

**Tahoe Sierra IRWMP Partnership
1275 Meadow Crest Dr.
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150**

June 9, 2011

California Department of Water Resources
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management
Financial Assistance Branch
PO BOX 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001
Attn: Mr. Trevor Joseph

RE: Comments on Funding Evaluations for Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation

Dear Mr. Joseph:

After reviewing the proposal evaluation for our recent Proposition 84 IRWM implementation application, the Tahoe Sierra IRWM partnership would like to submit the following comments:

1.) The proposal evaluation contained many comments that seemed to be made without substantive background or support for how they arrived at the final scores for each section evaluated. An example of this from our evaluation would be a comment from the Work Plan section: "The Proposal does not fully address the criterion and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient." However, the remaining comments in this section focus on several smaller details that do not seem to provide sufficient support for the comment as a whole. This occurs frequently throughout the evaluation. A more detailed evaluation that gave more information would be helpful in determining how to improve future application submissions. One suggestion might be a list of the criterion with points awarded for each.

2) Although the cost benefit analysis that was required as a submittal for Proposition 84 is relevant in some areas (ie flood reduction projects) it is very difficult to quantify cost savings for projects that are related to water quality, sediment reduction, environmental restoration or for projects that may address/enhance environmental justice or disadvantaged communities (ie potable water for school children). All of the above mentioned components are specifically mentioned as state-wide priorities and as resource management strategies. Reviewers scored many projects low on the cost benefit analysis, when developing such an analysis is either not applicable to specific project goals or objectives, or was extremely difficult to provide any quantifiable cost savings to associated benefits of project implementation. This process needs to be revised to reflect the potential benefits of project implementation in ways other than projected cost savings

and to include a scoring criteria that gives credit for projects that do relate directly back to established state wide priorities and resource management strategies.

3) Some IRWM groups that span more than one IRWM region received full funding available from both or multiple regions. This type of allocation is inequitable and in the instance of the Lahontan IRWM region, leaves a huge gap in other areas of the region that went completely unfunded in the 2010/2011 round of funding. Some of the areas that were unfunded in this region are comprised entirely of disadvantaged communities – Inyo/Mono IRWM. The allocation of monies in future funding rounds needs to be seriously reconsidered to ensure equity across the region and to take into consideration such factors as disadvantaged communities, sustainability of IRWMs, etc.

We hope these comments may be of value in future Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation funding rounds. If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to contact the partnership through our lead agency: Lynn Nolan, South Tahoe Public Utility District, 530-543-6215.

Thank you.

Representatives, Tahoe Sierra IRWM