

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County	County	Ventura
Project Title	WCVC IRWM Plan Update	Grant Request	\$485,694
		Total Project Cost	\$702,300

Project Description The WCVC IRWM Plan Update would revise the adopted IRWM Plan to meet new IRWM Plan standards. To support the Plan update, the proposal includes two technical studies, the Ventura River Watershed Bio-Digester Planning Study, and the Update to the Regional Groundwater Flow Model. These two focused studies will develop information that will be valuable in bridging data gaps and guiding the development of future regional projects that will enhance the WCVC IRWM Plan.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	15
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	8
Budget	8
Program Preferences	5
Geographic Balance	0
<i>Total Score</i>	46

- **Work Plan** The work plan fully addresses the criterion and was supported by thorough and well presented documentation and logical rationale. The proposal includes an update of the IRWM Plan and two focused studies. The work plan tasks are clear and logical and suggest the planned project can be implemented. Work items include appropriate task submittals (quarterly/final reports), support the budget and schedule, show how proposed tasks will facilitate DAC involvement in planning effort, and address the environmental/CEQA compliance approach for the proposal.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan provides detailed tasks for and clearly shows the process the applicant will use for facilitation and support of DACs within the IRWM region. Tasks include: prepare strategy for ongoing DAC outreach, identify DAC areas, identify water-related needs of DACs.
- **Schedule** The schedule is complete, but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule format is not adequate. The format provided does not allocate specific time frame (duration) to individual work items (tasks), does not indicate task dependencies, and clearly does not allow the reviewer to gain an overall picture (sequential and concurrent nature of scheduling), and makes reasonable assessment of practicability difficult.
- **Budget** The budget addresses the criterion, but is not supported by adequate documentation. For example, the sources of funding match and individual contributions for the planning efforts since October 2008 to present are listed; however, the total contributions (\$161,541) are less than the proposed funding match of \$216,606. Applicant did not provide a clear explanation for the funding source to make up the difference. In addition, the formatting of the budget tables is confusing.
- **Program Preference** While applicant claims that each of the programs preferences will be addressed and that they will identify how each will continue to be met through Plan implementation, only five preferences are well supported. The well addressed preferences are: include regional projects/programs, effectively integrate water management programs and projects, ensure equitable distribution of benefits, climate change response actions, and effectively integrate water management with land use planning.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable