

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority	<b>County</b>	Amador, Alpine, Calaveras, Amador, San Joaquin
<b>Project Title</b>	Integrated Regional Conjunctive Use Program Concept Plan	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$229,800
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$307,200

**Project Description** The Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority (GBA) and the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) are proposing to jointly develop the Integrated Regional Conjunctive Use Project (IRCUP) Concept Plan. Both the GBA and UMRWA seek to rely on the Mokelumne River Watershed to meet current and future water supply needs. The IRCUP concept plan intends to find a mutually beneficial solution to resolve the conflict that has arisen between water right holders and the environment as a result of the timing and availability of the flows on the Mokelumne River.

#### Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	6
Budget	6
Program Preferences	4
Geographic Balance	0
<i>Total Score</i>	<b>33</b>

- **Work Plan** Work plan less than fully addresses the criterion. Both RWMGs have existing IRWM plans and both are applying for funds to update those plans, but no explanation is provided as to how the Integrated Regional Conjunctive Use Project (IRCUP) Concept Plan would help meet either plan's objectives.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan provides a task for a series of facilitated stakeholder meetings (including DACs), however insufficient detail has been provided to show how the applicants plan to ensure that the interests and needs of DACs are addressed in the planning process. There are significant concerns as to how each region will collectively engage DACs as part of the IRCUP. The application did not provide much detail.
- **Schedule** The schedule less than fully addressed the criterion. For example, there are far more subtasks included in the schedule than the work plan. While the duration of the subtasks appears to be reasonable, without a description in the work plan, it is difficult to know for certain.
- **Budget** The budget less than fully addresses the criterion. The subtasks in the schedule are identical to those in the budget. While a level of effort is provided for each subtask, not all subtasks listed in the budget are included in the work plan, making it difficult to determine reasonableness.
- **Program Preference** Four program preferences (include regional projects or programs, effectively integrate water management programs and projects identified in the California Water Plan, resolve significant conflicts, and protect surface water and groundwater quality) adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable