

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	County of Humboldt	Amount Requested	\$ 5,386,000
Proposal Title	North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, Proposition 84, Round 2, Implementation Grant	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 10,909,982

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal consists of the following 13 projects: (1) Big Rock Community Services District Stabilize Water Storage Tank, (2) Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Working Landscapes and Riparian Enhancement Project, (3) Gualala River Watershed Council Sediment Reduction Program: Lower Rockpile Creek Planning Watershed, (4) Siskiyou County Septage Pond Closure, (5) Karuk Tribe Lower Mid-Klamath (Red Cap/Perch Creek) Habitat Protection - Road Decommissioning Implementation Project, (6) Yurok Tribe, Restoration of Lower Klamath River Habitats, (7) Salyer Mutual Water Company, Distribution System and Hydrants, (8) Trinity County Resource Conservation District, West Weaver Creek - Channel and Floodplain Rehabilitation, (9) Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District, Ranney Collectors 1 & 1A Lateral Replacement, (10) Westhaven Community Services District, Water Tank, (11) California Land Stewardship Institute, Fish Friendly Farming and Fish Friendly Ranching Environmental Certification in the Russian, Navarro, and Gualala, (12) California Land Stewardship Institute, Russian River Watershed Agricultural Water Conservation & Water Supply Reliability Program, and (13) Gold Ridge Resource Conservation District, Coastal Watersheds Enhancement Project. Projects are summarized by North Coast IRWMP Watershed Management areas.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	8/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	4/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	24/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	10/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			64

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The work plan contains a tabulated overview of each project constituting the proposal, including a summary description, an abstract and project status, goals of the projects, a description of synergies or linkages between the projects, and photos and

maps showing the relative project locations. The work plan explains whether each project is a component of a larger project and how the project can operate as a stand-alone project or as a component of the larger project. Detailed construction tasks are described in the project description section of the work plan as well as in the work plan tasks for some projects (2 and 7). However, some projects do not include a detailed description for construction activities in either section (6, 7, and 11). Also, application states Project 3 is exempt from CEQA documentation; however, no explanation for this exemption is provided.

BUDGET

The budgets for more than half of the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories. The budgets are detailed and cover all tasks, but do not include adequate documentation for the sources of cost estimates. For example, the total cost for construction/implementation budget category in project 3 is estimated to be \$499,592; however, the budget does not show the corresponding tasks and subtasks as were shown in the work plan. In addition, the budget does not provide rationale or methodologies for how each project's costs were estimated. A summary budget is provided for the proposal and detailed budgets provided for each project contained in the proposal. However, not all projects include reasonable detailed costs. For example, the hourly wages for Project 8 appear high, compared with other projects, without any justification.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of at least one project of the proposal no later than October 2014. However, the start and end dates of each project and each task are not explicitly stated in the schedule. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether the project timing is reasonable or if each project or task will be on schedule during execution. In addition, the schedule does not discuss an assumed end date for the entire agreement.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The proposal presented performance indicators, desired outcomes, targets, project goals, and measurement tools and methods for each project. The project goals, performance measures, and targets seem to be achievable in the project lifetime. However, measurement tools and methods do not effectively monitor project performance. Many measurement tools and methods lack quantifiable metrics. For example, some projects rely too heavily on photographic monitoring and several projects listed implementation as the target and the project built as the measure of success. Links to monitoring plans are provided for several projects but no quantifiable metrics.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but is either not fully supported by documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects or physical benefits are not well described. The proposal identifies the project benefits and describes the details of the physical benefits claimed for each project. The physical benefits of the projects are quantified where applicable. However, although technical and scientific documents references are given and briefly summarized for the projects, the methods for estimation descriptions are vague for many projects with no linkage to the studies (For example, Project 2, Table 7 is general as to methods for sediment estimation. Methods for estimation paragraph on page 12 is vague with no linkage to studies referenced in Table 7.2).

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation. This application includes 5 projects that would replace or close outdated, inappropriate or depreciated equipment, and it includes 8 projects whose main benefit is to increase salmonid populations. For the 5 infrastructure projects, the descriptions indicate that the existing equipment is in need of replacement and, if the work is not accomplished, costs associated with the existing equipment are likely, and then the project work and costs would still be required anyway.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that five program preferences and eight statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for 12 of the Preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP; RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR; (3) Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions; (4) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (5) Drought Preparedness; (6) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (7) Climate Change Response Actions; (8) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (9) Practice Integrated Flood Management; (10) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; (11) Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources; and (12) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.