



**North Coast Resource Partnership
Policy Review Panel (PRP) & Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) Meeting
MEETING MATERIALS**

**Friday, October 19, 2018; 10 am – 3:30 pm
Weaverville Victorian Inn, 2051 Main St, Weaverville, CA**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following items correspond to the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) agenda for October 19, 2018 per agenda order and item number. The items below include background information for agenda items that require additional explanation and, in some cases, include recommendations for action. The meeting agenda and other meeting materials can be found on the NCRP website at <https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/news-item/north-coast-resource-partnership-quarterly-meeting-october-19-weaverville/>

V Local Project Presentation: South Fork Trinity River — Spring Run Chinook Salmon Restoration Project

The South Fork Trinity River is the largest un-dammed river in California, federally designated as a wild and scenic river, and is a keystone watershed within the Klamath River basin supporting one of the last remaining populations of wild spring-run Chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) which are nearing the brink of extirpation. The South Fork Trinity River watershed was listed as sediment impaired in California’s 1995 CWA 303(d) list and in subsequent updates.

The major components of this project are to increase wild spring run Chinook populations through in-stream restoration techniques targeted at improving adult and juvenile salmonid habitats, restoring reach-scale physical geomorphic processes, and improving water quality related to thermal refugia.

See the October 1, 2018 San Francisco Chronicle article and video at the link below.
https://m.sfgate.com/news/article/Yurok-tribe-revives-ancestral-lands-by-restoring-13270437.php?t=fbdd51e0a1&utm_campaign=email-mobile&utm_source=CMS%20Sharing%20Button&utm_medium=social

More information about the project can be found at

https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/site/assets/uploads/2017/09/NCRP_2015_Project-WatershedTrainingCenter.pdf

X Opportunities & Priorities for the NCRP

During the NCRP Quarterly meetings in January & April, 2018, the NCRP Partnership held discussions regarding strategies, policy and funding to support regional resiliency in the face of wildfire and other extreme events. These discussions integrated information from a project funded by the Strategic Growth Council that included local and regionwide assessments of forest carbon, renewable energy, biomass, fuel load reduction options, water and wastewater system enhancements, natural capital and ecosystem services and climate resiliency. Through a series of “round robin” conversations and interactive panels, the NCRP Policy Review Panel will continue this discussion and develop updated strategies with the input and recommendations from legislators and state agency leaders.

XI PRP Direction to Staff: Strategies for Funding

Background

Over the last two years, the NCRP Chair, Vice-chair and staff have had ongoing conversations with elected officials and agency staff at the state and national level regarding the accomplishments of the NCRP and the need for funding to support planning and project implementation focused on forest and watershed health, community health and safety, and local economic vitality. In the wake of the worst fire season in California history, legislation and funding opportunities are rapidly evolving. Positioning the NCRP to receive funding for fuel load reduction and forest health requires the focused and flexible effort of the NCRP staff team. Past bond funding opportunities have had more lead time, and were well aligned with the timing of the quarterly NCRP meeting, allowing for TPRC and staff work in the intervening months and PRP decision making during the quarterly meetings. The current set of funding and legislative opportunities are on a much faster timeframe and in some cases require immediate staff and Chair/Vice-chair engagement to secure them or signal the interest of the NCRP.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Through April 2019, authorize NCRP staff to work with the Chair, Vice-Chair and Executive Committee to pursue funding and provide legislative input that furthers the goals of the NCRP. The following assumptions apply:

1. NCRP staff would only pursue funding opportunities that align with PRP approved Goals and Objectives
2. Prior to proceeding on any funding or legislative opportunity, NCRP staff would receive approval from the Chair and Vice Chair at a minimum, and would request approval from the full Executive Committee

3. NCRP staff would send draft funding requests or legislative input to the full PRP and TPRC for comment
 4. A decision to formally submit a grant application would be voted on by the full PRP
 5. Any funding request would honor the PRP approved approach to local autonomy – allowing Tribes or counties to opt out of any element of the funding request in which they do not wish to participate.
 6. Funding requests or legislative input will predominantly focus on project implementation, but may also include stakeholder outreach and coordination, technical support for project proponents, data, analysis and planning.
 7. At the April 2019 meeting, this authorization would be revisited by the PRP
-

XII Russian River Pilot

Russian River Pilot Background Information:

In cooperation with the Department of Water Resources and local stakeholders, California Forward and the Pacific Institute are developing a management framework for the Russian River watershed. This pilot effort is intended to contribute to the CA Water Plan Update 2018. The activities described below will explore, and in some cases pilot, watershed-based planning, regulation, governance, and finance innovations as framed up in various DWR planning initiatives (e.g., CA Water Plan, Statewide Flood Planning, and Building Capacity for Regional Sustainability). The Russian River watershed was selected as the preferred location due to established relationships and a demonstrated willingness to partner and innovate.

Throughout the Russian River Pilot development process, concerns have been expressed about adequate Tribal and NCRP input in the plan development process. This presents an opportunity for the NCRP to establish a clear protocol for how the NCRP engages in other regional planning processes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Executive Committee are approved to review a letter regarding the Russian River Pilot from the NCRP Tribal leadership, as well as to consider developing and submitting any additional letters or communication with DWR and California Forward regarding the Russian River Pilot. Note: the NCRP Executive Committee includes two members who reside in the Russian River watershed, and two Tribal members, all of whom are familiar with the Russian River Pilot process to date.
 - As per past PRP Policy, any letters submitted on this matter will be shared with the full PRP
 - The Executive Committee and staff will bring a draft policy regarding NCRP interaction with external plans to the full PRP for discussion and consideration during the next NCRP meeting in January
-

XIII Reconfirm: NCRP Proposition 1 Round 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Process

Background:

During the NCRP Meeting in January 2018, the PRP formed a NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee comprised of TPRC Co-Chairs, other PRP & TPRC member volunteers and staff to develop NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation process, guidelines and solicitation materials for review and consideration by the PRP. During the April NCRP meeting the PRP adopted the ad hoc committee's overarching recommendation along with five related recommendations.

The PRP approved the overarching motion to allow for the commencement of the NCRP 2018 Project Solicitation and development of a regional NCRP 2018 Grant Application. The approval also included a provision to allow staff to alter the draft solicitation materials with input from the NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Ad Hoc Committee to comply with the Draft and Final Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) when released by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in the spring and summer of 2018. The related motions passed and include:

1. Regional Application Budget Limit: up to 60% of the total amount available to the North Coast funding area for Round 1 IRWM Implementation funding; allowing 40% to be held for Round 2.
2. PRP Final Project Approval and Regional Application Timing: **January 18, 2019:** PRP consider/approve TPRC recommended suite of Priority North Coast Projects; **March/ April 2019:** regional application due to DWR
3. Economically Disadvantaged Communities: provide additional project scoring weight for projects that benefit severely disadvantaged communities
4. Climate Change Adaptation: provide additional project scoring weight for projects that assist water infrastructure systems adapt to climate change
5. Program Preferences: to provide project scoring criteria for projects that promote any or all the Program Preferences including 3 Tribal additions

Though expected to be released in the spring of 2018, DWR released the 2018 Proposition 1 Round 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Draft PSP and IRWM Grant Program Guidelines on October 5th for public review. ***This timing change requires that the PRP reconfirm the NCRP April decision with slight scheduling updates.***

NCRP PROPOSITION 1 IMPLEMENTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Ad Hoc Committee recommends ***reconfirming*** the April 2018 PRP approval of the Draft 2018 NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, Scoring Criteria and draft Application materials (see Attachments B, C & D) to allow for the commencement of the NCRP 2018/19 Project Solicitation and development of a regional NCRP 2018/19 Grant Application. The recommendation includes approval to allow changes to the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines and NCRP 2018/19 Project Application materials to be made by staff with input from the

NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee to comply with the Draft PSP released by DWR on October 5th and Final PSPs to be released by DWR late 2018.

The recommendation includes **reconfirming** the April 2018 PRP approval of the related motions listed above with one exception:

2. PRP Final Project Approval and Regional Application Timing

Establish the preferred timing of the for PRP Final Priority Project Approval and Regional Application submittal, with the provision that this may change based on the provisions in the Final PSP:

- **April 19, 2019:** PRP consider/approve TPRC recommended suite of Priority North Coast Projects for NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation
- **June/ July 2019:** regional application due to DWR for the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant.

A full description of the NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation and PRP April 2018 decisions can be found in Attachment A.

The updated draft solicitation materials can be found as Attachments B-D in the digital version of these meeting materials or online at <https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/news-item/north-coast-resource-partnership-quarterly-meeting-october-19-weaverville/> Please note, the printed October 19 meeting materials will not include Attachments B-D in an effort to reduce the use of excessive paper.

- Attachment B - NCRP 2018/19 Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines
- Attachment C - NCRP 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria
- Attachment D - NCRP Proposition 1, 2018/19 Project Application & Information Form (example application)

Staff will work with the Ad Hoc Committee to review the draft PSP and provide comments to DWR by the specified due date of November 20th along with requested information.

XV Updates

ii. Regional Administrator & Project Implementation Update: Humboldt County

Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Implementation Projects

Prop. 84 Round	Total Projects	Grant Amount	Amount Invoiced	% Complete	Projects Complete at End of Year (estimated for 2018, 2019, 2020)			
					2017	2018	2019	2020
<i>Round 1 (2013)</i>	18	\$8.2 million	\$6.0 million	75%	10	18	18	18
<i>Round 2 (2014)</i>	12	\$5.4 million	\$4.0 million	75%	7	9	12	12
<i>Drought (2015)</i>	11	\$8.7 million	\$3.5 million	40%	3	7	11	11
<i>Final (2016)</i>	25	\$11.0 million	\$4.2 million**	38%	6	11	20	25
			**Includes \$1.1 million advanced payment					
66		\$33.3 million			26	45	61	66

Notes

- In June 2018, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) grant manager changed from Kaylee Vanni to Eric Martinez. Humboldt County staff have been working closely with Eric to continue the strong working relationship and maintain timely processing of grant deliverables.
- Within the last few months, turn-around time for reimbursement payments from DWR has returned to the normal 60 days. Timely payments are essential to avoid financial hardships for local project sponsors, and DWR's recent efforts to reduce slow-downs are greatly appreciated.
- The Karuk Tribe completed its "Camp Creek Habitat Protection-Road Decommissioning" project under the Prop. 84 Round 1 grant with substantial cost savings (\$180,000). According to NCRP guidelines, the unspent funds can be transferred to another project within the Round 1 suite of projects, with a first priority for projects situated within the same County or tribal region. The unspent funds from the Camp Creek project will be allocated to the Happy Camp Sanitary District to support their project replacing a sewer pipeline crossing on Indian Creek, tributary to the Klamath River.

Planning Projects

Title and Funding Source	Grant Term	Status	Grant Amount
<i>North Coast Integrated Regional Planning: Healthy Communities, Functional Watersheds and Viable Economies</i> Dept. of Conservation (Strategic Growth Council)	June 2014 to March 2018	Project Complete	\$1 million
<i>North Coast Resource Partnership Outreach & Involvement: Tribal Engagement & Economic Opportunity for Disadvantaged Communities (DACTI)</i> Dept. of Water Resources, Proposition 1	April 2017 to April 2020	In progress	\$2.65 million

Notes

- The Strategic Growth Council planning project is complete. The final project reports are available at <http://www.northcoastresourcepartnership.org/>.
- The Tribal Engagement & Economic Opportunity for Disadvantaged Communities project is well underway. Work continues with key support provided by West Coast Watershed and the California Environmental Indian Alliance. This grant supports the coordination and continued collaboration of the NCRP leadership, a regional needs assessment, a small update to the North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, technical assistance for tribes and disadvantaged communities, and much more. Administration has been smooth and the DWR IRWM grant manager has been responsive and helpful. Half of the award was received in the form of an advance payment, to be spent within 18 months of grant agreement execution between DWR and the County of Humboldt. The deadline for spending the advance payment is October 20, 2018. Spending has been slower than expected for a variety of unanticipated reasons. An extension to the Advance Payment Funding Plan of one year has been requested. A more detailed report on project progress is provided in the meeting materials for item v. in Agenda Item XIV: Informational Updates.

Contacts

Hank Seemann, Deputy-Director (hseemann@co.humboldt.ca.us) – Program Management

Cybelle Immitt, Senior Planner (cimmitt@co.humboldt.ca.us) – Planning Projects

Devin Theobald, Sr. Environmental Analyst (dtheobald@co.humboldt.ca.us) – Prop. 84 Round 1 & Drought

Lauren Rowan, Environmental Analyst (lrowan@co.humboldt.ca.us) – Prop. 84 Final Round

Denise Monday, Environmental Analyst (dmonday@co.humboldt.ca.us) – Prop. 84 Round 2

iii. Notable Legislation

Molly Oshun, Sonoma County Water Agency

SB 901 (Dodd D) Wildfires.

Status: 9/21/18 Approved by Governor. Filed with Secretary of State.

Summary: The Budget Act of 2018 appropriated \$99,376,000 to the Office of Emergency Services for purposes of local assistance. Of those funds, \$25,000,000 was made available, pursuant to a schedule, for equipment and technology that improves the mutual aid system. Current law authorizes the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) to administer various programs, including grant programs, relating to forest health and wildfire protection. This bill would revise the Budget Act of 2018 to provide that the \$25,000,000 described above shall be applied to support activities directly related to regional response and readiness.

SB 1260 (Jackson D) Fire prevention and protection: prescribed burns.

Status: 9/21/18 Approved by Governor. Filed with Secretary of State.

Summary: Current law requires a local agency to designate, by ordinance, very high fire hazard severity zones in its jurisdiction within 120 days of receiving recommendations from the Director of Forestry and Fire Protection and exempts a local agency, as defined, from that requirement if ordinances of the local agency, adopted on or before December 31, 1992, impose standards that are equivalent to, or more restrictive than, specified state standards. Current law authorizes a local agency, at its discretion, to exclude from specified requirements governing fire risk reduction an area identified as a very high fire hazard severity zone by the director within the jurisdiction of the local agency, following a specified finding supported by substantial evidence that those requirements are not necessary for effective fire protection within the area. This bill would eliminate the above-described exemption and exclusion and would require the local agency to transmit a copy of the adopted ordinance to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection within 30 days of adoption.

AB 1956 (Limón D) Fire prevention activities: local assistance grant program.

Status: 9/21/18 Approved by Governor. Filed with Secretary of State.

Summary: Current law requires the Director of Forestry and Fire Protection to establish a working group, consisting of specified members, to identify potential incentives for landowners to implement prefire activities, as defined, in state responsibility areas and urban wildland communities and to identify all federal, state, or local programs, private programs, and any other programs requiring a cost share that involves prefire activities. This bill would repeal this law.

[AB 2541](#) (Salas D) Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund: project financing: severely disadvantaged communities.

Status: 8/27/18 Approved by the Governor. Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 217, Statutes of 2018.

Summary: Current law authorizes the State Water Resources Control Board, to the extent permitted by federal law, to provide grant funding, and principal forgiveness and 0% financing on loans, from the Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund to a project for a water system with a service area that qualifies as a severely disadvantaged community if the water system demonstrates that repaying a Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund loan with interest would result in unaffordable water rates, as defined. This bill would instead authorize the board, to the extent permitted by federal law, to provide up to 100% grant funding, and principal forgiveness and 0% financing on loans, from the Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund to a project for a water system that serves a severely disadvantaged community.

[AB 2551](#) (Wood D) Forestry and fire prevention: joint prescribed burning operations: watersheds.

Status: 9/21/18 Approved by Governor. Filed with Secretary of State.

Summary: Current law authorizes the director of the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to enter into an agreement with an eligible landowner pursuant to which the landowner will undertake forest resource improvement work in return for an agreement by the director to share the cost of carrying out that work. Current law authorizes the director to make various types of loans, including loans to cover all or part of the landowner's cost for the work. Current law requires these loans to be made for a term not exceeding 20 years and bearing interest at the prevailing rate. This bill would instead authorize the director to enter into those agreements with small nonindustrial landowners, as defined.

iii. NCRP Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Outreach & Involvement Program

PROGRAM VISION: In keeping with North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) Goals & Objectives and building on past initiatives, this Program aims to continue, expand and improve Tribal and disadvantaged community¹ engagement with the NCRP and the Integrated Regional Water Management program.

¹ *Disadvantaged Communities Definitions:*

- *Disadvantaged Community (DAC): Census tract, block or place with an annual median household income (MHI) that is less than 80% of the statewide MHI (North Coast – 89%)*
- *Severely Disadvantaged Community (SDAC): Census tract, block, place w/annual MHI <60% of state MHI (NC – 57%)*

PROGRAM STATUS UPDATE

NCRP Quarterly Meeting Planning

- Meetings with NCRP staff and leadership to develop agenda approach and topics
- Draft and refine agenda; draft meeting materials
- Outreach to meeting presenters and participants; follow up communication and panel coordination

Watershed Based – Holistic Needs Assessment

- Humboldt Bay Watershed Management Area selected as the pilot watershed to develop and test the process to identify green and grey infrastructure needs and priorities as well as to encourage integrated solutions, projects and partnerships through data gathering, interviews and workshops.
- Tribal and Disadvantaged Community pilot interview process, interview questions, data compilation and outreach materials were developed
- Humboldt Bay area Interviews conducted spring/summer 2018
- interviews in other areas summer – summer/fall 2018 & spring 2019

Water and Wastewater Services Needs Assessment Survey

- Completed 2018 Needs Assessment collecting information from 54% of the 207 water and wastewater service providers serving disadvantaged communities in the North Coast region
- Developed a survey summary
- Tribal Water and Wastewater Services Needs Assessment ongoing

Technical Assistance

- Analysis of the NCRP 2014, 2018 needs assessment data along with the state compliance data based on the NCRP Disadvantaged Community Technical Assistance Selection Process approved by the NCRP Policy Review Panel (PRP) in January 2018.
- Meetings held with State representatives to discuss the process and get input regarding regional need. This process will direct the selection of entities to receive technical assistance in the first of several rounds of technical assistance to be provided by the NCRP.
- Data analysis also identifying capacity building and training needs for assistance in 2019

-
- *Economically Distressed Area: a rural county or municipality w/ population of < 20,000 with an annual MHI <85% of statewide MHI, & one of following:*
 - *Financial hardship*
 - *Unemployment rate 2% higher than the statewide average*
 - *Low population density*
 - *Under-represented Community: Tribes have been historically under-represented in local and State water management and planning efforts*

- Tribal selection process may include other factors
- Ad Hoc committees to meet in October/November to finalize Round 1 Technical Assistance list
- Enter into contracts with engineering firms that submitted RFQs in summer of 2017 and were approved by the Ad Hoc committee

Prepare for the NCRP Proposition 1, Round 1 IRWM Project Solicitation

- Proposition 1 Implementation Ad Hoc Committee developed draft process and solicitation materials; these will be updated based the Proposition 1 IRWM Proposal Solicitation Package released on October 5th
- Conducting a survey of project sponsors to gather information about past solicitation processes, contract administration and NCRP processes, outreach and governance with the intent of process improvement where possible
- Developing a Grants Compliance manual including FAQs and Tribal specific approaches
- Developing monitoring guidelines
- Forming a team of technical assistance providers for phone-in help with application development and minor project development assistance. Team comprised of retired engineers, TPRC members, and CSD staff with local experience.

NCRP OUTREACH

- Updated NCRP web content including regional and local news items, calendar events, and funding opportunities.
- Made the NCRP library of spatial data available for download as ESRI map packages organized by content themes
- Worked with the TPRC to review a Shasta Valley RCD groundwater planning project into the NCRP IRWM Plan; once reviewed and approved, posted the project to the NCRP website
- Worked with subcontractors on locally important outreach efforts: regarding the highly contentious water quality threat of failing septic systems in the economically disadvantaged communities of the lower Russian River; and to provide information to legal cannabis producers regarding water conservation, beneficial rural road maintenance practices and proper use and disposal of toxic materials
- Working to improve the NCRP Community Tool Box with the intent of converting the toolbox to a web-friendly tool
- Tribal community outreach ongoing

NCRP PLAN UPDATE & DEVELOPMENT

- Updated the NCRP GIS data catalog and develop NCRP Plan maps
- Updated and developed NCRP/NCIRWM Plan sections pertaining to built and natural resource conditions in the North Coast & performed contaminants research/ analysis and text development

iv. Executive Committee, PRP direction and staff action

NCRP Executive Committee Comment Letters

NCRP Executive Committee submitted a comment letter to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) regarding proposed changes to the Proposition 1 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) implementation project solicitation process on June 1, 2018

On August 20th, the NCRP Executive Committee submitted a letter of support at the request of the Alliance of Regional Climate Change Collaboratives who are applying for funding from the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) to develop some demonstration project ideas and shared planning across multiple geographic areas.

Conference and Meeting Participation

- [California Water Plan Update Plenary 2018](#)
Brandi Brown, NCRP Executive Committee member, Redwood Valley Rancheria and Karen Gaffney were panelists for the *Priorities for Sustaining, Broadening, and Strengthening Regional Water Management*, session during the third California Water Plan Update 2018 Plenary held on October 9 & 10, 2018 at the Civic Center Galleria in West Sacramento.
- Round Table of Regions and DWR Meetings on May 4 & 24, June 20, August 16 & 20, October 1, 8 and 10
- Alliance of Regional Collaboratives for Climate Adaptation (ARCCA) meetings on June 11 and August 20
- NCRP Executive committee, met on May 28 and June 4
- Forestry Task Force meeting materials June 11 (for Dale Roberts) and attendance on October 4

Incorporation of Storm Water Resource Plans into the NCRP Plan

During the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) meeting in April, the Policy Review Panel (PRP) unanimously approved the NCRP Plan & Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) Integration Process which is included in the [2018 NCRP Leadership Handbook](#) under Appendix D, NCRP Policies (see https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/site/assets/uploads/2018/06/NCRP_Handbook_2018.pdf). The approved policy was provided to the SWRP planning projects in the region. The policy includes provisions for review of draft SWRP plans by the PRP and Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) and states that in accordance with the SWRP Guidelines, the submittal of the SWRP to the IRWM group (for further incorporation into the NCRP IRWM Plan, expected in 2019) fulfils the requirement for “incorporation”.

- **Final Russian River Storm Water Resource Plan**

The Draft Russian River Resource Plan was provided to the NCRP TPRC and PRP for review on March 30, 2018. The Russian River Watershed Association provided a presentation to the NCRP leadership during its April 2018 quarterly meeting. The Russian River SWRP was finalized in July 2018. <http://www.rwatershed.org/project/stormwater-resource-plan/>

- **Final Mendocino Coast Storm Water Resources Plan**

The Draft Mendocino Coast SWRP was sent to the NCRP TPRC and PRP for review on May 10, 2018. Notice of the finalized version was sent on July 9, 2018 along with a letter in response to NCRP comments. <https://www.mendocinocounty.org/government/executive-office/mendocino-county-water-agency/storm-water-resource-plan>.

- **Draft Eureka Area Watershed Storm Water Resources Plan**

The Draft Eureka Area Watershed Stormwater Resources Plan was sent to the NCRP TPRC and PRP for review on July 9, 2018. The final plan is expected to be completed late 2018. <http://northcoaststormwatercoalition.org/index.php/stormwaterresourceplan/>

On-Going Project Inclusion Process into the NCRP IRWM Plan

In August, the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District (SVRCD) provided a project submittal request for inclusion into the NCRP IRWM Plan as a requirement of a Department of Water Resources 2017 Groundwater Sustainability Planning Grant funding award. Per the NCRP protocol, the TPRC reviewed the Preliminary Project Information and approved the project for inclusion in the NCRP Plan. https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/site/assets/uploads/2018/09/NCRP_Project_SVRCD_Groundwater_0918.pdf



ATTACHMENT A

**NCRP PROPOSITION 1 IMPLEMENTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATION AND PRP APPROVAL, APRIL 20, 2018**

NCRP Proposition 1 Round 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Process, Project Review Guidelines and Project Application Materials

TPRC Co-Chair: Sandra Perez, Program Manager, Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program provided a presentation about the NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee efforts to develop NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation process, guidelines and solicitation materials which are subject to change based on new information and the Draft and Final PSP for the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant regional application expected to be released by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in June and August respectively.

She also presented the recommendation from the NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Ad Hoc Committee including some items that the committee requested PRP review, consideration and direction. NCRP PRP Chair, Trinity County Supervisor Judy Morris suggested that each item be considered separately.

NCRP PROPOSITION 1 IMPLEMENTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee recommends approval of the Draft 2018 NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, NCRP 2018 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria and the NCRP 2018 Project Application materials (see Attachments B, C & D) to allow for the commencement of the NCRP 2018 Project Solicitation and development of a regional NCRP 2018 Grant Application. The recommendation includes approval to allow changes to the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines and NCRP 2018 Project Application materials to be made by staff with input from the NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee to comply with the Draft and Final PSPs to be released by DWR in the spring and summer of 2018.

Overarching Motion: Supervisor Carre Brown, Mendocino County

Second: Supervisor Chris Howard, Del Norte County

Unanimous

3. Regional Application Budget Limit

Establish the budget limit for the Round 1 Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation grant to allow for the maximum funding amount provided in the Draft Round 1 Proposition 1 IRWM PSP up to 60% of the total amount available to the North Coast funding area for IRWM Implementation funding; allowing 40% to be held for Round 2.

Motion: Supervisor Carre Brown, Mendocino County

Second: Supervisor Chris Howard, Del Norte County

Yes:

- Chair: Supervisor Judy Morris, Trinity County
- Vice-Chair: Leaf Hillman, Director of Natural Resources, Karuk Tribe, Northern District
- Alternate: Buzz Ward, Pit River Tribe, Northern District
- Supervisor Chris Howard, Del Norte County
- Supervisor Ryan Sundberg, Humboldt County

- Supervisor Carre Brown, Mendocino County
- Supervisor Ray Haupt, Siskiyou County
- Supervisor Brandon Criss, Siskiyou County
- Alternate: Dale Roberts, TPRC member, Sonoma County

Oppose:

- Brandi Brown, Redwood Valley Little River Band of Pomo, Southern District
- Supervisor Mike Wilson, Humboldt County

Motion Passed

4. PRP Final Project Approval and Regional Application Timing

Establish the preferred timing of the for PRP Final Priority Project Approval and Regional Application submittal:

- **January 18, 2019:** PRP consider/approve TPRC recommended suite of Priority North Coast Projects for NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation; **March/ April 2019:** regional application due to DWR for the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant. This option allows project proponents 5 months to prepare project applications for submittal to NCRP; 5 weeks for TPRC review (given the holidays).

Motion: Supervisor Mike Wilson, Humboldt County
Second: Supervisor Ryan Sundberg, Humboldt County
Unanimous

5. Economically Disadvantaged Communities

The North Coast region is predominantly economically disadvantaged with nearly 90% of the region, geographically considered economically disadvantaged or economically distressed and nearly 60% severely economically disadvantaged.² The ad hoc committee was directed that the PRP project scoring guidelines should include screening criteria that will confer additional weight to projects that, in addition to meeting other NCRP criteria, will benefit North Coast disadvantaged communities and will provide additional weight for projects that benefit severely disadvantaged communities.

Motion: Supervisor Chris Howard, Del Norte County
Second: Supervisor Brandon Criss, Siskiyou County

² *Economically Disadvantaged Community (DAC): A community with an annual median household income (MHI) that is less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income.*

Severely Economically Disadvantaged Community (SDAC): A community with an annual household income that is less than 60% of the statewide MHI.

Economically Distressed Area: A community with a population of 20,000 persons or less, a rural county, or a reasonably isolated and divisible segment of a larger area where the segment of the population is 20,000 persons or less, with an MHI that is less than 85 percent of the statewide median household income, and with one or more of the following conditions: (1) Financial hardship; (2) Unemployment rate at least 2 percent higher than the statewide average; (3) Low population density.

Unanimous

6. Climate Change Adaptation

The PRP directed the ad hoc committee to provide additional weight for projects that assist water infrastructure systems adapt to climate change.

Motion: Brandi Brown, Redwood Valley Little River Band of Pomo, Southern District

Second: Supervisor Carre Brown, Mendocino County

Unanimous

7. Program Preferences

The PRP directed the ad hoc committee to provide scoring criteria for projects that promote any or all the Program Preferences including Tribal additions for a total of 10 Program Preferences for a maximum amount of 7 points.

- To support Tribal self-determination and cultural resources
- Utilize Traditional Ecological Knowledge in coordination with Tribe(s)
- Ensure that there is a sustainability aspect to the project

Motion: Supervisor Mike Wilson, Humboldt County

Second: Brandi Brown, Redwood Valley Little River Band of Pomo, Southern District

Unanimous

PUBLIC COMMENT

None



ATTACHMENT B

NCRP 2018/19 PROJECT REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS GUIDELINES



Table of Contents

1.	Background	1
2.	Schedule for NCRP 2018 Project Solicitation, Project Proposal Review and Selection Process	2
3.	Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles.....	3
4.	NCRP Project Application, Review & Selection Process.....	4
5.	Guidelines for Public Input and Project Proponent Input during the Project Review Process.....	6
6.	NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy	6
7.	On-Going Project Inclusion Process into the NCRP IRWM Plan.....	8
8.	Project Budget Funding Reallocation Process	9
9.	PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection	9

1. Background

The Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1), approved by California voters on Nov. 4, 2014, authorizes \$7.545 billion in general obligation bonds to fund ecosystems and watershed protection and restoration, water supply infrastructure projects, including surface and groundwater storage, and drinking water protection. Proposition 1 authorized the appropriation of \$510 million in Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) funding for Implementation and Planning efforts throughout the state. The North Coast funding area allocation is \$26.5 M and has approximately \$22 M (\$21,995,000) available for implementation projects. The Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program provides funding for projects that help meet the long-term water needs of the state, including:

- Assisting water infrastructure systems adapt to climate change;
- Providing incentives throughout each watershed to collaborate in managing the region's water resources and setting regional priorities for water infrastructure; and
- Improving regional water self-reliance.

PROPOSITION 1 IRWM GRANT PROGRAM SCHEDULE

- **Summer 2016.** DWR releases the following Proposition 1 IRWM program documents:
 - 2016 IRWM Program Guidelines
 - Planning Grant Proposal Solicitation Package
 - Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposals and Proposal Solicitation Package
- **April 2017.** Agreement between DWR and Humboldt County finalized for the NCRP Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Outreach & Involvement Program.
- **April 2018.** DWR release of Concept Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Grant for review and comment.
- **October 2018.** DWR release of for the Draft Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation PSP
- **November 2018.** DWR hosts three Public Meetings to received comments on the Draft PSP
- **Late 2018.** Anticipated release of Final Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation PSP
- **July 2019** for the regional application of the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant.
- **2020.** Anticipated roll out of Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation funding solicitation.

More information can be found at <https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs/Proposition-1/Implementation-Grants>

The North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) is committed to transparency, stakeholder inclusion and process improvement. At the January 19, 2018 NCRP meeting, the Policy Review Panel (PRP) directed the formation of an NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee comprised of Policy Review Panel (PRP) and Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC)

members to develop the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation process, guidelines and solicitation materials for review and consideration by the PRP during the NCRP April meeting.

2. Schedule for the NCRP 2018/19 Project Solicitation, Project Proposal Review and Selection Process

This schedule is subject to change based on new information and the Draft and Final PSP for the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant regional application expected to be released by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in October and December of 2018 respectively.

- October 2018: The NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee (NCRP Prop 1 Implementation Ad Hoc) develop the draft NCRP Project Review and Selection Process based on the IRWM 2016 Guidelines and the Concept Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant released by Department of Water Resources (DWR) on October 5, 2018.
- October 19, 2018 NCRP Quarterly Meeting: PRP review, consider, provide direction, edit and approve the draft NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, 2018 and draft NCRP 2018 Project Application with provision for changes to the materials based on the draft and final PSPs
- October 2018: The NCRP Prop 1 Implementation Ad Hoc refines the NCRP 2018 Project Application materials and NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines based on PRP direction and Draft PSP for the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant
- November 2018: NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant Solicitation. NCRP staff and sub-contractors provide project application support and project technical assistance is provided to eligible disadvantaged communities and Tribes through the NCRP Disadvantaged Community Technical Assistance Selection process.
- December 2018 or early January 2019: Informational & Assistance Workshops held throughout the North Coast Region. Project proponents are invited to bring project concepts and preliminary proposals to the meeting for review and discussion by TPRC members and NCRP staff.
- March 8, 2019: NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project applications due
- March 12 – April 8, 2019: TPRC project review period; a TPRC project evaluation conference call meeting will be held prior to the TPRC project review period.
- April 10 & 11, 2019 (or thereabout): TPRC Project Review meeting to select a portfolio of priority projects as a TPRC recommendation to be presented to the PRP for final approval. As a public meeting, project proponents and the public are welcome to attend the TPRC Project Review Meetings and provide public comment where noted on the published agenda.
- April 19, 2019: PRP consider/approve TPRC recommended suite of Priority North Coast Projects for NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Regional Grant at an in-person meeting held within the North Coast boundary

- May 6 – 10, 2019: Funding Area Pre-Application Workshop to allow for early interaction of all interested parties with DWR and other State funding agencies
- May 2019: Priority North Coast Project sponsors work with NCRP staff to develop materials for the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Regional Grant based on DWR feedback
- July 2019 (tentative): regional application due to DWR for the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant

3. Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles

Policy Review Panel

The [Policy Review Panel](#) (PRP) is the governing and decision-making body for the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP). The composition of the PRP and decision-making process is defined in Section 5.4 of the NCRP IRWM [Memorandum of Mutual Understandings](#) (MoMU). The role of the PRP in the NCRP project review and selection process is to set the policy, decision making criteria and framework for the process and to ensure that the process is fair, open and transparent. As the decision-making body, the PRP provides direction about how the project evaluation and selection process aligns with the NCRP priorities by defining project review and selection guidelines (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*). Considering the review and recommendations from the Technical Peer Review Committee, the PRP takes final action to approve all projects included in the NCRP and approves the region's highest priority projects for grant submittals. As defined in the MoMU, the PRP is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act and is committed to transparency and inclusion, supporting input from stakeholders from throughout the region. All NCRP meetings are noticed in advance, open to the public, and all meeting summaries and information are posted on the NCRP website.

Technical Peer Review Committee

The [Technical Peer Review Committee](#) (TPRC) is advisory to the PRP and evaluates and makes recommendations based on technical expertise and scientific data. The composition of the TPRC is defined in the NCRP [MoMU](#) and is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. The TPRC is comprised of technical and agency staff with expertise that includes fisheries, ecology, engineering, agriculture, geology, conservation, watershed planning and management, and water infrastructure. The role of the TPRC in the project review and selection process is to evaluate projects for technical merit based on their professional judgment and expertise, as well as on guidelines developed by the PRP and set by the funding solicitation. The TPRC prepares a draft suite of priority projects for review by the PRP. Scoring criteria and evaluation summaries from the TPRC are available for public review. TPRC Co-Chairs facilitate the project review meetings to ensure integrity in the process and presents the draft suite of priority projects to the PRP during the NCRP meeting.

NCRP Staff

The role of NCRP staff during the project application, review and selection process is to facilitate and coordinate the process. Staff develops and coordinates project application materials; performs outreach and makes information available to the PRP, TPRC and stakeholders; clarifies outstanding issues; makes sure decisions are understood; maintains records; consolidates and summarizes TPRC review of project

grant applications, and performs fact checking of state guidelines and criteria as necessary. Per the direction of the PRP, staff will support project proponents in developing the application materials where timing allows and in accordance with the source funding proposal process and eligibility requirements.

4. NCRP Project Application, Review & Selection Process

The NCRP project application, review and selection process is a multi-step process:

1. NCRP Project Solicitation and Project Information

At the direction of the PRP and when there is a funding opportunity, a call for proposals will be announced to North Coast stakeholders. The PRP will review and refine the PRP directed guidelines and criteria for project scoring and selection based on NCRP goals and objectives, specific regional priorities and funding source requirements and preferences. Staff will develop and make available Project Solicitation application materials based on the NCRP priorities and the funding source solicitation and requirements. The project application materials will include an application, detailed instructions, and a clear description of scoring guidelines and evaluation criteria, all of which will be reviewed by the TPRC and PRP and approved by the PRP. Project applicants will provide application materials to NCRP staff via email. Microsoft Word and Excel files that make up the NCRP project application will be made available for reference, for application development and for submittal to NCRP staff. Staff will provide outreach, education and application support via workshops and informal meetings by phone, internet and in person.

2. Individual TPRC review of NCRP Project Applications

Staff will compile and provide application materials to the TPRC for review and scoring along with scoring/evaluation forms. A TPRC project evaluation conference call meeting will be held prior to the TPRC project review period to discuss the general review process and go over scoring definitions to ensure calibration and clarity. When packaging the project application materials for the TPRC members review, a system will be developed to randomize chronology of the project applications that TPRC members review so that project applications in different order. The TPRC members will strive to individually review and score the NCRP project applications for technical merit based on criteria as defined by the funding solicitation, NCRP PRP defined guidelines (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*) and their professional expertise and judgment. TPRC members will review all projects referred to them unless they recuse themselves due to a potential conflict of interest. TPRC members will provide individual scores to staff for compilation. Time allowance for the individual TPRC review of project applications will be at least 2 weeks depending on the proposal solicitation timeframe. If two weeks is not available, the Executive Committee will determine the suitable duration to meet grant solicitation needs.

3. Group TPRC review of NCRP Project Applications

Staff will compile all individual scores submitted by TPRC members prior to the group TPRC review meeting, to determine an initial average project score; these scores are meant to facilitate discussion and will be presented at the TPRC meeting. Please note, the initial scores may not represent all TPRC scores and thus should not be interpreted as an official preliminary score.

Adhering to a high standard of professional conduct, TPRC members and staff will meet to discuss each project and may make adjustments to their individual scores based on the group discussion. To ensure a comprehensive project proposal review process, TPRC member in-person attendance is strongly encouraged at this meeting. Staff will compile all updated TPRC individual scores to determine an updated average project score. TPRC review meetings are open to project proponents and the public. The agenda at a formally noticed public meeting will include a thorough review of the NCRP Conflict of Interest Guidelines as well as time for comment from the public (*see Conflict of Interest and Public Input Guidelines sections below*). All meeting deliberations, project scores, applicant and public input and recusals will be recorded.

4. TPRC Selection of Draft Suite of NCRP Priority Projects

During the project review meeting, the TPRC will select a draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects and draft budget amounts for each project. The selection will be based on a number of factors including: technical project scores; project scalability and potential funding allowance; the overall balance of projects based on the PRP's defined guidelines for project selection (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*); and the collective ability of the projects to meet NCRP goals and be competitive for the funding opportunity. A contingency list of projects will also be developed for consideration in the event that a selected project could not move forward for inclusion into the regional application for any reason. All meeting deliberations, public input and Conflict of Interest recusals will be recorded in the meeting minutes.

5. PRP Review, Consideration and Final Approval of the Suite of NCRP Priority Projects

The NCRP PRP will convene a Brown Act compliant in-person meeting held within the North Coast boundary to present, review and approve the final list of NCRP Priority Projects. During a NCRP meeting, the TPRC will provide a summary of the project review process and present their recommended draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects and contingency project list. The PRP will review, may amend and will approve by majority vote a final suite of NCRP Priority Projects and contingency projects to forward to the funding entity. During the PRP's review of the draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects, the TPRC will answer questions and provide information as requested by the PRP. The PRP – comprised of elected public officials or their designees and elected Tribal representatives – will make their final decision based on TPRC recommendations, PRP guidelines and other factors that they believe represent the best interest of the North Coast region. For more information on the process by which PRP members are selected, refer to the NCRP Memorandum of Mutual Understanding (MOMU). The NCRP Priority Projects list will be posted to the website and made available to the public. Project review scores and review meeting materials will be made available to the project proponents and to the general public, upon request.

6. NCRP Priority Project Application Materials for Regional Proposal

Depending on the source funding solicitation, NCRP Priority Project proponents will be asked to provide additional project information to include in a competitive regional application. Additional information may include, but not be limited to, a detailed work plan, budget, schedule, economic

cost/benefits analysis, monitoring & performance measures and technical documentation that support the project. The timeframe to submit this additional information may be very short for expedited funding solicitations. In the event that sufficient additional information for a project cannot be provided within the requested timeframe, that project may not be able to be included in the regional application and another project may instead be selected from the contingency list. Where feasible, NCRP staff will provide technical assistance to project proponents who require it.

Once the regional application has been approved and selected for funding, individual project proponents will enter into an agreement, likely with the NCRP regional grant administrator, to implement each project. It is imperative that an agreement between a project proponent and the NCRP regional grant administrator be executed in a timely fashion, particularly with rounds of expedited funding. The NCRP Grants Manual and an example of a DWR grant agreement, is available online: [XXXXXX](#). Also see the DWR's Proposition 1 contract templates ([XXXXXX](#)).

5. Guidelines for Public Input and Project Proponent Input during the Project Review Process

All TPRC project review meetings will be noticed at least 72 hours in advance and will be open and welcoming to the public. A conference call-in number will be provided for project proponents so that they may listen to the meeting and provide input during the public comment period if desired. The meeting agenda and background materials to be used in the TPRC's decision-making will be available at the meeting location, posted to the NCRP website 72 hours in advance of the meeting and mailed to any interested member of the public upon request.

All TPRC meeting agendas include time for public comment, which will typically be limited to 3 minutes for each speaker. Public Comment portions of the meeting are not meant to be interactive and TPRC members will not engage in discussion or debate an issue with any member of the public. Public comment and materials delivered to staff from the public will be published on the NCRP website. Project proponents, interested stakeholders and members of the public will be invited to provide comment:

- on items not on the agenda;
- after the TPRC discusses the projects amongst themselves, but before the TPRC members submit their final scores
- after the TPRC develops their draft recommended list, but before the TPRC submits their final recommendation to the PRP

6. NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy

The NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy will follow the [California Fair Political Practices Commission](#) (FPPC) guidelines and the intent of the guidelines to address obligations under the Political Reform Act's conflict of interest rules.

Under the FPPC rules, when a member has a conflict of interest with a specific project, that member must publicly disclose the specific nature of the conflict and recuse themselves (i.e. leave the room or

remain silent) during discussion of that specific project. The FPPC guidelines seek to prevent conflicts of interest in two ways - disclosure and recusal.

"No public official at any level of state or local government shall make, participate in making or in any way attempt to use his official position to influence a governmental decision in which he knows or has reason to know he has a financial interest." (Political Reform Act; Gov. Code Section 87100)

"Assets and income of public officials which may be materially affected by their official actions should be disclosed and in appropriate circumstances the officials should be disqualified from acting in order that conflicts of interest may be avoided." (Gov. Code section 81002)

During the NCRP project review and selection process, TPRC and PRP members will disclose any potential financial interest in a project. If a TPRC or PRP member has a potential conflict of interest, they will be expected to recuse themselves (i.e. leave the room or remain silent) from making, participating in or in any way influencing a project scoring or selection decision.

In the interest of transparency, TPRC and PRP members will also disclose any history of contribution to the project including input in the grant development or project planning or other involvement that could potentially represent a real or perceived conflict of interest. Once disclosed, the TPRC and PRP member will determine whether these actions constitute a conflict of interest or will prevent an objective review of the NCRP implementation project(s) and will determine if recusal is necessary. The PRP or TPRC member may wish to request the advice of their colleagues on the PRP or TPRC to make their determination.

Opportunities for disclosure and reporting will occur during the individual TPRC review of NCRP projects, during the group TPRC project review and during the TPRC and PRP selection meetings. The project score sheets will include a checklist and comment box for TPRC members to disclose potential conflict of interest. Project review score sheets and meeting notes will document any conflict of interest disclosures and recusals. In addition, the TPRC Chair(s), or his/her designee, will be selected to provide oversight during the project review meetings and act as a facilitator of TPRC discussion should conflict of interest issues arise. The TPRC Chair(s), or his/her designee, will be supported by staff to ensure the process adheres to the Conflict of Interest Policy established by the PRP.

7. On-Going Project Inclusion Process into the NCRP IRWM Plan

Increasingly, funding opportunities for project implementation require or give preference to projects that are included in an IRWM Plan. The following process will provide a mechanism for including projects on an on-going basis into the NCRP IRWM Plan.

1. Project proponents will complete preliminary project information:
 - Project Name
 - Organization Name, Type & Contact information
 - Project location address
 - Funding Program names
 - Total project cost & Funding request
 - Start/End dates (tentative)
 - Alignment with NCRP IRWMP Objectives (selection boxes)
 - Project Summary & Goals
 - Project partners
 - Description of benefits (including if/how the project will benefit disadvantaged communities)
 - Project management strategies/ project elements (selection boxes)
2. Project proponent will submit a signed [Memorandum of Mutual Understandings \(MoMU\)](#) if one has not already been submitted.
3. Staff will review the project and follow-up with project proponents regarding any eligibility concerns (Urban Water Management Plan, Agricultural Water Management, Surface Water Diverter, Groundwater Management Plan, CASGEM/SGMA compliance, proponent type)
4. The TPRC will review and accept eligible projects
5. Staff will 'Publish' eligible NCRP Projects and project summaries will be included on the website; and staff will report to the PRP at a NCRP Quarterly Meeting
6. Additional project information will be required when NCRP funding solicitations and calls for proposals occur; NCRP project proponents will be allowed to edit preliminary project information.
7. NCRP Projects will be reviewed and scored by the TPRC if required by a respective funding solicitation; NCRP Priority Projects will be selected by the PRP. NCRP Priority Project proponents will need to adopt the NCRP IRWM Plan when completed as per the IRWM Guidelines.

8. Project Budget Funding Reallocation Process

Background: In some cases, a NCRP implementation project may complete under budget or otherwise not expend their entire grant allotment. Typically, the funding agencies have allowed reallocation of available funds to another project *within the suite* of projects included in the grant agreement. Reallocation of funding after a grant agreement is executed may be necessary for a variety of reasons. Potential scenarios include: when a project is completed under-budget; or when a sub-grantee elects not to implement their approved project, or is determined to be substantially out of compliance with the sub-grantee agreement. Another potential scenario is the availability of excess funds from the grant administration budget category. With concurrence from DWR, the NCRP allows reallocation of funds to another project within *the existing suite* of projects to supplement budget short-falls and/or expand the current scope of work to increase the project benefits. Funds will not be reallocated to a project not included within the existing suite of projects. NCRP staff will have the discretion to determine if a portion of the reallocation is necessary to supplement the grant administration budget.

NCRP Project Funding Reallocation Process

1. For amounts less than \$50,000, NCRP staff will use discretion to reallocate the funds to an eligible project within the existing suite of projects with a priority for:
 - a. Supplementing budget short-falls.
 - b. Supplementing a project that received less than their requested amount during the original selection process.
2. For amounts greater than \$50,000, project funding reallocation will occur, to the greatest extent feasible, within the County or Tribal region where the original project is located and is within *the existing suite* of projects in the grant agreement. PRP members from the County or Tribal region, where the original project is located, will determine which projects receive reallocation and the amount of funding.
 - a. If the original funds are from a non-Tribal project, they will be made available to another project within the existing suite of projects in the county where the original project was located. The PRP members representing that County will determine which projects receive reallocation and the amount of funding.
 - b. If the original funds are from a Tribal project, the funds will be made available to another project within the existing suite of projects in the Tribal region where the original project was located. The PRP member representing that Tribal region will determine which projects receive reallocation and the amount of funding.
3. If the County or Tribal region of origin option is not available (i.e., no projects from the County or Tribal region of origin within the project suite need additional funding):
 - a. Staff will announce the availability of funds to project proponents within the grant agreement suite of projects; staff will solicit project requests and description of need from eligible project proponents

- b. Staff will determine eligible projects
- c. TPRC ad hoc committee will be formed via email or at NCRP meeting if timing allows
- d. Ad hoc committee will develop criteria for project reallocation selection
- e. Ad hoc committee will develop project reallocation option recommendations
- f. PRP will review and approve recommendations at the next PRP meeting
- g. TPRC ad hoc committee will be disbanded

9. PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection

Background

The intent of the following PRP-directed project scoring and selection guidelines is to promote the implementation of NCRP goals while allowing the flexibility to address specific regional priorities and funding source requirements. These guidelines are in addition to those defined by the NCRP goals & objectives and IRWM Program or other funding source guidelines and scoring criteria. The PRP includes the following preferences and priority considerations in its decision-making process:

Regional Representation

The PRP will make every effort to ensure geographic representation by including projects from each of the seven counties and from the north, central and southern tribal areas of the North Coast Region. This guideline will apply only to those projects which are eligible for funding under the NCRP and other state and federal requirements, and which have met the technical criteria established by the PRP and evaluated by the Technical Peer Review Committee.

Economically Disadvantaged Community³

In an effort to build capacity and extend services to communities that are under-served and/or limited by economic barriers, the TPRC will include screening criteria that will confer additional weight to projects that, in addition to meeting other NCRP criteria, will benefit North Coast disadvantaged communities. The PRP reserves the right to prioritize disadvantaged community projects, based on a project's ability to mitigate threats to public health, watershed health, and the economic and public health benefits that project implementation would bring to these communities.

Jurisdictional Notification & Coordination

Project applicants are required to demonstrate that they have notified counties and Tribes re: proposed projects in the proposed project impact area of a particular watershed or relevant area of County or Tribal interest. Project applicants are required to demonstrate coordination and outreach to potentially interested stakeholders in the relevant watershed, sub-watershed or project impact area.

³ *Definition for Economically Disadvantaged Community*: Department of Water Resources defines "disadvantaged community" as a community with an annual household income that is less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income.*

Programmatic Integration and Balance of Project Type to effectively implement NCRP goals

NCRP goals: To support local autonomy and encourage cooperation; enhance public health & economic vitality in disadvantaged communities; restore salmon populations; enhance beneficial uses of water; and promote energy independence, emissions reductions and climate change adaptation.

- a) All project types should address grant requirements and NCRP goals and priorities
- b) Programmatic integration and project type diversity will be achieved at the portfolio level - (e.g. small /individual projects not required to demonstrate integration of all priorities, yet they must contribute to a comprehensive suite of projects that achieve a multi-benefit, integrated program)
- c) Programmatic integration and project type diversity will be achieved over time and through multiple rounds of funding
- d) Projects that provide multi-benefits will be prioritized (where all else is equal)
- e) Projects that address specific targets as identified by the PRP, including specific North Coast objectives, challenges and opportunities (e.g., promote biomass-related projects, effective in-stream flow approaches, energy retrofits, drought or flood preparedness, effective instream flow approaches or specific funding opportunities) may be prioritized by the PRP.



ATTACHMENT C

NCRP 2018/19 PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA

North Coast Resource Partnership 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria

Please note that all Criteria are scored on a 0 – 5 basis, with a weighting factor applied where:

- A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation & logical rationale.
- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed and not documented.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible
<p>Eligibility Criteria</p> <p>Does the project address at least one of the NCRP Objectives?</p> <p>Is the project type eligible for the current funding solicitation?</p> <p>Does the project impact groundwater? Is there a Groundwater Management Plan in place or planned for the groundwater basin that will be impacted? Is the project located within high or medium priority CASGEM groundwater basin? If yes, is the groundwater basin developing a SGMA Plan?</p> <p>Is the organization required to file an Urban Water Management Plan, Agricultural Water Management Plan and/or a Surface Water Diversion Report?</p>		y/n
<p>Project Information</p> <p>Has the project proponent implemented similar projects in the past? Has the project sponsor worked effectively with the NCRP in the past? Does the project proponent have the capacity and resources to implement this project?</p> <p>Does the Project Description include a clear problem statement and appropriate solution? Does the Project Description summarize the major components and the intended purpose of the project?</p>	2	<p>0 – 10 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)</p>

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible
<p>Do the goals and objectives of the Proposal help to achieve the goals and objectives of the NCRP IRWM Plan?</p> <p>Does the proposal describe adequate need for the project? Is this an important project for the project community? region?</p> <p>Will this project mitigate an existing or potential Cease and Desist Order or other regulatory compliance enforcement action?</p> <p>Is this project supported locally and/or politically? Are their collaborative partnerships involved in the project? Has the Project Proponent notified Counties and Tribes about their project?</p> <p>Is the Proposal part of a larger multi-phased project that leverages other benefits and resources?</p>		
<p>Project Benefits to Economically Disadvantaged Communities</p> <p>Is the project located in an economically disadvantaged community (DAC)?</p> <p>Does the project significantly improve a DACs public health, water supply and/or water quality?</p> <p>Was the description of how the project benefits the economically disadvantaged community adequate?</p>	2	<p>0 – 10 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)</p>
<p>Is the project located in a severely disadvantaged community?</p>	1	<p>0-3</p>
<p>Water Self-Reliance and Safety</p> <p>Does the project contribute to sustainable water supply and reliability? Expand water storage capacity and improve groundwater management?</p> <p>Does the project increase flood protection and improve flood response to protect public safety?</p> <p>Does the applicant clearly describe how the proposed project will effectively address long-term drought preparedness?</p>	2	<p>0 – 10 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)</p>

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible
<p>Project Justification & Technical Basis</p> <p>Is the description of the scientific and technical basis for the project adequate considering the size of the project and physical benefits claimed?</p> <p>Does the project employ new and innovative technology or practices?</p> <p>Does the technical analysis support the claimed physical benefits?</p> <p>Are the potential adverse impacts reasonable? Can they be mitigated?</p> <p>Does the project include adequate project performance monitoring?</p>	2	0 – 10 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)
<p>Project Benefits</p> <p>Does the project implement effective strategies and provide multiple benefits?</p> <p>Does the project appreciably benefit impaired water bodies, sensitive habitats or protected areas? Will the project effectively improve conditions for salmonids and other endangered/threatened species?</p> <p>Are the benefits claimed of a magnitude appropriate to the cost of the project and the grant request?</p> <p>Have alternative methods been considered to achieve the same types and amounts of physical benefits as the proposed project? Is the proposed project the least cost alternative to achieve the physical benefits?</p> <p>Does the project implement a project with greater watershed coverage relative to other projects?</p>	2	0 – 10 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)
<p>Does the project measurably address climate change by reducing GHG emissions, carbon, or water demand or by incorporating energy efficiency or other climate adaptation strategies?</p>	1	0 - 5
<p>Project Tasks, Schedule and Readiness</p> <p>Do the scope of the project and the projected immediate outcomes of the project provide an adequate solution to the problem?</p>	2	0 – 5 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible
<p>Are the Project Description, Major Tasks and Deliverables of adequate detail and completeness that it is clear that the project can be implemented?</p> <p>Does the proposal include appropriate environmental documentation and permitting?</p> <p>Does the Proposal include appropriate and reasonable Major Tasks, Deliverables and Timeframe for implementing the project?</p> <p>Does the Proposal include adequate design and planning support materials to ensure that the project has been well thought through and is ready to implement?</p> <p>Will the project be ready to implement soon after the contract agreement is in place?</p>		
<p>Project Budget</p> <p>Is the budget of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented?</p> <p>Are the task budget and the overall budget reasonable for the project type and current stage of the project?</p> <p>If the project does not benefit a critical water supply or water quality issue for an economically disadvantaged community, does the project budget leverage funds with at least a 50% non-state match that is reliable and timely?</p> <p>Does this Proposal and budget respond to a valid financial need? Is the project budget appropriate for this funding solicitation? Can the project budget be scaled to be appropriate for this funding solicitation?</p>	2	<p>0 – 10 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)</p>
<p>Professional Judgment and PRP Directed Criteria</p> <p>Is the project a good fit for the current funding solicitation?</p> <p>Is this partial funding to complete a quality project, partially funded by other sources?</p> <p>Is this an important project for the North Coast region? Does this project effectively implement the NCRP/NCIRWMP goals and objectives?</p>	2	<p>0 – 10 (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)</p>

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible
<p>Does this project contribute to the goals of programmatic integration and project type diversity at the project portfolio level?</p> <p>Is there general agreement among the TPRC members regarding the ranking of this project?</p> <p>Is this the project proponent’s highest priority project submitted to the NCRP?</p> <p>Can the project budget be scaled to be appropriate for this funding solicitation?</p>		
<p>Statewide Priorities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make Conservation a California Way of Life 2. Increase Regional Self-Reliance and Integrated Water Management Across All Levels of Government 3. Protect and Restore Important Ecosystems 4. Manage and Prepare for Dry Periods 5. Expand Water Storage Capacity and Improve Groundwater Management 6. Provide Safe Water for All Communities 7. Increase Flood Protection 8. To support Tribal self-determination and cultural resources 9. Utilize Traditional Ecological Knowledge in coordination with Tribe(s) 10. Ensure that there is a sustainability aspect to the project 		<p>0 – 7 (one point for each priority that is well defended in the application)</p>
<p>Total Score</p>		<p>0 - 95</p>



ATTACHMENT D

**NCRP PROPOSITION 1, 2018/19 PROJECT APPLICATION &
INFORMATION FORM**

(EXAMPLE APPLICATION)

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2018/19 IRWM Project Application

*The North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) 2018 Project Application Instructions and additional information can be found at the **NCRP 2018/19 Project Solicitation** webpage. Please fill out grey text boxes and select all the check boxes that apply to your project. Application responses should be clear, brief and succinct. Character limits are provided and include spaces. **It is important to save the application file with a distinct file name that references the project name. When the application is complete, please email to kqledhill@westcoastwatershed.com***

*Project Applications will be accepted until 5:00 pm, March 8, 2019. The project solicitation will be closed after this date/time and edits to project applications and new applications will no longer be accepted. **If you have questions, need additional information or assistance please contact Katherine Gledhill at kqledhill@westcoastwatershed.com or 707.795.1235.***

Project Name: _____

A. Organization Information

1. Organization Name: _____

2. Contact Name/Title

Name: _____

Title: _____

Email: _____

Phone Number (include area code): _____

3. Organization Address (City, County, State, Zip Code):

4. Authorized Representative (if different from the contact name)

Name: _____

Title: _____

Email: _____

Phone Number (include area code) : _____

- 5. Has your organization implemented similar projects in the past?** yes no
Briefly describe these previous projects.

6. List all projects your organization is submitting to the North Coast Resource Partnership for the 2018/19 Project Solicitation in order of priority.

7. Organization Information Notes:

B. Eligibility

1. North Coast Resource Partnership and North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Objectives

[for more information see the [North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan](#)]

Check any of the following that apply to your project:

GOAL 1: INTRAREGIONAL COOPERATION & ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Objective 1 - Respect local autonomy and local knowledge in Plan and project development and implementation

Objective 2 - Provide an ongoing framework for inclusive, efficient intraregional cooperation and effective, accountable NCIRWMP project implementation

Objective 3 - Integrate Traditional Ecological Knowledge in collaboration with Tribes to incorporate these practices into North Coast Projects and Plans

GOAL 2: ECONOMIC VITALITY

Objective 4 - Ensure that economically disadvantaged communities are supported and that project implementation enhances the economic vitality of disadvantaged communities by improving built and natural infrastructure systems and promoting adequate housing

Objective 5 - Conserve and improve the economic benefits of North Coast Region working landscapes and natural areas

GOAL 3: ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT

Objective 6 – Conserve, enhance, and restore watersheds and aquatic ecosystems, including functions, habitats, and elements that support biological diversity

Objective 7 - Enhance salmonid populations by conserving, enhancing, and restoring required habitats and watershed processes

GOAL 4: BENEFICIAL USES OF WATER

Objective 8 - Ensure water supply reliability and quality for municipal, domestic, agricultural, Tribal, cultural, and recreational uses while minimizing impacts to sensitive resources

Objective 9 - Improve drinking water quality and water related infrastructure to protect public health, with a focus on economically disadvantaged communities

Objective 10 - Protect groundwater resources from over-drafting and contamination

GOAL 5: CLIMATE ADAPTATION & ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

Objective 11 - Address climate change effects, impacts, vulnerabilities, and strategies for local and regional sectors to improve air and water quality and promote public health

Objective 12 - Promote local energy independence, water/ energy use efficiency, GHG emission reduction, and jobs creation

GOAL 6: PUBLIC SAFETY

Objective 13 - Improve flood protection and reduce flood risk in support of public safety

2. Water Conservation Law Compliance

[Compliance with Water Conservation Laws link:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/finance>]

California Groundwater Management compliance

To be developed from specific requirements outlined in the Proposition 1 IRWM Proposal Solicitation Package expected to be released in October (2018)

Urban Water Management Plan

- a) Is your organization required to file an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP)?
 yes no
[Definition of entity that is required to file an UWMP with DWR: water supplier of more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3000 acre-feet annually].
- b) If Yes, list the date the UWMP was approved by DWR: _____
- c) Is your UWMP in compliance with AB 1420 requirements?
 yes no
- d) Does the urban water supplier meet the water meter requirements of CWC 525?
 yes no

Agricultural Water Management Plan

- a) Is your organization – or any organization that will receive funding from the project – required to file an Agricultural Water Management Plan (AWMP)?
 yes no
[Definition of an agricultural water supplier: a water supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water to 10,000 or more irrigated acres, excluding the acreage that receives recycled water. This includes a supplier or contractor for water regardless of the basis of right that distributes or sells water for ultimate resale to customers.]
- b) If Yes, list date the AWMP was approved by DWR: _____
- c) Does the agricultural water supplier(s) meet the requirements in CWC Part 2.55 Division 6?
 yes no

Surface Water Diversion Reports

- a) Is your organization required to file surface water diversion reports per the requirements in CWC Part 5.1 Division 2?
 yes no
- b) If Yes, list date the surface water diversion report was submitted to DWR: _____

C. Project Information

1. **Project Name:** _____

2. **Project Description**

The project summary should include a problem statement, the major components of the project and the intended purpose of the project. [3000 characters max.]

3. **Specific Project Goals/Objectives**

[for each goal list specific objectives]

Goal 1: _____ [100 characters max.]

Goal 1 Objective: _____ [200 characters max.]

Goal 1 Objective: _____ [200 characters max.]

Goal 1 Objective: _____ [200 characters max.]

Goal 1 Objective: _____ [200 characters max.]

Goal 2: _____

Goal 2 Objective: _____

Goal 2 Objective: _____

Goal 2 Objective: _____

Goal 2 Objective: _____

Goal 3: _____

Goal 3 Objective: _____

Goal 3 Objective: _____

Goal 3 Objective: _____

Goal 3 Objective: _____

Additional Goals & Objectives (List)

4. **Describe the need for the project.** [1000 characters max.]

5. **List the impaired water bodies (303d listing) that your project benefits:**

[500 character max.] [for more information, see [map](#) and [SWRCB](#)]

6. **Will this project mitigate an existing or potential Cease and Desist Order or other regulatory compliance enforcement action?** yes no

If so, please describe? [500 characters max.]

7. **Describe the population served by this project.** [500 characters max.]

8. Is this project located in a Disadvantaged Community? [[see North Coast map](#)]

- Entirely
- Partially
- No

List the Disadvantaged Community(s)

9. Is this project located in a Severely Disadvantaged Community? [[see North Coast map](#)]

- Entirely
- Partially
- No

List the Severely Disadvantaged Community(s)

10. Describe local and/or political support for this project. [500 characters max.]

11. List all collaborating partners and agencies and nature of collaboration. [1000 characters max.]

12. Is this project part or a phase of a larger project? Are there similar efforts being made by other groups? If so, please describe? [500 characters max.]

13. Describe the kind of notification, outreach and collaboration that has been done with the County(ies) and/or Tribes within the proposed project impact area: Note that selected projects may be requested to submit documentation of notification or land owner access for the appropriate jurisdiction of the proposed project impact area. [500 characters max.]

14. Project Information Notes:

D. Project Location

1. Describe the location of the project

Geographical Information (latitude and longitude in degrees, minutes, and seconds):

2. Site Address (if relevant) :

E. Project Tasks, Budget and Schedule

1. Projected Project Start Date: _____

2. **Anticipated Project End Date:** _____

3. **Describe the financial need for the project** (i.e. describe why the project cannot be completed with the existing financial resources of the project proponent, landowner and/or beneficiary). [1000 characters max.]

4. **Is the project budget scalable?** yes no

Describe how a scaled budget would impact the overall project. [500 characters max.]

9. **Describe the basis for the costs used to derive the project budget according to each budget category. Include the source of the unit cost estimates used. Also, explain any costs that are higher than the average market value. If labor costs are higher than those required by prevailing wage, explain why and what those labor costs are based on.** [500 characters max.]

5. **List the sources of non-state matching funds, amounts and indicate their status** (i.e. not applied for, pending, received and the date of receipt).

6. **List the sources and amount of state matching funds** (these are not eligible matching funds).

7. **Project Tasks, Budget and Schedule Notes:**
