



**North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP)  
Leadership Council (LC) & Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) Meeting  
MEETING MATERIALS**

**Friday, January 21, 2022; 10 am – 12:00 pm**

**ZOOM MEETING INSTRUCTIONS**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84298415638?pwd=K3dDOTJmWjEyYUZCR3NLcDZKUUNDZz09>

Meeting ID: 842 9841 5638

Passcode: 806524

One tap mobile

+16699006833,,84298415638#,,,,\*806524# US (San Jose)

+12532158782,,84298415638#,,,,\*806524# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 929 436 2866 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 842 9841 5638

Passcode: 806524

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/kcHCKNg6dJ>

---

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*The following items correspond to the NCRP Quarterly Meeting agenda for January 21, 2022 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/north-coast-resource-partnership-quarterly-meetings/>

---

## **V NCRP MOMU & HANDBOOK UPDATE**

The NCRP MoMU was developed in 2005 in response to requirements of the DWR IRWM program. The intention of the MoMU was to document partner and grantee support for and understanding of the requirements of the IRWM program and NCRP goals and objectives. Any entity receiving funding from the NCRP has been required to become a signatory to the NCRP MoMU, via adoption of the MoMU by resolution of its decision making body. Since the initial creation of the MoMU, the NCRP has diversified its goals and objectives, refined its principles, roles and governance structure, modified the name of the NCRP and the Leadership Council, and developed a detailed Policies and Procedures Handbook that has been adopted by the NCRP Leadership Council. Although the Policies and Procedures Handbook is regularly updated, the MoMU is significantly out of date and not in alignment with the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

NCRP staff will update the MoMU to accurately reflect the current state of the NCRP, and to align with the Policies and Procedures Handbook as approved by the Leadership Council. The MOMU will continue to be a positive statement of NCRP principles, goals and objectives, and a non-binding voluntary agreement. Additional changes to the MoMU and the Handbook for future consideration of the Leadership Council include principles, policies and procedures related to Tribal sovereignty and consultation, Tribal leadership on land stewardship, staff roles and decision-making authority to increase efficiency, and other new refinements recommended by the NCRP staff team. Updates to the MoMU and the Handbook will be considered by the Leadership Council at its April 2022 meeting.

---

## **VI APRIL & MAY NCRP MEETINGS**

### **April 15, 2022 NCRP Quarterly Meeting:**

At their last meeting, the NCRP Executive Committee discussed whether to hold the April NCRP Quarterly meeting in person in Yreka. There was strong interest in a 1-2 day in person meeting in Yreka, and the Executive Committee requested that the decision be added to the January 21, 2022 NCRP Quarterly Meeting agenda for discussion with and decision by the entire Leadership Council.

### **May 5-6, 2022 Wildfire & Forest Resilience Task Force Meeting/NCRP Event in Sonoma County:**

The Governor's Wildfire & Forest Resilience Task Force will be meeting in Sonoma County on May 5, hosted by NCRP. NCRP staff are working with Task Force staff to develop a two-day agenda that is expected to include field tours and an outdoor gathering of elected officials and other partners. Per Task Force staff, the Task Force meeting could be moved to an online meeting depending on the status of COVID19. A Save the Date memo will be sent out shortly.

---

## **VI GOVERNOR’S OFFICE OF PLANNING & RESEARCH: BIOMASS GRANT**

The NCRP was awarded a grant from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research to develop a regional plan for woody feedstock utilization and local pilot projects. The grant was approved with unanimous support of the NCRP Leadership Council. The grant is in the process of being executed by Humboldt County on behalf of the NCRP. A Steering Committee will be formed, comprised of experts and leaders on biomass issues from the North Coast Region’s Tribes, counties, private sector firms, UC ANR, NGOs and others. NCRP staff are requesting input from the Leadership Council on potential steering committee members or technical advisors. Additionally, staff are requesting input on whether the Leadership Council would like to appoint a Leadership Council or Technical Peer Review Committee member to the Steering Committee.

---

## **VIII DROUGHT AND PROPOSITION 1 IRWM FUNDING**

### **Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Grant Program**

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR), is providing \$190 million in grant funding through the [Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Grant Program](#) for interim or immediate relief in response to conditions arising from drought across California. The drought relief goal is to address immediate impacts on human health and safety and on fish and wildlife resources, and to provide water to persons or communities that lose or are threatened with the loss or contamination of water supplies. The Final Guidelines/ Proposal Solicitation were released on October 29 and can found at: [Final 2021 Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Grant Program Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package](#)

During the NCRP Quarterly meeting on October 15, 2021, the Leadership Council directed staff to work with the TPRC Co-Chairs and the Proposition 1 Ad Hoc committee to develop and implement a streamlined approach to evaluating the projects to be included in one or more NCRP regional applications for drought relief. They also authorized the Executive Committee to make the final decision about the TPRC recommended suite of projects for submittal.

The Proposition 1 Ad Hoc Committee met on Nov 10 and approved project evaluation/selection process and criteria which were the basis for the [NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, 2021](#)

### **NCRP Drought Relief Regional Proposal, Submission 1 Project Review & Submittal**

On November 29, the NCRP received 25 project proposals to be considered for inclusion into the NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Grant Regional Proposal for submittal to DWR on December 17. The total funding request was \$22.9 million with total project costs of over \$25 million. See the [NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Grant](#) webpage for a list of proposed projects hyperlinked to their proposals.

The TPRC conducted their individual technical reviews and met collectively on December 7 for the [TPRC Project Review Meeting](#) to discuss the project proposals and select a draft suite of Priority Projects for review and approval during the [NCRP Executive Committee meeting](#) held on Dec 10, 2021. The NCRP

Executive Committee unanimously approved the TPRC recommendation and suite of 13 Priority Projects. Project proposals were improved based on the [TPRC project review comments](#) and the regional proposal was submitted to DWR on January 14.

## **NCRP Drought Relief Regional Proposal Submission 2: Tribal and Underrepresented Communities Set-Aside**

The Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Grant Program also established a \$5 million set-aside for each IRWM Funding Area in California, such as the North Coast, to encourage regional proposals to support Tribal, disadvantaged and underrepresented community projects. Regional Underrepresented Communities and Tribal Set-Aside proposal is expected to be due in late February or early March. The NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, 2022 were refined for Leadership Council review (see Appendix A) including the following timeline:

- January 21: NCRP Leadership Council review and approve the NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief for Underrepresented and Tribal Communities Set-Aside Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, 2022
- Feb 7-10, TBD: TPRC Pre-review meeting
- Feb 9: due date for the Project Information Applications submitted to NCRP staff
- Feb 10: proposal materials provided to the TPRC for review
- Feb 21: due date for preliminary scores from the TPRC
- Feb 22, 9 am – 3pm: TPRC review meeting via zoom
- Feb 23: post the TPRC recommendation for project selection
- Feb 25, 10 am: NCRP Executive Committee meeting to review to TPRC recommendation and make final determination
- Feb 27: Project sponsors submit eligibility materials, if required
- Feb 28 (or early March): staff finalize and submit the NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief for Underrepresented and Tribal Communities Set-Aside Grant proposal to DWR

## **Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Funding**

The IRWM Implementation Grant Program provides funding for implementation projects that meet the intent of [Proposition 1, Chapter 7](#). Approximately \$403 million in grant funding is being made available for implementation projects with at least \$51 million being made available for projects that provide benefits to [Disadvantaged Communities](#). The North Coast funding area Proposition 1 IRWM allocation is \$26.5 M and approximately \$22 M is available for implementation projects over two rounds of funding. In April 2020, DWR awarded \$12,720,000 for the first round of NCRP IRWM funding to implement 20 projects leaving approximately \$9,280,000 available for the second round of funding.

DWR released the Draft Proposition 1 - Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) on December 10, 2021 and the Final PSP is expected to be released in February/March 2022 with regional applications due later in 2022. Staff developed the Draft 2022 NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines that includes technical review and LC directed project selection criteria for review (see Attachment B). Staff will work with the TPRC Co-Chairs and the Proposition 1 Ad Hoc

Committee to review the Draft Proposition 1 - Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant PSP and develop NCRP solicitation materials anticipated for release in early 2022.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

### **NCRP DROUGHT RELIEF REGIONAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION 2: UNDERREPRESENTED COMMUNITIES AND TRIBAL SET-ASIDE**

To approve the timeline and NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, 2022 (Appendix A) to develop a NCRP Drought Relief Submission 2: Underrepresented Communities and Tribal Set-Aside Regional Proposal. Authorized the Executive Committee to make the final decision regarding the TPRC recommended suite of projects for submittal.

### **PROPOSITION 1 IRWM ROUND 2 FUNDING**

To approve the Draft 2022 NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines (see Attachment B), with provisions for developing project application materials and finalizing the Guidelines with oversight of the Proposition 1 Ad Hoc Committee to allow for the commencement of the NCRP 2022 Project Solicitation and development of a regional NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Grant Application.

---

## **IX STAFF DETERMINATION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE & CAPACITY SUPPORT ALLOCATION**

The NCRP has a long history of providing capacity building and technical assistance to North Coast communities to support and develop local and regional projects that promote integrated and multi-benefit outcomes in the North Coast region.

The NCRP Policies and Procedures Handbook includes a policy for selection of entities to receive technical assistance based on a Water and Wastewater Service Provider Needs Assessment of North Coast disadvantaged communities in the region. The policy also states that the “technical assistance process is subject to review and refinement per recommendations of the LC, TPRC, NCRP staff, and the current Grant Program Guidelines, technical assistance funding opportunities and requirements.”

Specific to wildfire resilience, the NCRP was awarded a grant from the [Department of Conservation, Regional Forest and Fire Capacity Program \(RFFC\) Block Grant](#) which has multi-year funding to identify and provide technical assistance and capacity building support for local and regional projects that promote forest and community health and long-term resilience to wildfire. To more effectively respond to upcoming grant opportunities through the NCRP Regional RFFC program and other funding programs, NCRP staff recommends developing a programmatic approach to technical assistance which will be included in the NCRP Policies and Procedures Handbook and approved by the Leadership Council.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The NCRP will establish an on-going solicitation for concept proposals from eligible entities throughout the North Coast region that align with the NCRP Goals and Objectives. The concept proposals will briefly

describe the project, probable outcomes, and the nature of the technical assistance and capacity support requested.

Proposals for technical assistance and capacity support will be evaluated based on a selection process and selection criteria developed by the NCRP RFFC, Proposition 1 and/or Tribal Involvement ad hoc committees appointed by the NCRP Leadership Council. Technical assistance proposals and capacity support will be evaluated and selected by staff using the criteria developed by the Ad Hoc committees based on available funding.

NCRP staff will contract with a team of technical regional experts to provide one-on-one technical assistance and capacity building for the selected technical assistance projects. The typical value of technical assistance provided is in the range of \$5,000 to \$15,000 per entity.

---

## **X NCRP REGIONAL FOREST AND FIRE CAPACITY UPDATE**

NCRP staff and consultants are continuing to refine the draft regional priority plan funded by the Department of Conservation Regional Forest and Fire Capacity Program. Following is a summary of current status and next steps:

- NCRP staff and consultants have developed draft content for the Outcomes and Solutions section of the plan. This plan section is being reviewed by North Coast Tribal representatives with meeting and input coordination by Sherri Norris, NCRP Director of Tribal Engagement. The NCRP staff team and key consultants are also providing a comprehensive review.
- Project Tracker is being developed as an online tool for all NCRP projects, starting with RFFC projects and is expected to be launched in March 2022. NCRP staff team continues to identify projects and prepare them for entry into Project Tracker.
- All draft plan content reviewed by the Ad Hoc and approved by the Leadership Council is being developed into draft story maps and web pages (the plan will be digital)
- Demonstration projects are wrapping up and developing final reports, which are under review by NCRP staff team.
- Ad Hoc meeting scheduled for February and March
- Expected review and discussion of draft plan at April 2022 Leadership Council meeting
- Public review in May 2022/feature draft plan at May 5-6 Wildfire & Forest Resilience Task Force Meeting and related events
- Final plan in June 2022
- Plan adoption by NCRP Leadership Council July 2022
- Post July 2022: plan implementation and ongoing refinement

## **XI PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION: NCRP BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS**

The NCRP has been asked whether there is interest in expanding the regional geographic scope of the North Coast Resource Partnership to include the complete county landscapes of all or some current NCRP counties (e.g., Sonoma, Siskiyou and Modoc).

When the NCRP was formed in 2005, it intentionally aligned its boundary with that of the Regional Water Quality Control Board Region 1, which is focused on hydrologic boundaries, including watersheds that drain to the Pacific. This resulted in parts of Sonoma County, Siskiyou County and Modoc county not being included in the NCRP boundary, as their watersheds drain to the Sacramento River or the San Francisco Bay.

As the NCRP has evolved in scope and scale, there has been ongoing discussion of expanding to include full counties, and this issue has been discussed with the California Department of Conservation, the Director of the Governor’s Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force and other agency partners. There is an interest in revisiting the boundary due to the expanded work on wildfire resiliency, climate adaptation and biodiversity enhancement, all of which are affected by watershed boundaries, yet require consideration of other factors that go beyond watersheds. Additionally, there is an opportunity to better align with boundaries established by the Governor’s Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force and the Regional Forest and Fire Capacity program that is administered by the Department of Conservation, and perhaps other agency partners. This topic has been explored previously, and the NCRP has received funding for projects beyond its boundaries in the past on a case-by-case basis with approval from the Leadership Council.

Some potential challenges that may require a creative solution or the continuation of case-by-case decision making include:

- **Challenge:** Requirements of particular funding agencies (eg, DWR or IRWM funding may only be allocated inside the regional boundary established by the current adopted NCRP IRWM Plan and IRWM Regional Acceptance Process)
  - Options for Addressing: a) Require that DWR IRWM funding remain within the footprint of the adopted NCRP IRWM Plan and Regional Acceptance Process; b) consider revising both in future
- **Challenge:** Parts of Sonoma, Siskiyou and Modoc may fall within other funding area boundaries, allowing for expanded funding opportunities for those areas that are not available to the geographic areas in the current NCRP boundary (e.g., SF Bay Restoration Authority, Bay Area IRWM or other IRWM regions, Sierra Nevada Conservancy)
  - Option for Addressing: evaluation process can include extra points for areas that do not have other source of funding, or for IRWM regions, the above approach can be retained
- There may be jurisdictional or representation issues of concern to North Coast Tribes, counties or Leadership Council members.
  - Option for Addressing: per discussion of NCRP Leadership Council and partner agencies

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION, NCRP BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS:**

NCRP staff will gather input from the Leadership Council and others during the January 2022 meeting, discuss opportunities, challenges and preferences with agency partners, and bring a staff recommendation for Leadership Council consideration during the April 2022 NCRP Quarterly Meeting.

---

## **XII AD HOC COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP UPDATES**

The NCRP has three current Ad Hoc Committees appointed by the Leadership Council (listed below). Typically, at its January meeting the Leadership Council revises or adds to these committees. Per Brown Act, a maximum of seven Leadership Council members may serve on an Ad Hoc Committee.

### **NCRP Regional Forest and Fire Capacity Program Ad Hoc Committee**

Co-Chair: Leaf Hillman, Karuk Tribe, Northern Region  
Co-Vice-Chair: Supervisor Steve Madrone, Humboldt County  
Supervisor Gerry Hemmingsen, Del Norte County  
Supervisor Brandon Criss, Siskiyou County  
TPRC Co-Chair: Dale Roberts, Engineer, Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma County  
Toz Soto, Senior Fisheries Biologist, Karuk Tribe, Northern Region  
Wayne Haydon, Certified Engineering Geologist, Sonoma County  
Mark Lancaster, Director, Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, Trinity County

### **NCRP Proposition 1 Implementation Ad Hoc Committee**

Supervisor Mike Wilson, Humboldt County  
Supervisor Dan Gjerde, Mendocino County  
Supervisor Lynda Hopkins, Sonoma County  
TPRC Co-Chair: Sandra Perez, Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, Trinity County  
TPRC Co-Chair: Dale Roberts, Engineer, Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma County  
Hank Seemann, Deputy Director, Environmental Services, Public Works Department, Humboldt County  
Wayne Haydon, Sonoma County

### **Tribal Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Ad Hoc Committee**

NCRP Tribal Leadership Council and TPRC representatives

---

## **XIII NCRP PROGRESS DASHBOARD - LEADERSHIP COUNCIL DIRECTION**

Co-Chair Gore has requested a “dashboard” of NCRP progress on key Leadership Council decisions and guidance, so that Leadership Council members have a brief document that summarizes progress on key directives, with more detailed information provided for those who would like more background information. Co-Chair Gore would like to hear ideas and thoughts from the Leadership Council on what to include, and NCRP staff will return in April with a draft for Leadership Council consideration.



## UPDATES

### A. TRIBAL ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

Sherri Norris, NCRP Director of Tribal Engagement will provide a verbal update, time permitting.

### B. REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR & PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT (IRWM) IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS									
Grant Round	Total Projects	Grant Amount	Amount Invoiced	% Complete	Total Cumulative Number of Projects Complete at End of Year (Estimated for 2022)				
					2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
<i>Prop. 84 Drought (2014)</i>	11	\$8.7 million	\$8.3 million	100%	7	7	9	10 <sup>(1)</sup>	N/A
<i>Prop. 84 Final (2015)</i>	25	\$11.0 million	\$9.47 <sup>(2)</sup>	93.17%	3	4	10	15	23 <sup>(3)</sup>
<i>Prop. 1 Round 1</i>	20	12.7 million	\$2.8 million <sup>(4)</sup>	22%	--	--	--	1	7
<b>Totals</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>\$32.4 million</b>			<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>30</b>

**Overview:** The Humboldt County Regional Administrator Team (Admin Team) continues to collaborate with funders, NCRP consultants, and local project sponsors (LPS) to ensure quality grant deliverables and timely reimbursement payments. Members of the Admin Team are available to discuss suggestions or concerns regarding their work on behalf of the NCRP; see contact list below.

**Prop. 84 Drought Round:** This grant agreement ended on June 30, 2020, and was successfully closed out on December 27, 2021. DWR allowed an unfunded extension of time for the preparation and submittal of the Project Completion Report and final deliverables for two projects that were delayed due to staffing issues and the Covid-19 Pandemic. The Admin Team assisted the remaining projects with additional support to ensure the projects were successful at fulfilling the closeout requirements and receiving the withheld retention. A Grant Closure letter was received from DWR notifying the County of Humboldt that the contractual obligations of the grant have been met. The Admin Team continues to obtain, review, and submit post-performance monitoring reports from the LPS, which will be ongoing per the agreed upon duration and schedule.

**Prop. 84 Final Round:** This grant agreement ended on December 31, 2021. The Admin Team is currently working with LPS to finishing project completion reports, collect all deliverables, and prepare final retention invoices for the last remaining projects. The County of Humboldt's Grant Completion Report is also being finalized and will be submitted to DWR once all project completion documentation is

<sup>1</sup> One project encountered insurmountable obstacles that made project completion infeasible

<sup>2</sup> Included a \$1.1 million advanced payment

<sup>3</sup> One of the 25 projects was withdrawn by the LPS for reasons of hardship, and another encountered an obstacle that made project completion infeasible

<sup>4</sup> Included a \$1.6 million advanced payment

submitted from LPS. The Admin Team will continue to obtain, review, and submit post-performance monitoring reports from the LPS, which will be ongoing per the agreed upon duration and schedule.

**Prop. 1 Round 1:** All LPS are making progress on the planning and permit compliance components of their projects since the execution of the grant agreement. It is anticipated that approximately eight projects will commence construction activities during summer of 2022. One noteworthy accomplishment this past quarter was the completion of a drinking water filtration system for an elementary school located in Whitethorn. The project provides safe drinking water to the students, staff and volunteers of the school and eliminates the need to purchase water for the school to remain open. Projects continue to invoice for reimbursement and over \$400,000 of the advance payment funds have been spent to date. Having cash in hand to cover expenses in a timely manner has been extremely helpful for the six projects that received advanced payments. The Admin Team continues to provide grant agreement administration support and coordinate with the LPS and DWR to secure approval for construction activities, invoice payments and advance payment accountability reporting.

PLANNING PROJECTS			
Title and Funding Source	Grant Term	Status	Grant Amount
<i>North Coast Resource Partnership Outreach &amp; Involvement: Tribal Engagement &amp; Economic Opportunity for Disadvantaged Communities (DACTI)</i> Dept. of Water Resources, Proposition 1	April 2017 to April 2022	In progress	\$2.65 million
<i>Regional Forest and Fire Capacity (RFFC) Program</i> CA Natural Resources Agency, administered by the CA Dept. of Conservation	May 2019 to March 2023	In progress	\$4 million
<i>Regional Forest and Fire Capacity (RFFC) Program</i> Early Action Funding - CA Dept. of Conservation	November 2021 to March 2025	In progress	\$2.9 million

**Tribal Engagement & Economic Opportunity for Disadvantaged Communities or “DACTI”**

The Humboldt Admin Team continues to work toward the goals of this project in close coordination with NCRP consultants, West Coast Watershed (WCW) and the California Indian Environmental Alliance (CIEA). Technical assistance continues to be provided to disadvantaged communities (DACs) and Tribes to help them identify needs and potential solutions and prepare to take advantage of the next round of support and funding opportunities, including Prop. 1 and emergency Drought funding.

The Admin Team supported NCRP consultants in the preparation of a regional application to DWR’s Urban Community and Multi-benefit Drought Relief Program (November-December of 2021). The application was submitted in early January and the County will administer the grant agreement if the proposed implementation projects are selected for funding. Funds are also available under this program for “Underrepresented Communities and Native American Tribes.” If the NCRP elects to apply for those funds, they will be administered under the existing DACTI grant agreement.

The Admin Team has also been working closely with WCW and CIEA as they continue to help LPS develop priority projects for Prop. 1 Round 2 implementation funds. To ensure that the DACTI program stays in alignment with the roll out of Prop 1, Round 2 and potential Drought Program funding, an extension of the grant agreement term will be requested. This will allow the NCRP to continue to meaningfully engage with the DACs and Tribes around the region in need of support and technical assistance.

**Regional Forest and Fire Capacity (RFFC) Block Grant (Original Agreement & Early Action Agreement)**

The Humboldt Admin Team continues to work toward the goals of this project in close coordination with WCW and CIEA, with County staff providing grant agreement administration and project management support, including the administration of 13 demonstration projects. The California Department of Conservation (DOC) and the Natural Resources Agency (NRA) continue to provide program guidance to staff as the RFFC program unfolds. The original grant agreement with NRA, referred to as Round 1, is pending a second amendment to ensure sufficient funds are budgeted to the successful completion of the north coast regional priority plan (RPP).

Staff continue to administer demonstration project subgrants as part of the Round 1 agreement, closing out those for which all work has been completed. Members of the staff/consultant team are in the process of integrating demonstration project findings and recommendations into a series of individual Story Maps as part of the RPP. LPS are cooperating by providing an initial synthesis and additional information as requested to ensure each Story Map is comprehensive and meets the needs and standards of the RPP. The Story Maps are envisioned as concise summaries (linking out to more detail) that include multi-media components to illustrate project information.

In late October, the DOC and the NCRP RFFC staff team successfully executed a grant agreement for a second RFFC budget allocation to the NCRP (\$2.9 million) supported by the Early Action Wildfire Resilience budget. Professional Service Agreements and tracking mechanisms are in development to facilitate management of these “Round 2” funds. The Early Action funds are intended to provide support for continued project identification, evaluation, and documentation; the provision of more technical assistance and subgrants to help partners build the capacity necessary to manage increases in project development and implementation workload; continued outreach and communication about the program; and collaboration and coordination with partners within the region and beyond.

An addendum to the State Budget for fiscal year 2021-2022 was approved in the final weeks of the year, including an allocation of \$50 million to the RFFC Program from state general funds. Regional allocations are expected in early to mid-2022. These funds are intended to provide long-term support for RFFC program implementation over a seven-year period. They are meant to fund a broad range of capacity development, planning, project development, and demonstration project implementation. The NCRP will use these funds for continued collaboration with partners in the North Coast region to develop and assemble the strategies necessary to increase wildfire and forest resilience and develop the pipeline of shovel ready projects to achieve them.

<b>CONTACTS</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	<b>NCRP Admin Role</b>
Hank Seemann, Deputy-Director	<a href="mailto:hseemann@co.humboldt.ca.us">hseemann@co.humboldt.ca.us</a>	Program Management
Cybelle Immitt, Natural Resources Planning Manager	<a href="mailto:cimmitt@co.humboldt.ca.us">cimmitt@co.humboldt.ca.us</a>	Regional Administration Team Management and Program Oversight
Denise Monday, Senior Environmental Analyst	<a href="mailto:dmonday@co.humboldt.ca.us">dmonday@co.humboldt.ca.us</a>	Lead Admin for Prop. 84 Drought and Prop. 1 Round 1
Julia Cavalli, Senior Environmental Analyst	<a href="mailto:jcavalli1@co.humboldt.ca.us">jcavalli1@co.humboldt.ca.us</a>	Lead Admin for DACTI and RFFC planning grants, including RFFC Demo Projects
Lauren Rowan, Environmental Analyst	<a href="mailto:lrowan@co.humboldt.ca.us">lrowan@co.humboldt.ca.us</a>	Lead Admin for Prop. 84 Final Round and admin support for Prop 1 Round 1 and NCRP planning grants

---

**C. NCRP FUNDING AND GRANT UPDATE**

NCRP staff team has pursued the following funding in the last year – all of which has been awarded or is pending:

USGS lidar:	\$6,950,000
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research Biomass Plan:	\$500,000
CAL FIRE Pilot Project:	\$10,000,000
Capacity Assessments Humboldt Area Foundation/Wild Rivers Community Foundation:	\$400,000
DWR Urban and Multi-benefit Drought Relief:	\$4,982,346
Governor’s Early Action and 2021-2022 budgets:	\$6,400,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$29,232,346</b>

Future Considerations

NCRP staff are evaluating an array of opportunities in the California and Federal budgets, including grants from FEMA, OPR, CDFW, CAL FIRE, DWR, as well as philanthropic funders. A detailed overview will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting and the April Leadership Council meeting.

---

**D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, LEADERSHIP COUNCIL DIRECTION AND STAFF ACTION**

**NCRP Executive Committee Meeting**

The NCRP held an [Executive Committee meeting](#) held on Dec 10, 2021 where the Executive Committee unanimously approved the TPRC recommendation and suite of 13 Priority Projects for the first NCRP Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief Regional Proposal.

**NCRP Letters**

A thank you memo was sent on October 14, on behalf of Co-Chairs Leaf Hillman and James Gore and the entire NCRP Leadership Council for collaboration on the submittal of an application to USGS to acquire lidar to fill data gaps in Northern California. The application was submitted in October by Humboldt County, in its role as fiscal agent for the NCRP and totaled \$6.95 million, with matching contributions totaling \$3.39 million from the California Natural Resources Agency, Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District, Sonoma Water, Sonoma Ag + Open Space, and UC San Diego. The application also included letters of support from the Yurok Tribe, California Natural Resources Agency, Natural Resources Conservation Service and United States Forest Service.

A letter of support was submitted on October 28, 2021 signed by Co-Chairs Hillman and Gore, on behalf of the NCRP Leadership Council supporting the application of the NCRP for the development of regional assessments, as well as sub-regional work plans and pilots to address feedstock barriers, as stated in the California Wildfire and Forest Resilience Action Plan Objective 3.10.

A letter of support was submitted on January 10, 2022 signed by Co-Chairs Hillman and Gore, on behalf of the NCRP Leadership Council supporting the application of the Scott River Watershed Council “Scott River Mountain Meadow Restoration Project” for DWR Urban and Multibenefit Drought Relief funding.



**ATTACHMENT A**

**NCRP URBAN AND MULTIBENEFIT DROUGHT RELIEF PROJECT REVIEW AND  
SELECTION PROCESS GUIDELINES, 2022**



**ATTACHMENT B**

**NCRP 2022 PROPOSITION 1 ROUND 2 IRWM**

**PROJECT REVIEW & SELECTION PROCESS GUIDELINES**

# NCRP 2022 PROPOSITION 1 ROUND 2 IRWM PROJECT REVIEW & SELECTION PROCESS GUIDELINES

## Table of Contents

---

- 1. BACKGROUND ..... 2
- 2. Schedule for the NCRP 2022 Project Solicitation, Project Proposal Review & 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..... 7
- 7. LC Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection ..... 8
- 8. North Coast Resource Partnership Project Proposal Scoring Criteria ..... 1



## 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. Approximately \$403 million in grant funding is being made available for implementation projects with at least \$51 million being made available for projects that provide benefits to [Disadvantaged Communities](#). The North Coast funding area Proposition 1 IRWM allocation is \$26.5 M and approximately \$22 M is available for implementation projects over two rounds of funding. In April 2020, DWR awarded \$12,720,000 for the first round of NCRP IRWM funding to implement 20 projects leaving approximately \$9,280,000 available for the second round of funding. **DWR released the Draft Proposition 1 - Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) on December 10, 2021 and the Final PSP is expected to be released in February/March 2022 with regional applications due later in 2022.** Please visit the [Implementation Grant Program](#) page for more information.

The North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) is committed to transparency, stakeholder inclusion and process improvement. At the January 19, 2018 NCRP meeting, the Leadership Council (LC) directed the formation of an NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation Funding Solicitation Ad Hoc Committee comprised of LC 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 LC. During the January 2020 NCRP Quarterly meeting the LC approved the Draft 2022 NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, with provisions for finalizing the materials with oversight of the ad hoc committee to allow for the commencement of the NCRP 2022 Project Solicitation and development of a regional NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Grant Application.

## 2. Schedule for the NCRP 2022 Project Solicitation, Project Proposal Review & Selection Process

The following schedule is subject to change based on new information and Final PSP for the Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation Project Grant PSP expected to be released by DWR **February/March 2022**.

- **January 2022 NCRP Quarterly Meeting:** LC review, consider, provide direction, edit and approve the draft NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines with a provision to allow changes based on the final DWR PSP and input from the NCRP Proposition 1 Ad Hoc Committee.
- **Date TBD:** The NCRP Project Application materials are developed and the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines refined, based on the final DWR PSP, NCRP Proposition 1 Ad Hoc Committee direction.
- **Date TBD:** NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation Project Grant Solicitation is announced. 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.**

- **Date TBD:** 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, NCRP staff and technical assistance provisions.
- **Date TBD:** NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation Project applications due
- **Date TBD:** TPRC project review period; a TPRC project evaluation conference call meeting will be held prior to the TPRC project review period.
- **Date TBD:** TPRC Project Review and Scoring meeting to select a portfolio of priority projects as a TPRC recommendation to be presented to the LC 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.
- **Date TBD:** LC consider/approve TPRC recommended suite of Priority North Coast Projects for the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation Project Regional Grant at an **in-person or zoom** meeting
- **Date TBD:** Priority North Coast Project sponsors work with NCRP staff to develop materials for the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation Regional Grant
- **Date TBD:** regional application submitted to DWR.

### 3. Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles

#### LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

The Leadership Council (LC) is the governing and decision-making body for the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP). The composition of the LC and decision-making process is defined in the [NCRP Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The role of the LC 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 LC provides direction about how the project evaluation and selection process aligns with the NCRP priorities by defining project review and selection guidelines (*see LC Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*). Considering the review and recommendations from the Technical Peer Review Committee, the LC 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 Handbook, the LC 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 LC and evaluates and makes recommendations based on technical expertise and scientific data. The composition of the TPRC is defined in the [NCRP Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The TPRC is comprised of technical and agency staff with expertise that includes fisheries, traditional ecological knowledge, ecology, engineering, geology, agriculture, climate change, forest health, watershed planning and management, water infrastructure and energy. 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 LC and set by the funding solicitation. The TPRC prepares a draft suite of priority projects for review by the LC. 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 LC 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 LC, 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 LC, 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 LC and when there is a funding opportunity, a call for proposals will be announced to North Coast stakeholders. The LC will review and refine the LC 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. Project applicants will provide application materials to NCRP staff via email or via the NCRP website. 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. This will include:

- A brief summary description of each project
- Technical reference section that includes a table of contents and is limited to 50 pages
- Solicitation FAQ regarding funding round specific requirements
- Clarification of the NCRP role is/was/will be in the proposed project if the NCRP is referenced in the application.
- For projects that received technical assistance, a brief synopsis of the type of technical assistance provided, who provided it and the status of any future technical assistance provided by the NCRP or other Technical Assistance entity will also be included.

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 are reviewed 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 LC defined guidelines (*see LC 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 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. It is recommended that all TPRC members bring laptops to the review session to ensure an efficient and thorough review. 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 LC's defined guidelines for project selection (*see LC 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) **LC Review, Consideration and Final Approval of the Suite of NCRP Priority Projects**

The NCRP LC will convene an **in-person or zoom** 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 LC 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 LC's review of the draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects, the TPRC will answer questions and provide information as requested by the LC. The LC – comprised of elected public officials and elected Tribal representatives – will make their final decision based on TPRC recommendations, LC guidelines and other factors that they believe represent the best interest of the North Coast region. 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/XXXXXXX>

## **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. Staff will mute the phone during breaks and include a statement in the agenda. A time keeper can be assigned to ensure that the break times follow the agenda. 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 LC

## 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 LC members will disclose any potential financial interest in a project. If a TPRC or LC 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 LC 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 LC 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 LC or TPRC member may wish to request the advice of their colleagues on the LC 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 LC 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 LC.

## 7. LC Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection

### Background

The intent of the following LC-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 other funding source guidelines and scoring criteria. The LC includes the following preferences and priority considerations in its decision-making process:

### Regional Representation

The LC 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 LC and evaluated by the Technical Peer Review Committee.

### Economically Disadvantaged Community<sup>5</sup>

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 LC 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

### **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 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 LC, 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 LC



## 8. North Coast Resource Partnership Project Proposal Scoring Criteria

Please note that all Criteria are scored on a 0 – 10 basis, with a weighting factor applied where:

- A score of 9-10 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed, achieves significant outcomes and is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation & logical rationale.
- A score of 7-8 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed, achieves significant outcomes but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale.
- A score of 5-6 points will be awarded where the criterion is addressed, achieves moderate outcomes and is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation & logical rationale. A score of 3-4 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed, achieves moderate outcomes but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale.
- A score of 1-2 point will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed, but achieves outcomes that are low in significance.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA	Section # & Question #	Weighting Factor	Range of Points
<p><b>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</b></p> <p>Is the project sponsor an eligible grant applicant?</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> <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
<p><b>PROJECT INFORMATION</b></p>			0 – 20

<b>NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA</b>	<b>Section # &amp; Question #</b>	<b>Weighting Factor</b>	<b>Range of Points</b>
<p>Has the project proponent implemented similar projects in the past? Has the project sponsor worked effectively with the NCRP in the past?</p> <p>Does the proposal demonstrate that the sponsor/project team has the qualifications, experience, capacity, and commitment to the project goals to perform the proposed tasks successfully and cost effectively?</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 Project help to achieve the goals and objectives of the NCRP and the Regional Priority Plan?</p> <p>Does the proposal describe adequate need for the project? Is this an important project for the project community? region?</p> <p>Does the project respond to a critical need that will not be met if the project is not funded? Is the project the best way to alleviate the critical need (e.g., hazard mitigation, critical infrastructure, etc.)?</p> <p>Does the proposal include a clear approach to measuring and reporting project effectiveness including data management, performance measures, and assessing project outcomes and lessons learned?</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>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 x 2)
<p><b>PROJECT BENEFITS TO ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES</b></p> <p>Is the project located in an economically disadvantaged community</p>		2	<b>0 – 20</b> (0 – 10 X 2)

<b>NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA</b>	<b>Section # &amp; Question #</b>	<b>Weighting Factor</b>	<b>Range of Points</b>
<p>(DAC)?</p> <p>Does the project significantly improve a disadvantaged community's economic vitality?</p> <p>Will the project provide important intangible benefits to a DAC such as improvements to watershed &amp; forest health, cultural priorities, Beneficial Uses, or ecosystem services?</p>			
<p><b>PROJECT BENEFITS TO SEVERELY ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES</b></p> <p>Is the project located in a severely disadvantaged community?</p>		1	<b>0-10</b>
<p><b>OTHER PROJECT BENEFITS</b></p> <p>Does the project implement effective strategies and provide multiple benefits?</p> <p>Does the project address contamination per the requirements of AB1249?</p> <p>Does the project provide sustainable, clean water supply and reliability; address long-term drought preparedness; expand water storage capacity or improve groundwater management?</p> <p>Does the project significantly improve a community's public health, safety, air quality, water supply/quality?</p> <p>Does the project appreciably benefit impaired water bodies, sensitive habitats or protected areas?</p> <p>Will the project effectively improve conditions for salmonids and other endangered/threatened species? Does the project address limiting factors identified by NOAA, US Fish and Wildlife Service, or CDFW?</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</p>		2	<b>0 – 20</b> (0-10 x 2)

NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA	Section # & Question #	Weighting Factor	Range of Points
<p>coverage relative to other projects?</p> <p>Are the benefits claimed of a magnitude appropriate to the cost of the project and the grant request?</p>			
<p><b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b></p> <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 - 10
<p><b>PROJECT JUSTIFICATION &amp; TECHNICAL BASIS</b></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>Does the project include adequate project performance monitoring?</p>		2	0 – 20 (0-10 x 2)
<p><b>PROJECT TASKS, SCHEDULE AND READINESS</b></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>Are the potential adverse impacts reasonable? Can they be mitigated?</p> <p>Will the project have the CEQA complete and the permits in place <b>1 year (or 6 months?)</b> after the funding award date?</p>		1	0 – 10

<b>NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA</b>	<b>Section # &amp; Question #</b>	<b>Weighting Factor</b>	<b>Range of Points</b>
<p>Does the Proposal include appropriate and reasonable Major Tasks, Deliverables and Timeframe for implementing the project?</p> <p>Does the Proposal include a detailed budget that breaks down hours or operating expense units with rates? If scalable, has the budget been detailed for the scaled funding requests?</p> <p>Are budget items reasonable? Do they demonstrate and understanding of the task at hand and align well with the tasks, scheduling, and environmental documentation/ permitting?</p>			
<p><b>PROJECT BUDGET</b></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 XX% 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><b>0 – 20</b></p> <p>(0-10 x 2)</p>
<p><b>PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT AND LC DIRECTED CRITERIA</b></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 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</p>		2	<p><b>0 – 20</b></p> <p>(0-5 x 2)</p>

<b>NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA</b>	<b>Section # &amp; Question #</b>	<b>Weighting Factor</b>	<b>Range of Points</b>
ranking of this project?  Can the project budget be scaled to be appropriate for this funding solicitation?			
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>0 – 150</b>

DRAFT