

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	The Sierra Fund	Amount Requested	\$ 5,543,032
Proposal Title	CABY Headwaters Resilience and Adaptability Program	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 9,812,152

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal includes seven projects including: (1) Camptonville Water System Improvement Project, (2) City of Placerville Waterline Replacement, (3) El Dorado County Small Hydro Development Program, (4) Water Efficiency, Water Quality, and Supply Reliability in the CABY Region, (5) Wolf Creek Watershed: Restoration, Stormwater Source Control and Flood Management, (6) CABY Mercury and Sediment Abatement Initiative, and (7) Meadow Restoration, Assessment and Prioritization in the CABY Region.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	15/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	4/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	21/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5	Program Preferences	10/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			65

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application includes an introduction containing three overarching objectives to accomplish five overarching goals. Furthermore, the applicant breaks-down individual objectives for each goal and illustrates which projects will help attain the goals of for the proposal. A tabulated overview of each project, including the status, is provided in the introduction of the proposal and in the individual descriptions for each project. The tasks for each project contain adequate detail so that it is clear that the project can be implemented. Tasks include appropriate deliverables and reporting submittals, including lists of all applicable permits and the status of their CEQA documentation. The submitted Plans and Specifications are consistent with the

designs tasks included in the work plan. The identified tasks include appropriate deliverables. The overall proposal is consistent with the Sacramento/San Joaquin Basin Plan.

BUDGET

The budget for each project in the proposal possesses detailed cost information for most of the estimated expenditures, but the costs associated to their funding match cannot be verified as reasonable because documentation is lacking. The tasks shown in the budget are consistent with the work items shown in the work plan and schedule. However, the budget attachment does not contain an explanation of all assumptions that support the cost estimates.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, is reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction/implementation for a number of projects before October 2014.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. For example, Project 2, narrative description of the Relief Hill Diggins site (p. 27) indicates both pre- and post- project monitoring but details of this monitoring are lacking; Project 4 mentions water quality, but there are no targets or methods identified for this benefit; and for Project 7, the applicant does not list increased streambank restoration (3,900 feet) or groundwater storage (10 acres) in the MAPM table, but they are claimed in the physical benefits section.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects and/or physical benefits are not well described. The proposal is lacking an explanation of how certain physical benefits were determined, and the connection between the physical benefits listed and the reference material is unclear. For example, the physical benefits claimed in Project 1 are uncertain, as the City of Placerville Master Plan is incomplete and the Mercury and Sediment Abatement Initiative references an incomplete study that is not included in the application's reference material.

BENEFITS AND COSTS ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation.

Benefits for the water system projects include the value of water for instream flow and some other avoided costs. The benefits and unit values used are reasonable except that avoided fines are not considered a statewide benefit, so that relatively small value was removed by the reviewer.

Benefits quantified for other projects appear to be reasonable and in many cases conservatively low. They include water quality improvements, groundwater recharge, habitat improvement, flood damage reduction, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Non-monetized benefits are described for all projects, and could be substantial for some of the projects. Non-monetized benefits are described and supported, and include health and safety, water supply reliability, water quality, technology innovation, recreation, and habitat improvement and associated values.

The applicant provides a very good description and rationale for monetized benefits in all but a few cases. Non-monetized benefits are also well explained. The cost analysis is consistent with budgets in Attachment 4. The analysis of benefits generally uses a conservative approach. As a result, the overall level of monetized benefits relative to proposal

costs is low. Considering the conservative approach taken for monetized benefits and the significant non-monetized benefits warrant an overall ranking of medium.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that six 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) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; (4) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (5) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; (6) Drought Preparedness; (7) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (8) Climate Change Response Actions; (9) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (10) Practice Integrated Flood Management; (11) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; and (12) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.