

Comments on Round 2 draft PSP

Elissa Brown [elissa.j.brown@gmail.com]



Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2012 10:10 AM

To: DWR IRWM Grants

To: IRWM staff:

As a grant writing consultant that has worked both on IRWMP and IRWM Implementation grants, I appreciate that you have modified the cost/benefit analysis section of the PSP and provided alternative ways to document project benefits (pages 22 – 24 and Exhibit D of the PSP). This provides more flexibility for the types of projects that would be competitive for the IRWM implementation grant. The bottom line, however, is how the magnitude of the benefits are judged. The cost/benefit section has the largest impact on the points which the application receives. The actual review criteria (see page 29) have not been modified in respect to the benefits analysis and are pretty vague: *“Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation.”* For projects where the benefits are largely non-monetized (such as watershed restoration), this could present a problem. Reviewers have an easier time comparing monetized benefits to monetized costs, and may have be confused as to how to value the non-monetized benefits.

I don't really have a suggestion on creating criteria for the reviewers to value non-monetized benefits. I hope that you will give this issue some additional consideration. At the very least, you should acknowledge this issue, Possible language to include could be: *Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits (both monetized and non-monetized) in relationship to cost...*

Thank you for your consideration

Elissa Brown
Consultant
559-877-2432