

INTERVIEW PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Proposition 50 Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Supplemental Funding Grant Program, July 2010

Applicant	East Contra Costa County IRWM	Amount Requested	\$3,700,000
Proposal Title	East Contra Costa County IRWM Prop 50 Supplemental Program Proposal	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,957,000

Recommended Award	\$0
--------------------------	-----

Proposal Summary

The proposal contains the following four projects: (1) Contra Costa County's HCP/NCPP Habitat and Watershed Protection and Restoration, (2) Contra Costa Water District's Phase 2 Canal Improvement Project, (3) Delta Diablo Sanitation District's Pittsburg Recycled Water Pipeline Rehabilitation, and (4) Diablo Water District's Beacon West Well Head Arsenic Treatment. These four projects would contribute to meeting all of the objectives of the East Contra Costa IRWM Plan in addition to addressing the Statewide Priorities of reducing conflict between water users and assisting in meeting Delta Water Quality Objectives.

Presentation/Interview Score (based on criteria and standard presented in Table 2 of PSP)

Element	1 (a) - Concept Project Proposal Overview	1 (b) - Benefits & Technical Feasibility	1 (c) - Need & Consequences	2 - Question & Answers	Total (Max possible score=50)
Score	3	9	9	15	36

Evaluation Summary

Element 1 (a): Concept Project Proposal Overview

The overall project presentation lacked detail. The HCP project details were not clearly defined. For example, the interview panel (Panel) was not clear on what type of activities would be conducted as part of the specific tasks of the HCP project. Specifically, the scope of work included in planning and design task was unclear as was why the planning and design task was significantly longer in duration and continued beyond the construction tasks. The Panel felt that

the proposal overview remained unclear even after the clarification question and answer period.

Element 1 (b): Benefit and Technical Feasibility

In part, project technical feasibility was demonstrated. Although the Panel recognized the Beacon Well Head Treatment cost is relatively minor in comparison to the total project cost, the Panel was concerned about the overall feasibility of this project. It appeared the project proponents still need to balance the benefit and risk of arsenic treatment with the potential benefit and risk of drilling a new small diameter production well. The presentation lacked sufficient evidence that well head treatment was the preferred approach. Although the Panel recognizes a benefit of replacing aging infrastructure, the Panel felt that as the proposed project is recycled water pipeline, the benefit was relatively small in magnitude based on the information presented.

Element 1 (c): Need and Consequences

The need for the Beacon Well Head Treatment and Canal Improvement Projects was well presented. The need associated with replacing the aging asbestos pipeline was possibly minimal and not deemed urgent by the Panel based on the information presented. Documented evidence indicating the pipeline was in imminent danger of failing would have been valuable. Finally, the consequences of not receiving funding were not sufficiently demonstrated for the recycled water line replacement project and the canal encasement project.

Element 2: Question and Answers

The applicant's answers to the standard questions were concise, clear, and adequate. The applicant's answers affirmed they met the essence of IRWM when developing, vetting, and ultimately proposing multi-benefit projects.