

*"Addressing Drought through IRWM Projects in the Yosemite-Mariposa Region"*

Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Group



October 3, 2014

California Department of Water Resources  
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management  
Financial Assistance Branch  
Post Office Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236  
Attn: Zaffar Eusuff

Delivered via email: Program Manager - Zaffar Eusuff [Muzaffar.Eusuff@water.ca.gov](mailto:Muzaffar.Eusuff@water.ca.gov)

Dear Mr. Eusuff,

Attached are comments regarding the Drought Round Funding Proposal submitted by the County of Mariposa, as this round's project proponent for the Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Group.

We request that you and your team re-evaluate the proposal based on these comments. We also ask that a meeting be scheduled to discuss the proposal.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

***Pat Garcia***

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



Integrated Regional Water Management



## Comments - Draft Drought Round Funding Recommendations

The Yosemite-Mariposa (Y-M) Regional Water Advisory Council (RWAC) and the Drought Round project proponent, the County of Mariposa, respectfully request review and consideration of the following factors in reference to the scoring of the Yosemite-Mariposa Drought Funding Proposal:

Question #1: Attachment 2 clearly demonstrates high regional drought impacts in 4 identified items. ***Italicized text is excerpted from Attachment 2 of the Drought Proposal.***

### 1.) At risk of not meeting existing drinking water demands:

- *Drinking water has become a major concern for the residents of Mariposa County*
- *The CDPH's Drinking Water Program identified Mariposa's drinking water systems at risk, including the Whispering Pines Apartments in Mariposa County*
- *The majority of its rural residents rely on private on-site wells for their domestic water source. It is unknown whether there will be any potable water available for the residents and farmers that use these wells*
- *Numerous public drinking water systems that serve tourists, residents, and businesses are managed by "water purveyors."*
- *These purveyors are just as susceptible to severe droughts, thus threatening major public drinking systems [as] the majority of its rural residents [that] rely on private on-site wells for their domestic water source*

### 2.) At risk of not meeting existing agricultural water demands

- *The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) deemed Mariposa as one of their disaster areas due to the damages and significant losses experienced by the recent drought*
- *This also threatens irrigated crops and orchards. To counter this, farmers are forced to purchase feed from alternative sources, fund more pumping, and depend more heavily on groundwater.*
- *The region's agriculture and economic survival are being impacted by the on-going drought conditions*

### 3.) Not meeting ecosystem water demands

- *Due to the wilderness and high level of wildlife in Mariposa County, the drought has negatively affected this region*
- *Ecosystem services include: the maintenance and enhancement of air, water, and soil qualities; the recycling of wastes and pollutants; the cycling of essential nutrients; the control of pests and diseases; and the pollination of plants.*
- *Many residents and ranchers in Mariposa rely heavily on private on-site wells and surface water*



- *When the wells do fracture, it may severely diminish the accessibility to water for ecological purposes, or in some cases completely eliminate it.*

#### **4.) Other drought related adverse impacts – Severe increase in wildfires**

- *In the month of June... including four fires in the Mariposa County, the Hunters Fire, Valley Fire, Smithers Fire, and the Haigh Fire burned upward of 900 acres.*
- *When these wildfires occur, ground water supplies diminish and erosion mars the area.*
- *Also, because of the heavily forested areas in the County, these project areas are in desperate need of better fire suppression tools (such as the water storage unit provided in the Fish Camp Project); otherwise, any structure fire within the community could spread rapidly.*

The category was scored as a 2, while the documentation clearly demonstrates that the correct score as high risk of regional drought impacts is **4**.

---

Question #2: Attachment 2 identifies voluntary water conservation measures to conserve water by reducing water usage by the project proponent, the County of Mariposa. As the reviewer was perhaps not aware of the geography and sphere of influence of Mariposa County, the water systems in Coulterville and Yosemite West are included in the original notification sent to each user in February 2014. Fish Camp is served by a separate Community Service District and also notified its customers in February 2014, of the state’s request that all water systems reduce their usage by 20% and recommended reducing water use as much as possible as well as judicious and wise use of water. **All of the water purveyors in the project areas have complied with the state’s request to reduce water usage.**

The category was scored as a 0, and the facts demonstrate a correct score of **5**.

---

Question #6: The Work Summary, Budget and Schedule demonstrate that the projects will be ready to start construction by April 1, 2015. **Although the summarized Work Summary shows completion of the final project tasks as 0%, project design and cost estimates were carefully and understandably gathered in order to determine the requested funding amounts. The detailed schedules clearly demonstrate the viability and readiness to proceed when funding is secured, by identifying all of the associated tasks required for the projects, including the readiness to issue the all projects’ notices to proceed no later than April 1, 2015.**

The score of 0 is incorrect. The proposal level score should be 2. As the summary instructions were taken literally, resulting in the brevity of the explanations, a score of **1** would be understandable.

---

*“Addressing Drought through IRWM Projects in the Yosemite-Mariposa Region”*

Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Group



Question #16: The necessary tasks for each project are discussed in summary form as demanded in the PSP, and are organized by the 4 budget categories required. The Work Summary also includes the anticipated deliverables for each task. **The comments of 0% completed do not reflect the cost estimates, and work scoping completed to arrive at the budget, but instead, refer to the final product of each task as outlined.**

The following table is provided as an example of the others that were submitted.

One point should be scored for each project, resulting in a score level of **5, / an average of 1.**

<b>Project 1: Coulterville Second Water Source</b>	
<b>Category (a): Direct Project Administration</b>	
Task 1: Administration	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Preparation of invoices and other deliverables as required.
Task 2: Reporting	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Submission of quarterly and final reports as specified in the Grant Agreement.
<b>Category (b): Land Purchase/Easement</b>	
Task 3: Land Acquisition	N/A
Deliverables:	N/A
<b>Category (c): Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation</b>	
Task 4: Assessment and Evaluation	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Site selection
Task 5: Final Design	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Completion of project plans and specifications at the final level.
Task 6: Environmental Documentation	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Approved and adopted CEQA documentation.
Task 7: Permitting	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Well Drillers' Permits; amended Water Supply Permit; Building Department Permit.
<b>Category (d): Construction/Implementation</b>	
Task 8: Construction Contracting	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Advertisement for bids; pre-bid contractors meeting; evaluation of bids; award contract.
Task 9: Construction	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Notice to Proceed; site preparation; well drilling; construct pump house; well connection; install controls
Task 10: Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Potential erosion control
Task 11: Construction Administration	0% completed; ready to proceed with funding
Deliverables:	Testing and acceptance of well; project close out.

"Addressing Drought through IRWM Projects in the Yosemite-Mariposa Region"

Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Group



Question #21: The costs presented in the Budget are reasonable for the project type and current stage of the project. Cost estimates, project design, initial site selections, CEQA requirements already addressed in the project areas and prior costs of similar projects were all considered in preparing the budget costs as reasonable and feasible, as detailed on each Project Budget.

The following table is provided as an example of the others that were submitted.

One point should be scored for each project, resulting in a score level of 5, / an average of 1.

Table 7 – Project Budget					
Proposal Title: Addressing Drought through IRWM Projects in the Yosemite-Mariposa Region					
Project Title: Yosemite West Water Line Improvements					
Project serves a need of a DAC?: No					
Funding Match Waiver request?: No					
Category		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source* (Funding Match)	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source*	Total Cost
(a)	Direct Project Administration	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$100,000
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation	\$84,559	\$28,186	\$0	\$112,745
(d)	Construction/Implementation	\$1,276,470	\$425,490	\$0	\$1,701,960
(e)	Grand Total (Sum rows (a) through (d) for each column)	\$1,436,029	\$478,676	\$0	\$1,914,705
*List sources of funding: County of Mariposa local funds					
Reasonableness of Budget		<p><i>This project budget reflects a desire for cost effectiveness in order to maximize the use of IRWM funding. A detailed split of funds between local match and in-kind funding will be provided upon conditional award. Direct Project Administration funding is kept to a range acceptable to DWR and within its established parameters. The modest request provides a significant benefit to a community in need of an improved water line infrastructure.</i></p>			

*“Addressing Drought through IRWM Projects in the Yosemite-Mariposa Region”*

Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Group



**Question 23:** The schedules clearly demonstrate all of the required tasks to be completed within the overall project timeframe. This includes documented readiness for issuing the notices to proceed with construction by no later than April 1, 2015 and also throughout each of the projects’ completion date.

The following table is provided as an example of the others that were submitted. Please note the text in red that was not highlighted in the proposal.

One point should be scored for each project, resulting in a score level of **5, / an average of 1.**

Project Schedule															
Proposal Title: Addressing Drought through IRWM Projects in the Yosemite-Mariposa Region															
Project Title: Coulterville Water Line Improvements															
Timeline	2014					2015									
	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	Mar.	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	
<b>Category (a): Direct Project Administration</b>															
<b>Task 1: Administration</b>															
Invoices and Other Administrative Documents															
<b>Task 2: Reporting</b>															
Quarterly and Final Reports															
<b>Category (b): Land Purchase/Easement</b>															
<b>Task 3: Land Acquisition</b>															
<b>Category (c): Planning/Design/Eng./ Env. Doc.</b>															
<b>Task 4: Assessment and Evaluation</b>															
<b>Task 5: Final Design</b>															
Site Plan and Specifications															
<b>Task 6: Environmental Documentation</b>															
CEQA Documentation															
<b>Task 7: Permitting</b>															
Water Supply; Building Permits															
<b>Category (d): Construction/Implementation</b>															
<b>Task 8: Construction Contracting</b>															
Advertise for Bid															
Bid Period															
Award Contract															
<b>Task 9: Construction</b>															
Notice to Proceed															
Installation of House Services															
Installation of Fire Hydrants, Valves, Pipe Repair															
Repair Pavement															
Install Booster Pump and Tank															
Set and Test Pump															
Install Controls															
<b>Task 10: Env. Compliance/Mitigation/ Enhancement</b>															
Potential Erosion Control															
<b>Task 11: Construction Administration</b>															
Close Out Project															
<b>Schedule Feasibility</b>	<p>The proposed project, the Coulterville Water Line Improvements, is viable and ready for implementation. The County of Mariposa is in dire need of funding to produce an alternative water source for its residents. During this drought season, the County has completed a number of examinations regarding water issues and what actions could take place to remedy them. In doing so, Mariposa came up with five projects that would satisfy the risks of: not meeting water drinking demands, water supply, ecosystem conflicts, and an increase of wildfires. Unfortunately, due to the limited funds of the region, the County has been unable to begin the project process. This is reflected on Attachment 4 – Work Summary. The County is ready and willing to divert time and significant resources to this Project as soon as funding is secured. The start date of November 2014 reflects the commencement of the project once funding has been extended to the County. It is feasible and well within reason that the project will be completed by December of 2015 as the County is determined and ready to begin the process on behalf of their residents in need.</p>														

**SUMMARY**

The changes to the scoring listed above result in a proposal score of 16 and an average project level score of 12, totaling **28**, qualifying the proposal to be considered for funding.

We are formally requesting a meeting to discuss DWR’s final decision after October 8, 2014, the end of the Public Comment period.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our request for the updates to the proposal scoring and overall evaluation.