

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5038	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	California State Coastal Conservancy	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$451,230
PROJECT TITLE	San Francisco Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$806,230

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop the Watershed Management and Habitat Protection and Restoration and Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Functional Area Documents. Develop an IRWMP to achieve greater efficiencies, enhance public services, and build public support for vital plans and projects pertaining to management of Bay Area water and natural resources.

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: 12

Comment: Work plan is complete and includes work items and deliverables consistent with the budget and schedule. While the budget is detailed, there is no documentation to support the costs shown on the budget. Also, there is no support for costs shown as funding match.

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: 4

Comment: Region is defined as consistent with San Francisco Bay RWQCB boundaries. However, it is not totally clear if the region may also be the nine bay area counties, which is different. Description is fairly extensive and provides useful characterization of the region, though it could include more description of existing water infrastructure and interrelationships. Task 3.1.2 details a very complete list of information in order to prepare a regional description; much of the information should already be compiled and readily available without the need to recompile and summarize. The applicant states that overlapping and 'upstream' planning efforts by CALFED in the Bay-Delta were considered.

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

Score: 8

Comment: The objectives are clearly presented and comprehensive for the two elements covered in this application. However, the objectives are fairly broad and could use more specificity in terms of meeting both short and long-term goals.

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: 8

Comment: Major strategies are listed as part of the planning process, but more specifics need to be developed. The applicant needs to include more integration of elements related to stormwater quality and improvements in urban runoff management. Integration is proposed to meet challenges and opportunities for collaboration and coordination, but the process for how this will ultimately work is not clearly defined. Project prototypes that will serve as models are proposed to be developed, with a list of projects that meet multiple objectives. Figure 8 shows how the functional areas in each of the work plans would be integrated, and then the integration of the Bay Area IRWMP planning grant proposal (see PIN 5336). One concern is that the IRWMP may not be well integrated since each applicant appears to be working separately.

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

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant detailed how the proposed IRWMP will be implemented to compile a list of regional projects, fill informational gaps, and disseminate the information. It does not discuss how IRWMP projects or objectives that cross jurisdictional boundaries can be implemented. Also, a schedule of implementation after adoption could not be found. Participating agencies have signed a Letter of Mutual Understanding. The IRWMP implementation, as described, may not have an optimal or firm institutional structure. There needs to be a clear method for ensuring that implementation will be successful and to define how progress will be assessed, as well as more specific timelines and commitments.

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: 6

Comment: Applicant discusses the development of the draft Technical Analysis and Plan Performance section of the IRWMP in two elements: testing the Project Assessment Framework and compiling and analyzing existing performance measures from all functional area documents to identify those features that are most relevant to the IRWMP. Selected performance measures will be entered into a matrix to be compared with the full range of Plan Objectives, as stated in the Guidelines. The matrix will be used to assess how a given project will benefit multiple functional areas. The applicant stated that the IRWMP is not intended to be a CEQA compliance document. Entities responsible for implementing projects have the responsibility of ensuring that all appropriate environmental approvals will be met. It is not well outlined how benefits will be analyzed.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

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: 3

Comment: Planning documents are the only category listed in the application as "data." Part 1 of the proposal is to collect and document technical methods and analysis, with a list of performance measures. Specific types or categories of technical studies to be performed under the IRWMP are not detailed, although needs for additional data or monitoring will be identified.

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

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant presented detailed data management procedures by providing web based data management and decision support tools. Also included was a set of strategies and tactics to guide the development of the web infrastructure, database, and tools. However, a discussion on how data management will support statewide data needs could not be found in the application.

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

Score: 4

Comment: A significant stakeholder involvement has gone into initial development of this proposal, especially in developing the watershed management and habitat protection and restoration element. Continuing recruitment of stakeholders is also covered in numerous tasks. Little description is provided on the extent to which watershed groups and other non-agency groups have been involved in work already completed on the habitat/watershed plan. Stakeholder involvement concerns associated with projects overlapping jurisdictional boundaries and how they will be handled is not adequately documented or addressed in the planning stages. Lack of substantive evidence of participation by non-agency stakeholders is one of the weaknesses of the proposal. The use of a stipend for participation by DACs is an interesting notion that speaks to the desire of the group to foster inclusion.

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

Score: 3

Comment: Although some neighborhoods may rightly be classified as disadvantaged, there are no communities in the Bay Area that meet the DAC criteria. Those from disadvantaged areas will be encouraged to participate in the planning process and to provide input on how to improve water supply and water quality. Funds will be set aside to address environmental justice issues and ensure inclusion of persons of color, people speaking languages other than English, and others living in low-income areas. However, there appears to be no process to identify/notify such individuals.

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: 3

Comment: The local planning documents will be utilized and they appear to form a foundation for projects and plans within the region. ABAG is strategic player in the regional planning section of the IRWMP. An existing contract between ABAG and the applicant that defines ABAGs supporting role is included in the application. Local authority and planning documentation are described. However, the dynamics and relationship between the IRWM management strategies and the local planning documents is marginally discussed.

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

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant discussed agency coordination and cooperation with local, State, and federal agencies through participation in technical committees, workshops, and meetings, but sufficient documentation is not provided. There is not much evidence that such agencies have been involved to date in plan development, so process needs to be defined clearly and documented throughout the planning effort.

TOTAL SCORE: 64