

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	CABY Regional Water Management Group	County	Nevada, Sierra, Placer, El Dorado
Project Title	CABY Regional Planning Grant Application	Grant Request	\$647,593
		Total Project Cost	\$947,935

Project Description The CABY Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) performs annual self evaluations, in the most recent self-evaluation, the group determined that outreach to several key constituencies needed to be enhanced; the existing plan needed to be completely reformatted to reduce the cost and complexity of printing; and the significant body of new data generated by three regional Federal Energy Regulating Commission (FERC) relicensing efforts, the group's strategy for assessing regional adaptive strategy in response to climate change, ongoing project development, and a development of diversified funding strategy were important issues for consideration in 2011. Finally, the RWMG has determined that a reevaluation of the key water management issues will need to include considerably more coordination with and outreach to regional water agency boards of directors, county boards of supervisors, city councils, and land use management agencies.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	8
Budget	8
Program Preferences	6
Geographic Balance	0
Total Score	44

- **Work Plan** In general, the work plan meets the requirements of the scoring criteria. However, some tasks were unclear or confusing. Two examples are: potential stakeholder outreach activities are listed but no clear steps are provided to detail how they will be accomplished. The DAC discussion describes a need to update the plan but does not detail how the update will be accomplished.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan meets the criteria and is well supported through multiple activities contained in tasks such as outreach, brochures, contacting water agencies, and census data review. Implementation of work plan tasks will assist in DAC involvement.
- **Schedule** The schedule is adequate, but not fully supported. It is difficult to determine whether or not scheduled tasks are dependent on each other. The color used in the schedule is not intuitively understood and no explanation was found. Task 4.5 seemed unreasonably long to integrate the Mountain Meadow IRWMP. Task 13 is shown as an on-going task for 18 months, but the budget seems to indicate only enough funds for 1 person to work 1 month.
- **Budget** The required information is present, but the budget is confusing. For example, it is difficult to determine administrative costs as they are combined with another task in Table 1. In Table 7 the average hourly rate for all entities is depicted as \$50/hr but in the assumptions in Budget Table 2 that same hourly rate is depicted as \$60/hr without an explanation.
- **Program Preference** Six program preferences (Climate Change Response, Regional Projects, Resolve Significant Water-Related Conflicts, Address Critical Water Supply/Quality of DAC, Equitable Distribution of Benefits and Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources) are adequately addressed and sufficiently documented.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable