



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Semitropic Water Storage District	County	Kern
Project Title	Poso Creek IRWM Plan Update and Improvement Proposal	Grant Request	\$690,000
		Total Project Cost	\$1,365,113

Project Description The Proposal builds upon the progress made with regard to integrated regional water management planning and project implementation within the Poso Creek Region since formation of the Poso Creek Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) in 2005. Specifically, this Proposal is intended to help fund the planning necessary to update and improve the adopted 2007 IRWM Plan, such that it is compliant with present standards; to advance project “readiness” through selected preliminary engineering studies; and to enhance public outreach.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	6
DAC Involvement	6
Schedule	3
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
Total Score	26

- **Work Plan** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. It is not clear that this Work Plan will result in a standards-compliant IRWM Plan. The score is awarded based on the following: (1) Subtasks identified in Task 3 (IRWM Standards Update) in the Work Plan do not correspond clearly to the work identified in Table 2 that summarizes the “Potential Revisions and Documentation Needed” for the IRWMP to meet all standards. (2) Task 1 indicates that the applicant has not yet decided on the steps to produce a standards compliant plan, instead requiring DWR provide “verification” that a submitted “Plan Update Outline” will result in a plan update that “complies with the requirements of DWR.” The intent of the work plan is to allow the applicant to control the development of the plan and demonstrate to DWR that the plan will meet current standards. The proposed process seems to fall short of this intent. (3) Applicant is proposing \$650,113 be included as funding match for completed work (per Budget Table, Att. 4). However, the Applicant does not provide a breakdown of this work describing tasks and subtasks (nor is this found in the Budget table or Schedule). Instead, Applicant proposes that as Task 1, for past cost share, DWR will determine if these past costs are eligible as match. Thus, it is not possible for reviewers to determine if costs for past work are even related to the proposed Work Plan scope.
- **DAC Involvement** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The score is awarded based on the following: (1) Tasks within the Work Plan that show how the IRWM Region will facilitate and support sustained DAC participation in the IRWM planning process are not defined beyond updating the Plan’s Region Description to reflect past activities. These activities include the addition of a DAC-representative voting member to the RWMG, and the inclusion of DAC projects into their Round 1 Implementation grant. (2) Task 5.3 (DAC feasibility studies for wastewater projects for the cities of Shafter and Delano) address DAC projects directly. However, the



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Work Plan does not seem to contain activities or actions that imbed long term engagement of DAC's into the IRWM Plan.

- **Schedule** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Applicant provides a schedule, in Gantt chart format. The score is awarded based on the following: (1) The schedule contains inconsistencies relative to the Work Plan tasks, including many sub-tasks and sub-sub tasks (Tasks 4, 5 and 6) that are not included within the Work Plan (Att. 3). (2) While the Applicant indicates August 6, 2012, as the assumed effective date of the grant agreement and an end date within two years, the Applicant insufficiently shows completed work as a milestone by August 6, 2012, (Section A), and thus does not indicate when this work was done. Reviewers could not tell if this work is pre or post 9/30/2008. (4) As described in Work Plan, the Schedule does not break out work already completed, as specific tasks.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete and insufficient. Applicant provides a Budget table and explanatory text. The score was awarded based on the following: (1) Lump sums are submitted for work in Task 5.1 (Regional Water Supply and Flood Management Projects), but it is unclear what each lump sum will produce, especially in consideration of prior work done for each of these projects described in the provided Poso brochure. In addition, a justification for why lump sum estimations are adequate in these instances was not included. (2) Applicant states that they have "shown 49% funding match (\$675,113/\$1,365,113) to be considered as eligible expenses in support of the IRWM Plan Update," but, the breakdown of the funding match in the Budget (or Work Plan, Schedule) does not adequately support the Applicant's statement. (3) The breakdown of the funding match in the application Introduction on page 9 shows historical (2009-2011) local expenditures for RWMG Coordination to be \$184,067; it is not specified how this activity contributed to the update of the IRWM Plan. (4) Budget table includes line item estimates for some work plan tasks, but also includes additional tasks not described in the Work Plan, such as Task 4 and 5 (Work Plan, Page 25), and thus is inconsistent.
- **Program Preference** The Proposal demonstrates that 12 of 15 Program Preferences will be met upon IRWM Plan implementation.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.