



NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP
2018/19 PROJECT REVIEW & SELECTION
PROCESS GUIDELINES



NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP 2018/19 PROJECT REVIEW & SELECTION PROCESS GUIDELINES

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Background | 2 |
| 2. Schedule for the NCRP 2018/19 Project Solicitation, Project Proposal Review & Selection Process .. | 3 |
| 3. Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles..... | 4 |
| 4. NCRP Project Application, Review & Selection Process..... | 5 |
| 5. Guidelines for Public Input and Project Proponent Input during the Project Review Process..... | 7 |
| 6. NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy | 8 |
| 7. PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection | 9 |
| 8. North Coast Resource Partnership 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria..... | 10 |

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 ecosystem/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 is administered by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and 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
- **Early 2019.** Anticipated release of Final Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation PSP
- **Summer 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 April 2018 NCRP meeting the PRP approved the Draft 2018 NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, Scoring Criteria and draft Application materials, with provisions for finalizing the materials with oversight of the ad hoc committee to allow for the commencement of the NCRP 2018/19 Project Solicitation and development of a regional NCRP 2018/19 Grant Application. During the October 2018 NCRP meeting this was reconfirmed with slight modifications to the process schedule.

2. SCHEDULE FOR THE NCRP 2018/19 PROJECT SOLICITATION, PROJECT PROPOSAL REVIEW & SELECTION PROCESS

This schedule is subject to change based on new information and Final PSP for the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Project Grant regional application expected to be released by DWR late 2018.

- **October 2018:** The NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee (NCRP Prop 1 Implementation Ad Hoc) developed the draft NCRP Project Review and Selection Process based on the IRWM 2018 Guidelines and the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) released by 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 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.
- **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** (this may change to April 26): 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
- **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:

a) 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.

b) 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, 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.

c) 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 adjust 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.

d) 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.

e) 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.

f) **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. The NCRP Frequently Asked Questions is available online: <https://northcoastresourcepartnership.org/proposition-1-irwm-round-1-implementation-funding-solicitation/>

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. 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 Community ¹

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

¹ Definition for: 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.

interested stakeholders including Tribes in the relevant watershed, sub-watershed or project impact area; including source and receiving water areas.

Programmatic Integration & 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.

8. 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.

| NCRP 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria | Weighting Factor | Range of Points |
|--|------------------|-----------------|
| <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>Is the project sponsor an eligible grant applicant?</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> <p>Will the project have CEQA completed (including Notice of Determination/Exemption submitted to DWR) by the time the regional grant agreement is expected to be executed (March 2020?). <i>Projects providing water-related benefit entirely to DACs, EDAs or Tribes or projects implemented by Tribes are exempt from this requirement.</i></p> <p>Does the project proposal demonstrate that the project has a useful life of at least 15 years as required by Government Code 17627.</p> <p>If the project is a stormwater and/or dry weather runoff capture project, is it included in a Stormwater Resource Plan that has been incorporated into an IRWM plan?</p> <p>If the project affects Groundwater, does the project have the support of the local Groundwater Sustainability Agency?</p> | | y/n |

| NCRP 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria | Weighting Factor | Range of Points |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <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> <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> | 2 | 0 – 10 (0-5 x 2) |
| <p>Project Benefits to Economically Disadvantaged Communities</p> <p>Is the project located in and substantially benefit an economically disadvantaged community (DAC) or economically distressed area (EDA)?</p> <p>Does the project significantly improve a DAC or EDA’s 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 | 0 – 10 (0-5 x 2) |
| <p>Project Benefits to Severely Economically Disadvantaged Communities</p> <p>Is the project located in and substantially benefit a severely disadvantaged community?</p> | 1 | 0-3 |

| NCRP 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria | Weighting Factor | Range of Points |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Water Self-Reliance and Safety</p> <p>Does the project contribute to sustainable water supply and reliability?</p> <p>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> <p>Does the project address nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination?</p> | 2 | 0 – 10 (0-5 x 2) |
| <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) |
| <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) |

| NCRP 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria | Weighting Factor | Range of Points |
|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Climate Change</p> <p>Does the project measurably address climate change by reducing GHG emissions, carbon, or water demand or by incorporating energy efficiency or other water-related climate adaptation strategies, including but not limited to sea level rise, reduced snowpack, increased rainfall, sea water intrusion, etc.?</p> | 1 | 0 - 5 |
| <p>Project Tasks, Schedule and Readiness</p> <p>Does the scope of the project and the projected immediate outcomes of the project provide an adequate solution to the problem?</p> <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>Will the project have the CEQA complete and the permits in place 6 months after the funding award date? <i>Projects providing water-related benefit entirely to DACs, EDAs or Tribes or projects implemented by Tribes are exempt from this requirement.</i></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> | 2 | 0 – 5 (0-5 x 2) |
| <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 | 0 – 10 (0-5 x 2) |

| NCRP 2018/19 Project Proposal Scoring Criteria | Weighting Factor | Range of Points |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| <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> <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>Can the project budget be scaled to be appropriate for this funding solicitation?</p> | 2 | 0 – 10 (0-5 x 2) |
| <p>Statewide & Tribal Priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make Conservation a California Way of Life • Increase Regional Self-Reliance and Integrated Water Management Across All Levels of Government • Protect and Restore Important Ecosystems • Manage and Prepare for Dry Periods • Expand Water Storage Capacity and Improve Groundwater Management • Provide Safe Water for All Communities • Increase Flood Protection • Increase Operational and Regulatory Efficiency • Identify Sustainable and Integrated Financing Opportunities • 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 | | 0 – 5 (one point for each priority that is well defended in the application up to 5 points) |
| TOTAL SCORE | | 0 – 93 |