

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Rancho California Water District	<b>County</b>	Orange, San Diego,
<b>Project Title</b>	Upper Santa Margarita Watershed IRWM Plan Update and Special Studies	<b>Grant Request</b>	Riverside \$999,090
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$1,809,609

**Project Description** The proposal requests to update the adopted IRWM Plan through planning studies, stakeholder outreach, and inter-regional coordination. The proposed Tasks include: Ongoing Outreach and Coordination, Salt and Nutrient Management Plan, Anza-Aguanga Groundwater Study Planning (Phase I), and San Mateo Habitat Improvements.

#### Evaluation Summary

<b>Scoring Criterion</b>	<b>Score</b>
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	6
Budget	4
Program Preferences	5
Geographic Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>37</b>

- **Work Plan** The proposal fully addresses the criterion but is not fully supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The proposal lacks details about the processes used to identify the region's water related objectives and to determine criteria for developing regional priorities. In addition, details are missing on how the group collected and managed data, and how the technical analysis was performed. The proposal is generally strong on how the current plan will be brought up to current IRWM standards and includes appropriate deliverables.
- **DAC Involvement** The proposal provides documentation that a considerable effort has been made to date on engaging DACs. Included in the work plan is a task committing to continual outreach to encourage participation by non-responsive DACs prior to IRWM meetings. A commitment to attendance by the IRWM leadership team at four meetings for the specific benefit of DACs is included in work plan. Outreach to DACs is shown in the schedule to be an ongoing activity.
- **Schedule** The schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable for the work plan. The work plan indicates that the outreach effort will consist of eight separate outreach meeting dates, yet the projected meetings are not specifically indicated on the schedule. The schedule for some of the tasks did not adequately reflect the descriptions in the work plan.
- **Budget** Less than half of the work tasks have detailed cost information in the budget, and supporting documentation is lacking. The budget details the individual project costs from the consultant and three RWMG agencies for each task, however, no detail on total hours or hourly rates are provided; thus it is difficult to evaluate whether the costs are reasonable. Funding match to date is given for previous outreach and coordination efforts, but no supporting documentation for this large cost is provided. Total costs for certain tasks seem large relative to the level of detail provided in the narrative description of the work plan.
- **Program Preference** Five program preferences (integrate within hydrologic region, address critical water supply/quality needs for DAC, protect surface and groundwater quality, improve tribal water and natural resources, and equitable distribution of benefits) have been adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable