

12 November 2015

Keith Wallace  
Project Manager  
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management  
Financial Assistance Branch  
California Department of Water Resources  
Post Office Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236

Via email: Keith.Wallace@water.ca.gov

Subject: 2015 Grant Solicitation Draft Funding Recommendations for Yosemite-Mariposa Lake Don Pedro Community Services District 2015 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal

Dear Mr. Wallace:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft funding recommendation for the Yosemite-Mariposa Lake Don Pedro Community Services District 2015 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal. We recognize the time and effort taken to evaluate all of the submitted applications, and we appreciate your willingness to accept and respond to comments on the draft recommendations.

The Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM region has a very low population (about 18,000) the majority of which is disadvantaged community (DAC), therefore we appreciate the opportunity, with DWR's planning grant support, to participate in the IRWM process and grant solicitations. We understand that DWR, and the state, is continuously working to improve small and disadvantaged communities' ability to participate in the IRWM and other state programs. The Yosemite-Mariposa Region has received a planning grant for the development of an IRWM Plan. The draft recommendations to partially fund our projects through the 2015 Grant Solicitation further enable our region to continue to implement the Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM Plan.

As noted above, we would like to better understand the scoring of our 2015 Grant Proposal to aid our efforts in improving our grant proposals in future solicitations. Our questions on the scoring of the 3 projects in our application, Project 1: Drought Emergency Groundwater Supply Wells, Project 2: Regional Water Use Efficiency Program, and Project 3: Service Line Replacement Project, follow. These projects benefit the Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM region and especially the Lake Don Pedro Community Services District which is facing dire water supply shortages as a result of the extended and intense drought.

Comment 1: We feel that the following questions from the Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) scoring table in the table below were answered fully for Projects 1, 2, and 3 and would like to better understand the reasoning for not obtaining points for our response to these questions.

Q#	Project Level Evaluation	Attachment	For DWR to award a full score, the application must contain:	Points Available	Points Awarded (Project 1, Project 2, Project 3)
8	Are the anticipated primary and secondary physical benefits of the project described and quantified with the units specified in Table 5?	2	A properly completed Table 5 for at least the primary and secondary benefit of each project. If the primary and secondary physical benefits were not clearly identified or quantified for each year of the project's lifecycle using the specific units provided in the instructions for Table 5, a response of "no" will be given. For DAC projects that do not include construction, benefits do not need to be quantified, but must be qualitatively described.	1	0, 0, 0
9	Does the technical analysis support the claimed physical benefits?	2	A demonstration that the benefits were quantified correctly: 1. An explanation of project need 2. An explanation of without project conditions 3. A description of how benefits were derived For DAC projects that do not include construction, only #1 (project need) must be described.	1	0, 0, 0

Table 5 from the Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for all three projects was properly completed with the primary benefit of water supply saved with the units of acre-feet per year (AFY) and the secondary unit of fishery flows with the units of cubic feet per second (CFS). Both benefits and units correspond with those allowed on page 19 of the 2015 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP). Both benefits were quantified for each year of the project's lifecycle (2016-2036 for a 20-year useful life of the project). While the benefits are modest, they are appropriate for the extremely rural nature of the Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM region.

In addition, we demonstrated that the benefits were quantified correctly with an explanation of need, without project conditions, and a derivation of the benefits.

Moreover, Project 2 benefits DACs and does not include construction. In addition to providing quantitative benefits, qualitative benefits and project need were also provided for Project #2. Therefore, if Table 5 was not filled out properly or the explanation of without project conditions or derivation of benefits was not sufficient, Project 2 should still have received a score of 'Yes' as it is a DAC benefit project without construction. It was unknown that if this section was

completed for Project 2 that it would be penalized for incomplete or improperly completed answers.

Comment 2: We feel that each project should have received a score of 1 for question 13 below and would like to better understand why the projects received zero points for this question.

Q#	Project Level Evaluation	Attachment	For DWR to award a full score, the application must contain:	Points Available	Points Awarded (Project 1, Project 2, Project 3)
13	Is the proposed project performance monitoring plan expected to track progress towards meeting the claimed physical benefits?*	2	- Monitoring targets identified that will assist the implementing agency achieve the claimed benefits. - Monitoring tools that are appropriate for measuring the project's performance.	1	0, 0, 0

PSP Table 6 was utilized for all 3 projects and listed monitoring targets and tools for measuring each project's performance. Although the Project Performance Monitoring Plan tables for Project 1 and Project 3 were both mislabeled for Project 2, that should not have been a reason for a '0' award, as PSP Table 6 was a suggestion, not a requirement, for presenting the Project Performance Monitoring Plan.

Secondly, Project 2 directly benefits DACs, is in planning phase, and does not include construction; therefore it was not required to complete this section as stated on page 21 of the PSP. It was unknown that if this section was completed for Project 2 that it would be penalized for an incomplete or improperly completed answer.

Comment 3: The Yosemite-Mariposa Region is made up of mostly DACs, with a population that is smaller than most cities in California. It should be recognized that the benefits from our projects will naturally be less, quantitatively, than that of a larger region, but significant qualitatively to the region. Evaluation of benefits for smaller agencies, regions, projects, etc. should be done relative to a region's size and ability to develop and implement projects with multiple benefits. Not only is it more difficult for smaller agencies to develop larger projects with multiple benefits, it is also difficult to develop benefits when confined to the limited list of benefits allowed in the PSP.

Comment 4: We realize that the draft Application Evaluation Summaries were issued with the intent on providing feedback to applicants quickly and to expedite the funding process. We also realize that is the reason why a full explanation of the scoring was not provided.

Keith Wallace  
California Department of Water Resources  
12 November 2015  
Page 4

Thank you for your time in accepting and responding to our comments. We welcome the opportunity to discuss your review and response.

Very truly yours,

Pete Kampa  
General Manager  
Lake Don Pedro Community Services District  
9751 Merced Falls Rd.  
La Grange, CA 95329  
(209) 852-2331 (Don Pedro Office)  
(209) 694-7023 (Sonora Office)  
(209) 591-7100 (Cell)

---

Send on the behalf of the Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Group including the Y-M Regional Water Advisory Council and the Y-M Regional Water Management Group.

By

Pat Garcia

Project Manager  
Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM Plan Development  
Fiscal agent:  
Mariposa County Resource Conservation District  
209-966-3431  
[www.mcrcd.net](http://www.mcrcd.net)