

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	County	Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino
Project Title	Greater Los Angeles County IRWM Plan Update	Grant Request	\$1,000,000
		Total Project Cost	\$1,352,560

Project Description The Greater Los Angeles County IRWM Plan Update would revise the adopted IRWM Plan to meet new IRWM Plan standards including those related to climate change, participation in the planning process through expanded outreach, and including implementation of ongoing DAC outreach efforts. To support the Plan update, a habitat and open space analysis would be performed, the Plan objectives and quantified planning targets would be updated, the project database would be updated and expanded, subregional project planning would be undertaken, and the benefits from Plan implementation would be reassessed.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	15
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	10
Budget	8
Program Preferences	10
Geographic Balance	0
<i>Total Score</i>	<i>53</i>

- **Work Plan** Work Plan addresses the criterion and is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The work plan details the specific tasks that will be followed to collectively implement the Proposal. Work plan tasks are detailed, logical, and suggest the planned proposal can be implemented.
- **DAC Involvement** The applicant describes the process used to outreach and involve DACs in IRWM planning to date. These prior activities suggest limited DAC engagement in IRWM in the past. The application outlines a very well articulated plan to reach out to the DACs which also includes outreach to Native American. The work plan contains necessary tasks that ensures involvement and active participation of DAC communities and should lead to a bottom up approach in identifying and prioritizing their water management needs.
- **Schedule** This criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. In addition, the schedule is adequate and consistent with the work plan, budget, and appears reasonable. It includes final adoption of the Plan.
- **Budget** The budget is not always adequately supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The budget tables are somewhat confusing and not easily understood at first glance. For example: there is a line item in the summary budget table identified as “Direct Costs (including printing)”. There is no description or documentation of what this budget item entails. It may be project administrative costs, which at 5.54% of the total proposal costs, is just above the PSP recommended limit of less than 5%.
- **Program Preference** The work plan background section describes that the existing adopted plan contributes to several of the program preferences. The proposal demonstrates a significant degree of commitment to meeting these preferences. The proposal further demonstrates that additional program preferences are either not addressed or inadequately addressed in the current plan, but will be addressed as specific tasks in the proposal.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable