

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	4896	COUNTY	Los Angeles
APPLICANT	San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	Southern California Foothill Communities Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Study	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$625,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A collection of existing studies and plans together form an existing, functionally equivalent Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan that successfully manages the region's water supplies. This study will evaluate specific water supply, reliability, groundwater management, and water quality issues to enhance elements of the existing IRWM Plan. Regional water management agencies, local water agencies and water companies, and municipalities are cooperatively participating in this continuation of a long established water planning process. The San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District, owner and operator of a regional water transmission pipeline that offers multiple opportunities to improve regional water management, is serving as lead agency for this planning effort. The study will evaluate alternative approaches to resolve the issues identified, determine the costs and benefits of the alternatives and identify preferred solutions.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 9

Comment: The proposal includes a work plan with specific work items, schedule, and budget. However, the work plan is for feasibility studies, not for development of an IRWMP (or component) and is of insufficient detail and is too vague to determine if it is consistent with the budget and schedule. While the budget contains a cost share analysis, it is limited in data and is not supported with documentation. The budget does not include stakeholder involvement or submittal of deliverables. Additionally, the budget does not appear to be either reasonable or logical and it is not supported with other assumptions or estimates. The schedule depicts a definite performance period and a completion date within the allotted time frame.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant briefly discusses water supply, but does not discuss water quality at all. The application does not sufficiently discuss social makeup or economic trends of the region. The applicant made little to no attempt to describe important ecological processes and environmental resources, such as the major surface waters and habitat areas.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: While the application addresses some major water-related conflicts and objectives of the region, including water supply and groundwater management, the applicant does not entirely address all major water-related conflicts and objectives in the region since ecosystem restoration and water quality are barely touched upon. Additionally, statewide priorities are not addressed.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: There is almost no attempt to integrate water management strategies other than those relating to water supply and groundwater management. Although non-water supply related plans are mentioned, e.g. Rio Hondo Watershed Management Plan and the Emerald Necklace Park Network Plan, there is no discussion of how proposed projects from those plans would integrate into this IRWMP. Only water supply stakeholders seem to have been consulted. The water management strategies to be considered meet the IRWM standards, but not all the required strategies are included.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: This proposal does not include any institutional structure to ensure project implementation and fails to identify appropriate management measures etc. for NPS projects. The applicant discusses coordination with TACs, but not in sufficient detail. Additionally, while there is a general schedule for implementation of the IRWMP, it is unclear who is responsible for various tasks and how performance of the IRWMP would be monitored.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposed IRWMP includes only a very minimal reference to impacts and benefits, the latter all relating to water supply, within the region and adjacent areas, e.g., "Programs that may have primary benefit to one group of producers often have incidental benefits to other producers." This statement is too general and is the only discussion of this specific criterion. Additionally, there is no discussion of a strategy for complying with CEQA.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The application states that the IRWMP would be supported with the applicant's existing data and models, but does not sufficiently discuss how existing or future data would support the proposal.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant does not address this criterion adequately enough to determine if a process for data management exists. While the application states that feasibility studies and technical memorandum resulting from the IRWMP would be distributed to stakeholders, it did not state if this included the public or what the process would be used to distribute data. Additionally, the proposal does not demonstrate how data management would support statewide needs.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: For the most part, only water supply-related agencies or customer are involved. There is a description of how TAC stakeholders would be involved in the proposal, but not other stakeholders. Additionally, there is no mention of any process to identify additional stakeholders. Environmental justice concerns are not addressed in the application.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: There are three DACs in the region whose needs, as described, relate to improved water supply. The application needs a stronger discussion of the needs of the DACs and the benefits the DACs would derive from the IRWMP. Moreover, this criterion did not discuss if DAC representatives have been and/or would be included in the IRWMP's development and implementation.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The application states that UWMPs are the foundation for local planning and goes on to state that all cooperating agencies involved with the IRWMP have submitted UWMPs. There is little discussion on how local land use planning documents relate to IRWMP management strategies, and nothing on the dynamics between them.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant does not show any mechanism to align all agencies for the goal of the IRWMP. There is little mention beyond the required coordination among the water supply and customer agencies directly involved with the TACs. The proposal does not appear to provide for coordination and cooperation with relevant local, State, and federal agencies in IRWMP components. In addition, it is not likely that the proposed IRWMP would facilitate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers, nor the coordination with State and federal regulatory agencies.

TOTAL SCORE: 40