

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011*

<b>Applicant</b>	Central Sierra Resource Conservation and Development, Inc.	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$4,299,858
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Inyo-Mono IRWMP Round 1 Project Implementation Application	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$5,700,267

### PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Fifteen projects are included in the proposal: (1) Safe Drinking Water and Fire Water Supply Feasibility Study for Tecopa, California, (2) Coleville High School Water Project, (3) Round Valley Joint Elementary School's water supply reliability enhancement, (4) New Hilltop Well, (5) Well Rehabilitation (Phase I), (6) Pump Operation Redundancy and SCADA Improvement Project, (7) CSA-2 Sewer System Upgrade Project, (8) Secondary Water Tank Construction Project – Birchim Community Services District, (9) Brackish Water Resource Study, (10) Laws and Lone Pine Tank Project, (11) Water Meter Installation Project Final Phase, (12) Lone Pine, Independence, and Laws Water Meter Project, (13) Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades - Phase I, (14) Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Weed Control Project, and (15) Town of Mammoth Lakes Stormwater Master Plan Development and Implementation.

### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Points Possible	Criteria	Score/ Points Possible
Work Plan	<b>9/15</b>	Economic Analysis – Water Supply Costs and Benefits	<b>6/15</b>
Budget	<b>3/5</b>	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	<b>6/15</b>
Schedule	<b>3/5</b>	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction	<b>0/15</b>
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	<b>2/5</b>	Program Preferences	<b>10/10</b>
<b>Total Score (max. possible = 85)</b>			<b>39</b>

### EVALUATION SUMMARY

The following is a review summary of the proposal.

#### Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed, and is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The work plan includes supplemental attachments that contain plans and specifications to verify work performed. The suite of 15 projects collectively addresses two goals and six objectives of the IRWM plan and the work plan is consistent with the Lahontan Basin Plan. The applicant provides enough detail to ensure some projects can be implemented. However, most projects descriptions are lacking in detail

(Projects 1 and 11) or missing deliverables (Projects 3, 8, and 13). Other deficiencies were identified. For example, Progress Reports are not included for Project 1. Some of the tasks are lacking in detail. This can be seen with Project 11, Task 9 “Construction” which lists some of the construction activities for water meter installation. But through all the tasks associated with this Project none state how many meters will be installed. Also, page 76, sub-task 9.3 is a question and states “Are meters installed with arrow towards customer, any leaks, reads collected by collector and transferred into the billing system; can billing system generate a correct bill?” This task doesn’t explain any work that will be performed. It is recognized, most of the projects are needed to address failing or insufficient infrastructure, and therefore, they do not have scientific or technical information to support the feasibility.

## **Budget**

This criterion is not fully addressed, and not supported by thorough documentation and sufficient rationale. Specifically, the budgets for most of the projects lack supporting documentation. For example, the applicant provides varying levels of backup documentation for most projects, while some projects do not backup documentation at all (i.e. Projects 5, 9, and 15). The absence and varying levels of back up documentation make it impossible to determine the reasonableness of Projects budgets. For Projects 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, the applicant did not provide task budgets reflecting the work items in the work plan.

## **Schedule**

The schedule is not completely reasonable, and is not consistent with the work plan. Each of the project schedules are not presented in the same order or grouping as presented in the work plan. The presentation and organization of schedule material does not support the work plan documentation. The majority of the Projects have a start date of December 2011 or earlier, and with the supporting documentation, demonstrate a readiness to begin work between 6 to 12 months after the award date.

## **Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures**

The criterion is less than fully addressed, and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The project goals do not correspond with the goals and objectives identified in the proposal. Project 1 does not include the required “targets” category, neither do Projects 5 and 8 include output indicators. Projects 2, 3, 4, and 5 do not include quantitative measurement tool and methods. Projects 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, and 13 do not include quantitative targets. Projects 14 and 15 are not submitted in the required table format.

## **Economic Analysis – Water Supply Costs and Benefits**

Only average levels of benefits relative to costs can be realized through this proposal. The quality of the analysis is partially lacking and supporting documentation was unsubstantiated. Monetized water supply benefits claimed for 10 projects are \$6.19 million (M). Most of these benefits are for Project 5 (\$2.71 M) and Project 2 (\$1.41 M). The well rehabilitation benefits are avoided operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for new filter media. Avoided costs at the high school are costs of storage tanks and hauling water. Water supply benefits are claimed for one project that is a study. Supporting documentation was lacking. For example, a narrative was provided for only four of the 10 projects claiming monetized benefits.

### **Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits**

Only below average levels of benefits relative to costs can be realized through this proposal. The quality of the analysis was partially lacking and supporting documentation was unsubstantiated. Monetized water quality and other benefits claimed for 6 projects are \$46.51 M. Most of these benefits are Project 14 (\$45.36 M). This benefit is based on \$600 per acre protected or enhanced. No source or citation is provided. This benefit estimate is not reasonable for the region.

### **Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction**

No flood damage reduction benefits are claimed.

### **Program Preferences**

The proposal addresses long term drought preparedness, includes projects that directly address critical water supply needs of disadvantaged communities, and there is a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved. The proposal addresses additional multiple program preferences and statewide priorities including: Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within a hydrologic region, Use and reuse water more efficiently, Expand environmental stewardship, and Practice integrated flood management.