

**Table 7 - Final Funding - Urban  
Implementation Projects (Section A)**

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4014	1	Contra Costa Water District	High Efficiency Toilet and Urinal Replacement Program	\$647,446	\$647,446	\$1,314,892
4110	2	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	Multi-Family UFL Toilet Direct - Install Program	\$2,436,659	\$1,710,000	\$4,146,659
4131	3	Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC)	Industrial Process Water Use Reduction Program	\$414,208	\$404,801	\$819,009
4172	4	Los Angeles, City of	Cooling Tower Conductivity Controller Replacement Program	\$675,000	\$350,000	\$1,025,000
4139	5	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Rebate Program for Cooling Tower Conductivity Controllers	\$3,780,187	\$2,183,036	\$5,963,223
4134	6	Los Angeles, City of	Los Angeles City Park Irrigation Efficiency Program	\$778,970	\$362,000	\$1,140,970
4156	7	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Statewide Urban Water Agency One-Stop Rebate Program	\$4,328,080	\$3,573,322	\$7,901,402
4173	8	West Sacramento, City of	Parks Irrigation Retrofit	\$0	\$324,551	\$324,551
4091	9	El Dorado Irrigation District	EID CII/Multi-Family Landscape Sub-Metering and ET Controller Installation Project	\$84,201	\$83,098	\$167,299
4025	10	Sacramento, City of	Park Irrigation Infrastructure Improvements	\$200,000	\$1,053,661	\$1,253,661
4081	11	San Benito County Water District	Water Softener Rebate Program	\$305,560	\$300,000	\$605,560
4029	12	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Residential High Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$6,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$11,000,000
4033	13	Pittsburg, City of	Innovative Irrigation Saving Our Delta "I2SOD"	\$277,984	\$409,487	\$687,472

Proposal as Approved				
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Cost	Comments	CALFED Benefits (estimates include both recoverable and irrecoverable water savings, AFY)
\$647,446	\$647,446	\$1,294,892	Fully fund	136 water savings
\$1,650,133	\$2,436,659	\$4,086,792	Fully fund	1,210 water savings
\$404,801	\$414,208	\$819,009	Fully fund	689 water savings
\$350,000	\$675,000	\$1,025,000	Fully fund	314 water savings
\$349,714	\$606,000	\$955,714	\$349,714. Limit to about 700 rebates, instead of 700. Limit admin costs to less than 20%. Rebate for 200 and 20% admin costs, limit grant to	161 water savings
\$362,000	\$778,970	\$1,140,970	Fully fund	143 water savings
\$1,250,000	\$1,441,000	\$2,691,000	Administrative costs are excessive. DWR staff to negotiate administration costs of less than 20%. Take into consideration similar rebate programs to determine rebate amount.	qualitative benefits
\$324,551	\$0	\$324,551	<b>Applicant is disadvantaged community. Approve requested funds. Applicant must submit a complete UWMP by December 31, 2005.</b>	8,582 water savings
\$83,098	\$84,201	\$167,299	Fully fund	28 water savings
\$754,000	\$143,000	\$897,000	Limit \$10,000 for monitoring/assessment and report writing. Limit of \$428,620 for Group 2 part of the proposal for a total of \$754,000. Applicant's proposed local share is prorated.	172 water savings
\$300,000	\$305,560	\$605,560	Fully fund	781 water savings
\$1,660,000	\$1,992,000	\$3,652,000	Applicant claims Locally cost effective, but application data and economist evaluation indicates the application not locally cost effective. Moved to locally not cost effective. Limit grant to two third, two years of the program at \$1,660,000. Applicant cost share shall be \$1,992,000.	Reduce Bay Delta demand by 12,275 ac-ft
\$0	\$0	\$0	Applicant claims locally cost effective. Applicant doesn't make a compelling case that the project will have broad transferable benefits or accelerates implementation. Recommend do not fund.	Water quality improvements and instream flow and timing benefits of 226-271 ac-ft.

**Table 7 - Final Funding - Urban  
Implementation Projects (Section A)**

Proposal as Submitted						
App.	Rank	Applicant	Project Title	Applicant Proposed Share	Funds Requested	Total Project Costs
4071	14	Port Hueneme, City of	Citywide Meter Retrofit and System Audit Program	\$2,789,093	\$1,360,800	\$4,149,893
4005	15	Cathedral City, City of	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$54,450	\$36,900	\$91,350
4073	16	Newhall County Water District (NCWD)	Residential ET Controller Rebate Program	\$149,459	\$71,874	\$221,330
4064	17	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	California Friendly Communities	\$547,725	\$1,500,000	\$2,047,725
4142	18	Los Angeles, City of	Large Landscape "Smart Irrigation" Program	\$374,840	\$367,500	\$742,340
4067	19	Metropolitan Water district of Southern California	High-Efficiency Toilet Rebate Program	\$4,200,000	\$5,000,000	\$9,200,000
4031	20	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	Residential Water Use Audits Program	\$627,103	\$773,279	\$1,400,382
4039	21	Richgrove Community Services District	Richgrove Water Meter Retrofit Program	\$0	\$119,683	\$119,683
4080	22	West Basin Municipal Water District	West Basin Municipal Water District Restroom Retrofit Project	\$889,100	\$884,500	\$1,773,600
4127	23	Electric and Gas Industries Association (EGIA)	Regional Resource - Efficient Clothes Washer Rebate Program	\$8,143,560	\$5,742,675	\$13,886,235
4042	24	Los Angeles County Waterworks Districts	Commercial, Industrial, Institutional Water Use Audits and Dedicated Landscape Meter Installation Program	\$245,484	\$329,776	\$575,260
4069	25	Friars Village Homeowners' Association	Landscape Irrigation System Upgrade	\$64,220	\$46,870	\$111,090
				<b>\$38,013,329</b>	<b>\$32,635,259</b>	<b>\$70,668,586</b>

Proposal as Approved				
Funding Recommendation	Adjusted Applicant Share	Adjusted Total Project Cost	Comments	CALFED Benefits (estimates include both recoverable and irrecoverable water savings, AFY)
\$345,324	\$1,037,973	\$1,383,297	Fund one year of project, 1,733 meters. Locally cost effective, fund at 25% or \$345,324.	89 water savings
\$36,900	\$54,450	\$91,350	Fully fund	49
\$55,332	\$165,997	\$221,329	Applicant is found locally cost effective subject to 25% state share. Applicant to submit a complete Urban Water Management Plan by December 31, 2005.	2,514 water savings
\$423,150	\$154,000	\$577,150	Fund multi-family portion of project, 1,650 valves	Avoided diversions from the Bay Delta
\$183,750	\$187,420	\$371,170	Fund at 50 percent.	75 water savings
\$1,000,000	\$840,000	\$1,840,000	Limit to \$1,000,000 and limit program to 10,000 ULFTs. Was found to be not locally cost effective.	41 water savings
\$386,640	\$313,000	\$699,640	10% of district customers instead of 20%. Project does not meet Disadvantaged Community criteria.	1,235 water savings
\$119,683	\$0	\$119,683	Fully fund	74 water savings
\$294,834	\$294,834	\$589,668	Fund one year only, 383 restrooms.	91 water savings
\$1,534,342	\$2,175,816	\$3,710,158	Initial funding recommendation of \$1.9 million is reduced to allow funding for other eligible projects with higher score. Fund one year only, DWR to negotiate approximately 25,000 rebates.	564 water savings
\$108,681	\$326,046	\$434,727	Fund program, 1,788 audits. Applicant claims Locally Cost Effective. Project is LCE. Locally cost effective, fund at 25%=\$108,681. Project does not meet Disadvantaged Community criteria.	1,333 water savings
\$46,870	\$64,220	\$111,090	Fully fund	9 water savings
<b>\$12,671,249</b>	<b>\$15,137,800</b>	<b>\$27,809,049</b>		<b>30,791</b>