

NAME	AGENCY	COMMENT	RESPONSE (Incorporated into Draft Version 6 submitted to State DWR)
Wendy La	Laser LLC	A. Applicant selection on page 2, first sentence - instead "for the Los Angeles-Ventura Funding Area" after This Integrated Regional Water Management Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (IRWM DACIP) Grant Proposal.	Revised the sentence to reflect suggested language.
		B. Disadvantaged Communities Background on page 3, second paragraph relative to the GLAC IRWM Region - The total of the 108 DACs for the five subregions (35+34+30+9+0 = 108) of the GLAC IRWM Region is not consistent with the 105 DACs being referred in the other parts of the proposal. First and for most, I think we need to be consistent with DWR's grant guidelines and mapping tools relative to defining DACs and Economically Distressed Areas (EDAs). Are the 108 DACs places, tracts, or block groups? In addition, we also need to identify the (EDA) for the GLAC Region. For example, the whole City of Industry meets the EDA requirements, and it is located in the Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo (USGRH) Subregion. I am not sure if the whole City of Industry is being accounted for as part of the 9 DACs in the USGRH Subregion. In addition, some of the GLAC DAC outreach communities identified on the "Designed Disadvantaged Communities within the Prop 1 Los Angeles-Ventura Funding Area" Map do not include DWR defined DAC block groups. For example, it looks like the GLAC DAC outreach community #77 Rowland/Industry from the Map excluded DWR's DAC Block Group ID #: 060374086283 (population of 1,761; households of 725; and median household income of \$47,224), which is just adjacent to the boundary of #77 Rowland/Industry. Therefore, some of the outreach communities will need to be revised to include DWR defined DACs and EDAs.	1) Thank you for catching the inconsistency. The number of DACs in the Draft Version 5 Application narrative for Lower San Gabriel-Lower Los Angeles River Sub Region is incorrect. It should be 27, and has been noted in the Version 6 narrative. With that, the regions add up to 105 (35+34+27+9). Some DACs in that subregion fall outside the Funding Area. The numbers are correct on the Map provided with Draft Version 5. 2) The State Department of Water Resources (DWR), through the DAC Community Outreach Evaluation Study referenced in the narrative, has accepted the methods and definition of DAC areas moving forward (the study is published on their website). The map being used for the application illustrates the current DWR-designated DACs (by block group) in orange along with the refined "community boundaries" defined in the study. No DWR-designated DAC areas have been excluded from the map. Certain areas were excluded from the definition of a DAC "community" (i.e. LAX, or the City of Industry designated as an EDA) because there are no people living there. Therefore, these types of places did not get outlined/highlighted on the map, but still appear in orange as a DWR DAC area).
		C. Task 0 - Preprogram & Administration on page 10 - missing sub-task headings (0.1 Preprogram and 0.2 Administration)	Added the sub-heading, "Pre-Program and Administration Activities."
		D. Page 13, first paragraph - 105 DACs which is not consistent with the 108 DACs	See response to B above.
		E. Pages 16 & 17 for Task 2 Activities and pages 20 for Task 3.2 Project Development - when referring to other sub-tasks, please spell out the full sub-tasks (do not just reference the sub-tasks by #).	Sub-tasks have now been spelled out and added to the the first occurrence of the referenced sub-task #. Subsequent references include sub-task # only, similar to conventional practice for repeated abbreviations, terms, labels, etc.
		F. Schedule on page 28 - I think, data collection of existing outreach material from the institutional stakeholders within the traditional water and public agencies will need to occur earlier in Task 1.1 Design Outreach Program. This may help with reducing the cost of Task 1.1 Design Outreach Program.	Language has been added in Draft Version 6 for Task 1.1 narrative to allow for potential use of existing outreach and educational materials (or their ideas, content, images, etc.). The authorized use of existing ideas, content, images, etc. could reduce design costs depending on: * The additional in-house costs of researching materials from dozens of organizations and agencies * Potential in-kind donations of materials from traditional water organizations and public agencies * Whether existing materials are specific to a single jurisdiction or can apply across multiple communities.
		G. Budget on page 29 - The budget for Task 0.1 Proposal Development (\$264,000) is high considering that it is 2.7% of the grant amount of \$9.8 million. This is in addition to the \$540,000 (5.5%) for grant administration over three years. Together they add up to \$804,000 (8.2%). The budgets for Task 1.1 Design Outreach Program (\$420,700) and Task 2.1 Design Needs Assessment (\$335,700) are high considering that there are a lot of useful existing outreach material and studies. Together they add up to \$756,400 (7.7%). Will there be more cost savings by combining this two tasks together to be developed by the same consultant and at the same time? Overall the budget for Task 0 Administration (\$804,000 = 8.2%) and Task 1 Community Outreach Program (\$2,470,000 = 25.2%) are too high. I think, more funding should go towards Task 3 Project Development (\$4,672,000 = 47.7%) and Task 2 Needs Assessment (\$1,853,700 = 18.9%).	1) Proposal Development and Administration: DWR asks that these costs not exceed 10% total. These costs reflect the nature of the complex Funding Area created by DWR, which essentially requires 3 regions accustomed to competing for IRWM grant funds to instead collaborate on proposal development and execution. Since the Funding Area is comprised of a very large geographic area, significant coordination is required for even basic logistics such as securing time and locations for representatives (i.e., the Area's DACIP Task Force) to meet in a centralized location. The efforts of the Task Force (the bulk of proposal development costs) will also need to continue in some form (primarily program management and administration) through the completion of the 3-year program. The costs to administer this grant represent the complexity of contracting, inter-agency agreements, invoicing, payments, and the processes thereof, etc. 2) Costs for Tasks 1.1 and 2.1 (Design Outreach Program; Design Needs Assessment) reflect the complexity of the 3-region Funding Area creating a unified program that crosses many natural boundaries, cultures, and jurisdictions. Beyond designing the program, costs also include adapting and creating databases and web portals for community education and participation. A single consultant may jointly address these tasks for any of the regions and any cost savings could be applied to Task 3. As discussed in response to comment F above, potential use of existing materials is now explicitly identified. 3) In discussions with DWR, the DACIP Task Force framed the overall expense targets as 30% for Outreach, 20% for Needs Assessment, and 50% for Project Development (after administrative costs). DWR concurred with the targets, but also agreed that changes may be warranted once the needs are better understood and targeted. 4) There is nothing to prevent increasing Task 3 Project Development expenditures if/when there are savings realized elsewhere. Also, if the DACIP process determines that additional funds are needed to help achieve its goals, DWR may be approached for additional Prop 1 funds for the LA-Ventura Funding Area.

Colin Bailey	EJCW	A. Seems to me the draft application has a very project-focused approach. Capacity building should go beyond the purely technical, in my view. Water challenges must be taken in the context of power differentials between landlords and tenants, gentrification, a continuing foreclosure crisis, lack of access to affordable housing, transportation, healthcare, education, and other services.	Capacity building has been a central theme in the discussions of the DACIP Task Force as well as working with the consultants that will be implementing and managing most of the tasks in partnership with local NGOs and CBOs. The intent is to build capacity beyond technical skills and enhance DAC knowledge, empowerment, and engagement in local governance. The descriptions of capacity building within the task activities have been strengthened to better reflect this intent. We agree that water issues should be discussed in a broader context which includes other issues (i.e. housing, tenants rights, gentrification, transportation, etc.). However, for the proposal we have some limits in order to be able to address the grant's focus on water-related needs. The DACIP outreach and communication strategy intends to open up a broad dialogue to engage communities, which could lead us in many directions. Additionally, it is our intention that the technical assistance provided will lead to multi-benefit projects or programs, which would address other non-water related needs. The intended outcome of the grant-funded activities is that these communities are empowered to advocate for their needs and be active players in the water-related decision making process. As a result, they will likely be better equipped to take on other challenges and to become stronger partners with the institutions and entities that provide their services. This grant process will help water management institutions to better understand - and fully include and value - all their stakeholders, which will result in making communities stronger.
		B. Needs assessment should also go beyond technical for the same reason.	Agreed, see response to comment A included above
		C. You say you'll have an institutional needs assessment, which I hope you interpret to mean an examination of and commitment to equalize access to and participation in governance institutions and processes and the power to make decisions for residents of Disadvantaged Communities.	Agreed, see response to comment A included above
Matt Frary	LACFCD	A. Suggest including a separate map of the Funding Area from the Funding Area DAC map.	DWR, in the RFP, asked for a single map to show the Funding Area and certain other criteria, including DACs.
		B. The narrative states 105 DACs in the GLAC Region, but the map shows 108 DACs. Make corrections throughout the proposal that references the number of DACs in the GLAC Region.	See response to Wendy La's question B above.
Sharon Green	Sanitation Districts of LA Co.	A. Two things are missing from Tasks 2 or 3. One is some mention of identification of a project proponent that has the capacity to both develop and implement a project, including having a funding source for O & M. This leads me to the other comment. The workshops in Task 2 keep the communities and the institutions separate, but based on the needs assessment, I would think that there will be a need for subsequent workshops to be held jointly so that the community reps and agency/institutional reps can communicate and work together to determine how the needs could best be met. Maybe that is what you envision, but that didn't come through clearly.	1) The first comment speaks to an important criteria in implementing projects (i.e., feasibility). Since the DACIP focus is engagement, Task 2 Needs Assessment aims to identify the full range of DAC needs. DWR requires the Needs Assessment component and developed a Needs Assessment Template. This template includes collecting information on "Water System Financing Needs" including O&M costs (use of the template is included in the Application in Tasks 2 and 2.1, but details are not spelled out). Therefore, a "project proponent" could be a consideration in selecting projects for Task 3 (Project Development) based on the final Task 2 Needs Assessment. At the same time, a project may need to go through Technical Assistance and other Project Development to understand the costs of O&M and what an agency/landowner would need to commit to the project - and possibly how they go about identifying resources. 2) Yes, subsequent workshops were envisioned for the program and were implied in Task 1.4 of the narrative. To help clarify this point, draft language has been inserted under Tasks 1.2 and 2.2 to allow for additional workshops to bring community and water managers together.
		B. The schedule seems to be a bit optimistic for two of the Task 2 Needs Assessment Items: Community and Institutions' Needs assessments. We are scheduling 6 months to do 42 workshops for the institutions, and also 6 months to do 122 workshops for the community. It seems like we will need more time to accomplish that many community workshops.	The Application timeline is intended to serve the DWR timeline of ending in 2020 and still allow for a maximum period of Project Development. This mandates that the Needs Assessment be addressed as quickly as possible. The Application (and budget) are purposefully open in relation to the numbers of workshops and their schedule to allow flexibility in working with a large and diverse array of communities. In the GLAC region, it is assumed (as stated in Tasks 1.2 and 2.2) that communities will ideally be consolidated for joint workshops. As a result, the number of community workshops should be much lower - closer to 50 (or even less) to cover up to the 105 DACs. The use of CBOs to help host and market workshops (in all regions) is intended to reach several communities in a short time period. Institution outreach (as stated in the narrative) may be achieved by "workshops or other data collection methods," meaning there could be fewer than 40. The actual quantities and plan will be determined as part of the Needs Assessment Design.
		C. The Task 2 outreach to institutions includes outreach to elected officials. Are the consultants really who we want outreaching to elected officials? At a minimum, this needs further discussion as to how it should be handled.	The inclusion of elected officials in the Needs Assessment is to both inform their office of the DACIP's involvement of their constituents and obtain available Needs Assessment information. It is assumed that communication will occur with the elected officials' staff members who are most knowledgeable on water and related issues for the DACs they serve. A revisions was made to reflect this in the narrative for Task 2.3.
Robert Eranio	Cloverdale Mutual Water Company	Page 6 - Known Water Management Needs. Please consider adding Meeting Minimum Fire Flow Requirements/Fire Flow Water System Storage	The Known Water Management Needs section reflects previous studies, surveys and agency experience. A revision has been inserted in Version 6, page 6.
Ewelina Mutkowska	County of Ventura - Public Works	Page 7 - Partnering. Consider adding: Ventura Countywide Municipal Stormwater Resources Plan, Santa Clara River Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load Implementation Plans to the list of existing engagement and project planning efforts.	The Partnering Section lists generic kinds of plans as examples, but not specific plans. Language to include "stormwater resource and TMDL plans" as examples was included in draft Version 6.

Armond Ghazarian	LACFCD	There are many projects that are designed or have been constructed or implemented in some of the DACs. It is important to make sure that existing efforts are analyzed and brought forward as part of this process to ensure that limited dollars are not being duplicated or that existing efforts might be leveraged to solve a DAC community concern.	The Needs Assessment process with the community includes "a discussion of current and pending projects" (narrative, Task 2 overview) to bring existing projects and plans into the DACIP process for inclusion and consideration. Additional language is included in Draft Version 6, Task 2 to clarify that such projects exist for some DACs (and therefore implies both that duplication should be avoided and modification to leverage existing efforts should be considered). Inclusion of existing IRWM and other water projects has also been part of the conversation shaping this Application since the beginning. The program prioritizes projects vetted through DAC involvement and their identified community needs regardless of whether the project is an existing proposal or a new one that may originate through the needs assessments.
Don Henry	Agua Dulce	While there is interest in gaining access to services, technical assistance and projects, there is a competing concern that participation in this process might obligate a community to take actions. However, this community wants to explore options to empower the community to make its own decision on water issues without obligation.	The intent of the DACIP Program is to ensure DAC areas have full opportunity to benefit from Proposition 1 funding and that such benefits emerge from community-identified need. Neither the Application nor the DACIP Program require a community to take action but rather empowers them to do so as desired.

