



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

<b>Applicant</b>	Contra Costa Water District	<b>County</b>	Contra Costa
<b>Project Title</b>	East Contra Costa County Prop 84 Round 2 Planning Grant	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 451,818
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 1,493,045

**Project Description** Enhance the IRWMP for the East Contra Costa County region with a regional recycled water planning, a regional capacity study, an enhanced website, and additional DAC outreach to bring the IRWMP into closer alignment with the program preferences and statewide priorities, and benefit stakeholders and DACs.

### Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	5
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>36</b>

- **Work Plan** The criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation. The Work Plan contains the required sections and builds on the Round 1 framework. Table 3 describes how this Round 2 Planning grant will address the specific IRWMP standards. The Work Plan is supported with map graphics showing the IRWMP region, DAC areas and municipal jurisdictions. The line items of the Schedule and Budget correlate with the Work Plan description. The Work Plan task descriptions are detailed, but the deliverables associated with the various tasks are vaguely defined. For example, the deliverables associated with the work in the 38 subtasks of task 2 are buried in text, and will have to be clarified before incorporating into a grant agreement scope of work. Task 3 similarly lacks correlation of specific deliverables for the work proposed.
- **DAC Involvement** The DAC involvement criteria is fully addressed but not supported by sufficient rationale. The DAC outreach element is specifically addressed in task 1a. The Work Plan focuses on using a website to provide IRWMP information to DACs, but does not recognize the potential lack of internet access in DACs that are not covered by cities or Municipal Advisory Committees (MACs), nor does it discuss outreach to these areas. The benefits to DACs in task 2 are indirect and speculative. For example, task 2.3 states, “While DACs will not be directly served with recycled water as a result of the task 2c analysis, recycled water will replace potable water supplies served to Oakley by Diablo Water District, presenting an opportunity to make water deliveries to DACs in Bethel Island more reliable, once Diablo Water District water becomes available to Bethel Island residents.”
- **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 at the subtask level and provides for easy comparison. The Schedule starts on August 6, 2012, and is projected to finish on January 15, 2014, which is reasonable for the proposed scope of work.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are insufficient. There is no justification or supporting documentation to explain how the travel and ODC costs were estimated. A summary table of the amounts per task that directly benefit DACs is given with no backup to explain



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012*

---

where the numbers came from. The agency funding match is shown as lump sums by agency per task, but there is no documentation to support how the cost match values were derived.

- **Program Preference** The proposal sufficiently demonstrates that twelve of the fifteen program preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.