

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	San Luis and Delta Mendota Water Authority	County	San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Fresno, Kings
Project Title	Westside-San Joaquin Regional Planning Grant	Grant Request	\$1,000,000
		Total Project Cost	\$1,393,400

Project Description The Westside-San Joaquin IRWM proposal includes funding assistance for updating and improving the current WIWRP, as well as for projects focused on topic-specific planning efforts. The proposal also identifies projects where additional State funding can be used to further inform the WIWRP development and implementation of strategies to meet regional objectives.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	6
Budget	6
Program Preferences	7
Geographic Balance	0
<i>Total Score</i>	<i>36</i>

- **Work Plan** The work plan does not fully meet the PSP criterion. It does not adequately address the issues and lacks sufficient documentation. Specifically, the work plan is not presented in logical manner or in enough detail. The project prioritization task 3 is unclear whether the existing plan needs to have prioritization process revised or just new projects prioritized and incorporated into project list. Update task 4 description seems to be a duplicate of task 3. Update task 5e, is unclear whether there is a need to change region boundaries. The section on Planning Study for DAC is contradictory to task 2 which described over \$100 million of projects compiled from survey results. For the Topic Specific Regional Studies it was unclear whether these study projects are included in the existing IRWM as high priority projects.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan provides a task for facilitating and supporting DACs as it includes strong involvement and focus on DACs. However, there is no sufficient detail in the work plan involving two Environmental Justice groups. Also, in the update to IRWM it is unclear what the DAC outreach will actually entail.
- **Schedule** The schedule does not present information with adequate documentation and hence, deemed incomplete and insufficient. For example: the schedule lacks detail with respect to task milestones and completion dates. The schedule does not detail key parameters to determine if the schedule is reasonable.
- **Budget** Not all tasks seem reasonably budgeted and the tasks do not follow the work plan clearly. In addition, there was insufficient detail to justify the reasonableness of the costs. Furthermore, the budget lacks hours and rates. Examples include a single budget amount included for the 2nd Element: Planning Study Projects for DACs, with no budget for each task or how they derived the budget estimate.
- **Program Preference** Seven program preferences (include regional projects/programs, address critical water supply or water quality needs of DACs, drought preparedness, use and reuse water more efficiently, practice integrated flood mgmt, protect surface water and groundwater quality, ensure equitable distribution of benefits) were adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable