2014 IRWM Drought Grant Solicitation Application Evaluation Summary

Applicant	**Indio Water Authority**
Number of Projects	**3**
Proposal Level Score	**13**
Average Project Level Score	**16**
Tie-Breaker Points from Program Preferences Section (If Applicable)	
Grand Total	**29**

Q#	Questions			
	Proposal Level Evaluation	**Attachment(s)**	**Points Available**	**Score Proposal Level**
1	Does the Proposal clearly demonstrate the regional water management impact(s) due to the 2014 drought or any anticipated impacts if the drought or dry year conditions continue into 2015?	2	5	1
2	Did the Project Proponent identify the mandatory or voluntary water conservation measures/restrictions that have been implemented due to the 2014 drought or any planned or anticipated actions if drought or dry year conditions continue into 2015?	2	5	4
3	Is there a map of the IRWM Region that shows the location of the project(s) included in the Proposal?	3	1	1
4	Does the Budget contain a summary budget for the Proposal?	5	1	1
5	Does the Schedule contain a summary schedule for the Proposal?	6	1	1
6	Collectively, do the Work Summary, Budget, and Schedule demonstrate that a majority of the projects will be ready to start construction/implementation by April 1, 2015?	4, 5, & 6	2	2
7	Enter up to 3 points for proposals that address the Human Right to Water	7	3	3
	Total for Proposal Level		**18**	13

	Project Level Evaluation	**Attachment(s)**	**Points Available**	**Score Project Level**	**IWA Recycled Water Project #1**	**Regional Turf Reduction Program #2**	**DAC Onsite Plumbing Retrofit Program #3**
8	Is a brief description of the project included?	3	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Is there a project map that shows the location of the project and the areas and water resources affected by the project?	3	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Does the applicant clearly explain how the proposed project will help alleviate the identified drought impacts?	3	2	**6**	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Is each physical benefit annualized over the lifecycle of the project?	3	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	Are the anticipated primary and secondary physical benefits of the project described and quantified?	3	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Is the level of technical analysis reasonable considering the size of the project and the type of physical benefit claimed?	3	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
14	Does the technical analysis support the claimed physical benefits?	3	2	**0**	No	No	No
15	Is the proposed project the least cost alternative? If not, does the applicant sufficiently explain why it was selected instead of the least cost alternative?	3	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Does the applicant discuss the necessary tasks that will result in a completed project?	4	1	**2**	Yes	Yes	No
17	Do the tasks in the scope of work include appropriate deliverables (i.e., CEQA documents, plans and specifications, monitoring plans, progress reports, final report, etc.)?	4	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
18	Does the Work Summary include a project status that indicates the current stage of each task (e.g., % complete)?	4	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	If applicable, does the Work Summary include a listing of required permits and their status, and the appropriate environmental documentation for the proposed project? (N/A = Yes)	4	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Are the tasks shown in the Budget consistent with the tasks discussed in the Work Summary?	4 & 5	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Are the costs presented in the Budget reasonable for the project type and the current stage of the project?	5	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Are the tasks in the schedule consistent with the tasks described in the Work Summary?	4 & 6	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Does the schedule demonstrate that it is reasonable to expect that the project will start construction/implementation by April 1, 2015?	4 &6	1	**2**	No	Yes	Yes
24	Does the application describe the steps necessary to ensure that the proposed schedule can be met?	6	1	**3**	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Total Project Level Score for all projects		**19**	**49**	16	17	16