

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Sequoia Riverlands Trust	County	Madera, Fresno, Tulare
Project Title	Southern Sierra IRWM Planning Grant	Grant Request	\$975,525
		Total Project Cost	\$1,365,115

Project Description The Southern Sierra IRWM’s proposal includes an IRWMP, significant public involvement and outreach, including outreach to DACs, an informational website which will provide information about the process, six workshops on key issues (such as flood control, climate change mitigation and response, water quality, etc.) to discuss potential integrated strategies, hydrological studies for the region, development of an initial Groundwater Management Plan, and a comprehensive analysis of Climate Change issues which builds on the work already done by the National Center for Conservation Science.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	6
Budget	6
Program Preferences	4
Geographic Balance	0
<i>Total Score</i>	<i>33</i>

- **Work Plan** Work plan is incomplete and insufficient. As Southern Sierra is a developing region and does not yet have an IRWM Plan, the work plan needs a clear and focused direction. Tasks 2 through 6 should clearly, logically, and economically support the completion of task 7 - Draft IRWM Plan. Work plan would have been awarded more points if task 7 contained more detail on how the IRWM Plan standards would be addressed.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan provides a task for facilitating and supporting DACs; however, the applicant does not sufficiently detail the process as it isn’t clear how individual watershed committees reaffirm the goal of integrated water management and would benefit DACs.
- **Schedule** The schedule lacks adequate documentation and rationale. For example, although the schedule indicates an IRWMP will be finalized in 24 months from the beginning of the task 7, 26 months will be required in completion with other work plan tasks, exceeding the contract requirements of completion within two years of the effective start date. Furthermore, some typical schedule details, such as completion dates and milestones, were not included.
- **Budget** The budget lacks adequate rationale and details. For example, SSIRWM hasn’t provided sufficient funding match documentation. A more detailed budget would be required for a higher score.
- **Program Preference** The proposal demonstrates a high level of certainty that four program preferences will be implemented. Those Program preferences are: include regional projects/programs, effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions, address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region, and ensure equitable distribution of benefits.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable