

Attachment

5

Greater Los Angeles County Region

IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal

Budget Summary

Attachment 5 consists of the following items:

Budget. Attachment 5 provides a budget for each project within this Implementation Grant Proposal, as well as a summary budget for the entire Proposal. Each section following includes the proposed budget for each individual project in this Proposal.

This Budget Attachment provides detailed budget documentation to support each cost shown in the tables below under the section entitled Detailed Proposal Work Item Budgets. Please note that for many of the budget categories shown in each budget table, there may be several tasks and sub-tasks. The budget tables also present the proposed funding match for each project within the Proposal, including information that describes how each project will contribute to the Proposal's 85% funding match. The Proposal as a whole far exceeds the Department of Water Resources (DWR) funding match criteria of 25%.

Proposal Budget Summary

As described in Attachment 3, the *Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application Proposal* involves implementation of 14 projects to meet the Region's water management needs.

The total budget for this Proposal is \$184,183,399.84. Of this amount, \$27,261,413.50 is being requested from DWR through the IRWM Grant Program, \$156,921,986.34 (85% percent) is being provided through non-State funding sources (funding match), and \$0.00 is being provided through other State funds. A Disadvantaged Community (DAC) funding match waiver is not being requested.

Table 4-1 presents the overall cost of the Proposal implementation. Detailed cost estimates for each project contained in the Proposal follow. The specific work items outlined in Attachment 3 are reflected in the detailed cost estimates.

Project Budget Summary

Detailed budgets for each of the projects included within this Proposal, including a summary budget and a description of how the budget shown is reasonable based on current available information.

Table 4-1: Summary Budget (PSP Table 8)

Proposal Title: <u>Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application</u>						
Individual Project Title		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Funding Sources	Total Cost	% Funding Match
(a)	Los Angeles-Burbank Groundwater System Interconnection	\$517,440.71	\$501,024.46	\$0.00	\$1,018,465.17	49%
(b)	Mission Wells Improvement	\$3,017,440.71	\$19,632,939.00	\$0.00	\$22,650,379.71	87%
(c)	Manhattan Wells Improvement	\$3,017,440.71	\$21,887,400.76	\$0.00	\$24,904,841.47	88%
(d)	TIWRP Advanced Water Purification Facility and Distribution System Expansion	\$2,517,440.71	\$79,508,164.43	\$0.00	\$82,025,605.14	97%
(e)	Recycled Water Turnouts	\$5,000,440.71	\$1,696,800.00	\$0.00	\$6,697,240.71	25%
(f)	Goldsworthy Desalter Expansion	\$4,017,440.71	\$19,556,592.00	\$0.00	\$23,574,032.71	83%
(g)	Be a Water Saver Conservation Program	\$718,940.71	\$846,831.46	\$0.00	\$1,565,772.17	54%
(h)	On-Site Recycled Water Retrofits	\$628,940.71	\$1,933,830.70	\$0.00	\$2,562,771.41	75%
(i)	Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District Recycled Water Program Expansion	\$2,223,640.71	\$3,661,800.00	\$0.00	\$5,885,440.71	62%
(j)	West Coast Basin Barrier Project Unit 12 Injection Observation Wells	\$1,017,440.71	\$4,001,420.84	\$0.00	\$5,018,861.55	80%
(k)	Rockhaven Well	\$895,690.49	\$321,749.98	\$0.00	\$1,217,440.47	26%
(l)	Water Budget Based Rate Implementation	\$430,160.71	\$249,571.84	\$0.00	\$679,732.55	37%
(m)	Well No. 2 Rehabilitation	\$202,440.71	\$68,662.00	\$0.00	\$271,102.71	25%
(n)	Pomona Basin Regional Groundwater	\$3,056,514.49	\$3,055,198.87	\$0.00	\$6,111,713.36	50%
	Proposal Total	\$27,261,413.50	\$156,921,986.34	\$0.00	\$184,183,399.84	85%
	DAC Funding Match Waiver Total	-	-	-	-	-
	Grand Total	\$27,261,413.50	\$156,921,986.34	\$0.00	\$184,183,399.84	85%

Los Angeles-Burbank Groundwater System Interconnection Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: Los Angeles-Burbank Groundwater System Interconnection Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$40,037.92	\$0.00	\$57,478.63
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$159,896.94	\$0.00	\$159,896.94
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$500,000.00	\$301,089.60	\$0.00	\$801,089.60
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$517,440.71	\$501,024.46	\$0.00	\$1,018,465.17

***List sources of funding:** Los Angeles Department of Water and Power(LADWP) and Burbank Water and Power (BWP)

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of administrative effort required to implement the entire project. Activities include conducting meetings, memoranda of understanding between the cities of Los Angeles and Burbank, and invoicing DWR for reimbursement. Estimates were based on LADWP's labor rates, an estimated number of hours to complete the tasks, and on an agreement between the cities of Los Angeles and Burbank. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: This Project does not require the purchasing of land or lease agreements.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: The budget was determined by compiling costs already incurred as well as estimates for future phases of work necessary to complete the Project. Costs for the hydraulic modeling, plans and specifications, environmental documentation, and permitting are based on LADWP's actual hours and rates.

Construction/Implementation: Construction contracting, construction, and construction administration costs were estimated using previous project experience. The budget was determined through utilization of an engineer's cost estimate for "direct", "services", and "allocations" cost of the Los Angeles-Burbank 2,000 foot ductile iron pipe. Construction administration costs were estimated as 17% of the construction costs based on prior experience with pipe installation projects. No costs are expected for Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement as the Project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and all typical construction Best Management Practices are included in the construction costs.

Mission Wells Improvement Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)

Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application

Project Title: Mission Wells Improvement Project

Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes

Funding Match Waiver request?: No

Category	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a) Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$99,178.10	\$0.00	\$116,618.81
(b) Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$1,507,610.50	\$0.00	\$1,507,610.50
(d) Construction/Implementation	\$3,000,000.00	\$18,026,150.40	\$0.00	\$21,026,150.40
(e) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$3,017,440.71	\$19,632,939.00	\$0.00	\$22,650,379.71

*List sources of funding: Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Capital Improvement Program - Rate Payer Revenue

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: Estimates were based on the LADWP's labor rates. Based on other LADWP well construction projects, an estimated number of hours to complete the tasks were developed. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: The project site for production wells, collector line, and pump station upgrade is owned by LADWP and no further land purchase is needed.

Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation: Costs for the site assessment and evaluation and the final design are based on planning level estimate. Costs to complete the Notice of Exemption (filed in May 2014) are based on actual labor hours and LADWP's labor rates. Permitting costs are based on actual and estimated hours (using previous experience involving installation of groundwater wells) and LADWP's labor rates.

Construction/Implementation: Construction contracting, construction and construction administration costs are based on planning level estimate. All costs have been escalated to 2014 dollars. No costs are expected for Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement. A 20% contingency was included in cost estimates to cover unforeseen situations during construction.

Manhattan Wells Improvement Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)

Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application

Project Title: Manhattan Wells Improvement Project

Project serves a need of a DAC? Yes

Funding Match Waiver request? No

Category	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a) Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$52,167.96	\$0.00	\$69,608.67
(b) Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$219,008.03	\$0.00	\$219,008.03
(d) Construction/Implementation	\$3,000,000.00	\$21,616,224.77	\$0.00	\$24,616,224.77
(e) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$3,017,440.71	\$21,887,400.76	\$0.00	\$24,904,841.47

*List sources of funding: Los Angeles Department of Water and Power – Water System Capital Improvement Project Fund

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on currently available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: Estimates were based on the LADWP Agreement with Water Replenishment District (WRD) and on LADWP's labor rates. Based on other LADWP well construction projects, an estimated number of hours to complete the tasks was developed. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: The project site is owned by LADWP and no further land purchase is needed.

Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation: Costs for the site assessment and evaluation and the final design are based on actual and estimated LADWP approximate number of staff and hours needed to develop and complete the design plans. Costs to complete the Notice of Exemption (filed in January 2011) are also based on actual labor hours and LADWP's labor rates. Permitting costs are based on the August 2011 Final Scope of Work and were determined by permit fees, estimated labor hours and LADWP's rates to complete the permit application process.

Construction/Implementation: Construction contracting, construction and construction administration costs are based on the August 2011 Final Scope of Work, the LADWP and WRD Agreement and the December 2010 cost estimates. All costs have been escalated to 2014 dollars. No costs are expected for Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement. A 25% contingency was included in cost estimates to cover unforeseen situations during construction.

Terminal Island Water Reclamation Plant (TIWRP) Advanced Water Purification Facility and Distribution System Expansion Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)

Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application

Project Title: TIWRP Advanced Water Purification Facility and Distribution System Expansion Project

Project serves a need of a DAC? Yes

Funding Match Waiver request? No

Category	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a) Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$934,138.87	\$0.00	\$951,579.58
(b) Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$9,877,508.60	\$0.00	\$9,877,508.60
(d) Construction/Implementation	\$2,500,000.00	\$68,696,516.96	\$0.00	\$71,196,516.96
(e) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$2,517,440.71	\$79,508,164.43	\$0.00	\$82,025,605.14

*List sources of funding: LA City, DWP Fund and LA City, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation SCM Fund

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of administrative effort required to implement the entire Project. Activities include TIWRP Expansion and Distribution System Contract Administration conducted by BOE and LADWP, respectively, as well as invoicing DWR for reimbursement. Estimates were based on LADWP's and BOE's labor rates, an estimated number of hours to complete the tasks, Advanced Water Treatment Facility Cost Projection, LADWP Project Budget Interface, and BOE Budget template. The budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in the consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: The Distribution System Expansion will be located within the public right of way and will not require land acquisition. It will, however, require easements and encroachment permits for some portions of the pipeline. The TIWRP expansion and AOP implementation does not require any land acquisition or easements as the expansion takes place within existing TIWRP boundaries (in operation since 1935).

Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation: Estimated costs for site assessment and evaluation were based on BOE Cost Estimates, LADWP's and BOE's hours and rates from similar projects. The final design cost for the TIWRP Expansion was based on a consultant proposal to BOE and the Distribution Expansion was based on LADWP's hours and rates. Costs for environmental documentation and permitting costs were estimated using previous experience from other projects involving recycled water distribution pipelines with the same permitting agencies.

Construction/Implementation: Construction contracting, construction and construction administration costs were estimated using AWTF Cost Projections, 60% Design Drawings, BOE Budget Template, and Project Budget Interface based on previous LADWP and BOE project experience. For Environmental Compliance/ Mitigation/Enhancement, TIWRP Expansion received a Categorical Exception under Class II, Category 6, which allows the construction of structures accessory to existing uses, and the Distribution System Expansion is covered by a previously approved CEQA EIR. A 30% contingency was included in cost estimates to cover unforeseen situations during the Distribution System Expansion construction. A 5% contingency was included in cost estimates to cover unforeseen situations during the TIWRP AWP Expansion construction.

Recycled Water Turnouts Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: Recycled Water Turnouts Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$34,800.00	\$0.00	\$52,240.71
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$633,000.00	\$215,000.00	\$0.00	\$845,000.00
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$4,350,000.00	\$1,450,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,800,000.00
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$5,000,440.71	\$1,696,800.00	\$0.00	\$6,697,240.71

***List sources of funding:** Non-state funding source includes the Capital Improvement Program funded through bond indebtedness.

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of administrative effort required to implement the entire Project. Activities include project coordination with stakeholders, generating progress reports, scheduled invoicing, and completing financial reports. Estimates were based on WRD’s labor rates and an estimated number of hours to complete the tasks using previous experience. The WRD Board has approved implementation of a labor compliance program, and the cost to implement this program was included in the construction proposal from the contractor. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: The WRD will secure the necessary easements for the planned work. This Project will require construction of two reinforced concrete turn-out structures (Structure 001B and Structure 2). The construction easements required will either be permitted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Structure 001B or by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (Flood Control) for Structure 2. The Flood Control easement will be a maintenance type encroachment permit and will be granted for free.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: The budget was determined by compiling costs already incurred as well as estimates for future phases of work necessary to complete the Project. Costs for any planning assessment and evaluation documents were not included in the budget for this Project, as it was not utilized for a matching fund or part of the grant request. The costs associated with the design plans and specifications were based on 10% of the total Project cost. The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration were based on costs provided by a consultant proposal. The permitting budget was based on WRD’s actual hours and labor rates, including estimates from previous experience.

Construction/Implementation: Construction contracting estimates were included in the scope of work and based on WRD’s construction management provider. However, the costs associated with construction contracting were not included as part of

the budget as it was not utilized for a matching fund or grant request. Construction costs were estimated using an engineering consultant opinion of probable construction cost. The budget was determined by including the costs for: site civil, site electrical, distribution channel lining, diversion structure, new seals on outfall pipe joints, and replacement of existing weir gates for the turn-out structures. The costs associated with environmental compliance and mitigation during construction was based on an estimate included in the engineering consultant proposal. Construction administration costs were estimated as 6% of the construction costs based on prior experience. A 10% contingency was included in cost estimates to cover unforeseen situations during the construction and was based on similar past project experience.

Goldsworthy Desalter Expansion Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: Goldsworthy Desalter Expansion Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$243,470.00	\$0.00	\$260,910.71
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$7,329,248.00	\$0.00	\$7,329,248
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$4,000,000.00	\$11,983,874.00	\$0.00	\$15,983,874.00
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$4,017,440.71	\$19,556,592.00	\$0.00	\$23,574,032.71

***List sources of funding:** Water Replenishment District funding

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The costs presented include a 20 percent contingency and are presented in 2014 dollars. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of effort required to conduct project management, administration, memoranda of understand with WRD, and preparation of invoices for reimbursement. The budget also included draft deliverable and quality assurance, quality control reviews, and processes to implement the entire Project multiplied by a range of hourly rates appropriate to those that would be expected to complete the tasks. The cost for Labor Compliance Reporting was based on a cost estimate from a labor compliance consultant. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in the consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: The land is owned by the City of Torrance; therefore, this Project does not require the purchasing of land.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: The budget was determined by compiling costs already incurred as well as estimates for future phases of work necessary to complete the Project. Costs for the Feasibility Study and design plans are based on actual and estimated consultant hours. Costs to complete the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan Compliance Report are based on a consultant proposal. The cost incurred to initiate and finalize the permits required for the Project will be overseen by the WRD and were estimated using previous experience.

Construction/Implementation: The budget was determined by compiling an estimate of initial costs for the proposed project including the well-siting costs, which are composed of the Goldsworthy Desalter facilities estimated expansion and repair costs and WRD's design and construction management engineering services costs. The construction engineering services include both office and field engineering services. The field engineering services during construction include resident engineering, inspection and materials testing activities. The costs estimated for the well siting include installation and construction of the well, wellhead facilities, and well discharge pipelines at the Delthorne Park and the Torrance Police Department Parking Lot. The cost for environmental compliance during construction was determined through utilization of an engineering consultant cost estimate. A 15% contingency was included in construction cost estimates to cover unforeseen situations during construction.

Be a Water Saver Conservation Program Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: Be a Water Saver Conservation Program Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$27,340.71	\$7,709.76	\$0.00	\$35,050.47
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$6,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,600.00
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$685,000.00	\$839,121.70	\$0.00	\$1,524,121.70
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$718,940.71	\$846,831.46	\$0.00	\$1,565,772.17

***List sources of funding:** The City's cost share will be shared by the Burbank Water and Power (BWP) and the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). In previous years, MWD has provided \$130,000 per year, which would result in approximately \$260,000 for this Project.

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of administrative effort required to implement the entire Project, including grant application preparation, grant reporting, and invoicing DWR for reimbursement. Estimated hours to complete these tasks are multiplied by a range of hourly rates appropriate to those that would be expected to complete them. This estimate was completed and documented in the Detailed Budget Summary. The budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: There are no budgeted costs associated with this category.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: There are no budgeted costs associated with this category.

Construction/Implementation: The budget was determined by compiling costs already incurred as well as estimates for future phases of work necessary to complete the Project. The budget was determined through consultant cost estimates, an MWD agreement for the rebate distribution, and other cities' contracts for services. This budget is based on actual contracts and proposals from subcontractors required for tasks including: solicitation for the Home Water Reports, revision of existing agreements for increased services, implementation of the Home Water Reports Web Portal, and educational workshops and classes. Additionally, rates and estimated hours were used to budget staff efforts. No costs are expected for Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement.

On-Site Recycled Water Retrofits Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: On-Site Recycled Water Retrofits Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$179,710.50	\$0.00	\$197,151.21
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$30,000.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$472,072.11	\$0.00	\$472,072.11
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$611,500.00	\$1,252,048.09	\$0.00	\$1,863,548.09
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$628,940.71	\$1,933,830.70	\$0.00	\$2,562,771.41

***List sources of funding:** West Basin Municipal Water District (WBMWD): \$278,374.95 (In-Kind), \$1,454,605.75 (cash) and Metropolitan Water District Incentive: \$200,850

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in the consultant proposal. Estimates for other Project administration and reporting activities were based on WBMWD’s labor rates and an estimated number of hours to complete the tasks using previous experience with a funded Proposition 84 Round 2 project (South Gardena Lateral Pipeline Project) and similar recycled water retrofit projects. Previous project experience was also used to estimate the cost of hiring a Labor Compliance Consultant.

Land Purchase/Easement: The Manhattan Village HOA Project site is the only site that will require a land easement. Consulting engineering services proposals from a recent pipeline project funded in a previous IRWM Proposition 84 Round (South Gardena Lateral Pipeline Project) were used to assess the cost per foot of pipeline. The amount of work that would be required for this Project and the length of pipe needed (1 mile) were incorporated to estimate the costs that could be incurred for the easement.

Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation: Estimated costs for Site Assessment and Evaluation were based on a completed design engineering consultant fee and WBMWD’s hours and rates from similar projects. The Final Design cost was based on a consultant proposal to WBMWD. All costs associated with the necessary environmental documentation were incurred prior to January 1, 2010 and are not included in the budget for this grant. Permitting costs were estimated using previous experience from other projects involving recycled water laterals with the same permitting agencies.

Construction/Implementation: Construction Contracting, Construction, and Construction Administration costs were estimated using previous project experience. Capital cost estimates for the Dominguez and Anza Lateral G Laterals were provided in the Capital Implementation Master Plan, 2009 (Page 9-4). Additional estimates utilized a construction bid for a similar recycled retrofit project (American Honda Motor Co., Inc. Irrigation System Recycled Water Retrofit Project) and preliminary cost estimates prepared for the Project sites. Costs associated with the construction best management practices

and NPDES permit requirements are incorporated as a part of the Mobilization and Site Preparation costs (under Task 10.1) rather than Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/ Enhancement (Task 11) as the contractor is required to submit these as a part of mobilization and site preparation. A 20% contingency was included in cost estimates to cover unforeseen situations during the construction.

Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (USGVMWD) Recycled Water Program Expansion Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)

Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application

Project Title: USGVMWD Recycled Water Program Expansion

Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes

Funding Match Waiver request?: No

Category	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a) Direct Project Administration	\$105,640.71	\$146,520.00	\$0.00	\$252,160.71
(b) Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$331,100.00	\$549,100.00	\$0.00	\$880,200.00
(d) Construction/Implementation	\$1,786,900.00	\$2,966,180.00	\$0.00	\$4,753,080.00
(e) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$2,223,640.71	\$3,661,800.00	\$0.00	\$5,885,440.71

*List sources of funding: USGVMWD (\$75,800); San Gabriel Valley Water Company (\$2,320,000 from Capital Improvements Projects Fund); La Puente Valley County Water District (\$779,000 from Designated Capital Improvement and Replacement Reserve Fund and General Fund); Rose Hills Memorial Park and Cemetery(\$487,000 from a capital infrastructure loan)

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The level of administrative effort required to implement the entire project was calculated using USGVMWD's labor rates and an estimated number of hours to complete the tasks using previous experience with similar projects. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: No land purchase or easement is required for this Project.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: Assessments and evaluations were completed before January 17, 2014 and therefore were not included in the budget. The budget for Final Design and CEQA documentation is based on consultant proposals. Costs to attain permits are based on level of effort used for the same permits for similar projects and a consultant hourly wage.

Construction/Implementation: Construction contracting was estimated using average consultant costs and a level of effort based on experience with similar projects. Construction budget was previously estimated in the feasibility studies and memorandums related to the Project sites (South El Monte Feasibility Study (Table 3-2, page 35 and Table 3-3, page 40), La Puente Valley County Water District Memorandum (Table 3), and Rose Hills Memorandum (Tables 1 and 6)) and includes costs for pipelines, tank altitude valves, meter removal, infrastructure improvements, landscaping, pump station modification, and customer retrofits. No environmental mitigation costs are expected. Construction administration costs were estimated as 8% of the construction costs based on prior experience. A 15% contingency was included to account for the estimates being planning level cost estimates.

West Coast Basin Barrier Project Unit 12 Injection and Observation Wells Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: West Coast Basin Barrier Project Unit 12 Injection and Observation Wells Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$300,526.00	\$0.00	\$317,966.71
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$421,881.09	\$0.00	421,881.09
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$1,000,000.00	\$3,279,013.75	\$0.00	\$4,279,013.75
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$1,017,440.71	\$4,001,420.84	\$0.00	\$5,018,861.55

*List sources of funding: Los Angeles County Flood Control District Funds

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: Project Administration costs were based on approximately 7% of the total project costs. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in the consultant proposal. A previous Proposition 84 Round 2 grant application for the Pacoima Spreading Grounds was used to estimate the amount of work and rates to complete Administration, Labor Compliance Program implementation, and Reporting tasks.

Land Purchase/Easement: No land purchase or easement is required for this Project.

Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation: The Project Concept Report and 60%, 90%, and 100% Design Plans were completed between October 2010 and September 2012 (after January 1, 2010). Costs for these reports are based on the actual charges to prepare the plans and are only included as part of the cost share, not the grant request. Because the Project is Categorically Exempt, a Board Letter to Adopt the Categorical Exemption will be filed. The typical amount of effort needed to prepare and file a Board Letter was used to estimate costs for the documentation. The cost to attain the City of Redondo Beach Engineering Permit is based on actual costs discussed in a meeting with City of Redondo Beach representatives on June 5, 2014.

Construction/Implementation: Construction Contracting costs were based on a previous Proposition 84 grant application for the Pacoima Spreading Grounds. Construction costs for mobilization, construction of the wells, and performance testing and demobilization were based on an Engineering Estimate. The grant request of \$1,000,000 will be used for grant application preparation and Project Construction. No costs are expected for Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement as the Project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA and all typical construction Best Management Practices are included in the construction costs. Construction Administration costs were estimated at approximately 5% of the construction costs. A 10% contingency was applied to the Construction category to cover unforeseen situations.

Rockhaven Well Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)

Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application

Project Title: Rockhaven Well Project

Project serves a need of a DAC?: No

Funding Match Waiver request?: No

Category	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a) Direct Project Administration	\$23,065.71	\$30,875.05	\$0.00	\$53,940.76
(b) Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$107,625.00	\$35,875.00	\$0.00	\$143,500.00
(d) Construction/Implementation	\$764,999.78	\$254,999.93	\$0.00	\$1,019,999.71
(e) Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$895,690.49	\$321,749.98	\$0.00	\$1,217,440.47

*List sources of funding: Share costs of the project will be paid through CVWD – FY 14/15 CIP Budget - \$160,874.99; GWP – FY 14/15 CIP Budget - \$160,874.99.

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of effort required administering processes to implement the entire Project including preparation of contracts, agreements, and reimbursement invoicing with DWR based on previous project experience. This level of effort was then multiplied with Crescenta Valley Water District's (CVWD) internal staff labor rates. The budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in the consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: There are no eligible costs associated with this category.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: The planning budget is based on an estimated cost to prepare a technical memorandum to incorporate design parameter for the Project based on the *Rockhaven Exploratory Bid Package, Specifications No. 3426; 2011 and the Rockhaven Exploratory Well No. 1 Letter Report*. Preliminary and Final Design budgets estimates are based on previous proposals for completing the work. Environmental Documentation and Permitting budget estimates are based on previous projects of similar scope.

Construction/Implementation: The construction contracting budget estimate is based on CVWD's experience with the bidding process from previous projects. The budget estimate for construction/implementation is based on a detailed estimate prepared by the CVWD based on contractor bids, materials costs, and invoices from similar projects.

Water Budget Based Rate Implementation Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: Water Budget Based Rates Implementation Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$20,024.48	\$0.00	\$37,465.19
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$412,720.00	\$229,547.36	\$0.00	\$642,267.36
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$430,160.71	\$249,571.84	\$0.00	\$679,732.55

***List sources of funding:** Local cost share will be funded by Las Virgenes Municipal Water District’s potable and recycled water enterprise funds. The source of these funds includes revenue generated from water billing rates.

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of administrative effort required to implement the entire Project, including grant application preparation, grant reporting and invoicing DWR for reimbursement. Estimated hours to complete these tasks are multiplied by a range of hourly rates appropriate to those who would be expected to complete them. The budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in the consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: There are no budgeted costs associated with this category.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: There are no budgeted costs associated with this category.

Construction/Implementation: The budget was determined by compiling costs already incurred as well as estimates for future work necessary to complete the Project in the following areas: *Contracting* – This estimate is based on LVMWD labor rates and estimated hours to advertise bids, evaluate, and award contracts. *Project Implementation* - This budget is based on actual contracts and proposals from contractors required for tasks including: budget rate advisory services; aerial imagery and irrigated landscape delineation; verification of irrigated areas; evapotranspiration data setup; financial cost of service analysis and budget based rate development; customer information/billing system modification and reprogramming; and monthly meter reading for billing. Additionally, LVMWD labor rates and estimated hours were used to budget staff efforts for the following tasks: indoor use analysis; irrigated area determination; evapotranspiration vendor identification and data setup; meter reading plan development, billing system development; financial analysis; LVMWD code revision and public outreach.

Well No. 2 Rehabilitation Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: Well No. 2 Rehabilitation Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: Yes					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$17,440.71	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$22,440.71
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$0.00	\$3,662.00	\$0.00	\$3,662.00
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$185,000.00	\$60,000.00	\$0.00	\$245,000.00
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$202,440.71	\$68,662.00	\$0.00	\$271,102.71
*List sources of funding: Share costs of the Project will be paid through the City of Inglewood Water Fund and in-kind services.					

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of effort required to administer processes required to implement the entire Project including Project inspection and reimbursement invoicing with DWR based on previous project experience. This level of effort was then multiplied with City of Inglewood internal staff labor rates. Grant application preparation costs are based on a fee estimate provided in the consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: No land purchase or easement is required for the Project.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: This budget is based on the actual cost for Richard C. Slade & Associates LLC to perform the *Preliminary Evaluation of Downwell Conditions; Municipal-Supply Water Well No. 2*, prepared by Richard C. Slade & Associates LLC.

Construction/Implementation: The budget is based on the estimate provided in the supporting document, *Preliminary Evaluation of Downwell Conditions; Municipal-Supply Water Well No. 2* (page 18). A detailed estimate was prepared by the City of Inglewood by referencing contractor quotes and invoices from other well rehabilitation projects performed for the City of Inglewood in order to verify the estimate in the supporting document.

Pomona Basin Regional Groundwater Project (Project)

Project Budget (PSP Table 7)					
Proposal Title: Greater Los Angeles County Prop. 84, Round 3, Part 1 Grant Application					
Project Title: Pomona Basin Regional Groundwater Project					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$258,787.61	\$222,781.75	\$0.00	\$481,569.36
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation	\$493,636.52	\$705,564.48	\$0.00	\$1,199,201.00
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$2,304,090.36	\$2,126,852.64	\$0.00	\$4,430,943.00
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$3,056,514.49	\$3,055,198.87	\$0.00	\$6,111,713.36
*List sources of funding: Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD) and Rowland Water District (RWD) Capital Improvement Project (CIP) and general fund					

The budget presented in the table above is considered reasonable based on current available information. The justification for each category of budget presented is provided below:

Direct Project Administration: The budget was determined by estimating the level of administrative effort required to implement the entire Project as 15% of construction costs. This rate is based on experience with administering similar projects from design through construction and additional activities associated with grant requirements and reporting. Budget for grant application preparation was determined from a fee estimate provided in consultant proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement: There are no eligible costs associated with this category.

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation: The budget was determined by compiling costs already incurred as well as estimates for future phases of work necessary to complete the Project in the following areas: *Planning* – Costs based on contracts and invoices from the contractor that completed the Pomona Basin Regional Groundwater Project, Alternatives Analysis, and Six Basins Groundwater Project Hydraulic Analysis and Pomona Basin Regional Groundwater Project Final Engineering Report; *Design and Engineering* – Costs were based on consultant proposal for 100% design; *Environmental Documentation* – consultant proposal for 100% design included estimated fee.

Construction/Implementation: The budget was determined by compiling an estimate of construction phase services from a consultant’s 100% design proposal as well as the construction estimates prepared as part of the conceptual 10% design and resulting Pomona Basin Regional Project Final Engineering Report. These estimates were also modified to incorporate more recent information on potential construction costs from similar projects (documented as local well implementation bid results).