Reclamation USDA - United States Department of Agriculture

Superscript	Grant Request Amount	Match%	
1	\$13,500,000	85%	
2	\$3,783,900	9%	
3	\$133,000	40%	
4	\$1,063,000	6%	
5	\$750,000	0%	
6	\$1,528,000	25%	