



NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP

2022 Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2

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.....	7
6. NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy	8
7. Leadership Council Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection	9
8. NCRP 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. 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. On May 17, 2022 the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) released the Final Proposition 1 Round 2 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program Guidelines and Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP). Information about IRWM program, guidelines and PSPs can be found at the [DWR IRWM Implementation Grant Program](#) webpage.

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 solicitation process and guidelines 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

- **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.
- **July 15 2022:** 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.



- **August 15:** [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.
- **September/October:** Informational & Assistance Workshops held online, recorded and posted to the NCRP website. Project proponents are invited to attend and ask questions.
- **November 4:** NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation Project applications due
- **November 7 - December 2:** TPRC project review period; a TPRC project evaluation conference call meeting will be held prior to the TPRC project review period.
- **December 1 & 2, 2022:** 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.
- **December 9:** 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
- **December/January 2023:** Priority North Coast Project sponsors work with NCRP staff to develop materials for the NCRP Proposition 1 IRWM Round 2 Implementation Regional Grant
- **February 1, 2023:** 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 what 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. 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 attendance during the entire meeting is strongly encouraged, including in-person attendance during in-person meetings. 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. To ensure an open and fair project selection process, only TPRC members who have reviewed all the project proposals (excepting project recusals), provided project review scores and participated in the majority of the TPRC group discussions can be involved in the project selection process and deliberations. 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/ncrp-proposition-1-irwm-round-2-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. 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 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. Leadership Council Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection

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:

a. 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.

b. 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.

c. 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 LC reserves the right to prioritize disadvantaged community projects, based on a project's ability to mitigate threats to public

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.



health, watershed health, and the economic and public health benefits that project implementation would bring to these communities.

d. 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.

- All project types should address grant requirements and NCRP goals and priorities
- 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)
- Programmatic integration and project type diversity will be achieved over time and through multiple rounds of funding
- Projects that provide multi-benefits will be prioritized (where all else is equal)
- 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. NCRP 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	Weighting Factor	Range of Points
<p>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project sponsor an eligible grant applicant? • Does the project address at least one of the NCRP Objectives? • Is the project type eligible for the current funding solicitation? • 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? • Is the organization required to file an Urban Water Management Plan, Agricultural Water Management Plan and/or a Surface Water Diversion Report? • Does the project proposal demonstrate that the project has a useful life of at least 15 years as required by Government Code 16727. • 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? • If the project affects Groundwater, does the project have the support of the local Groundwater Sustainability Agency? 		y/n
<p>PROJECT INFORMATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project proponent implemented similar projects in the past? Has the project sponsor worked effectively with the NCRP in the past? • 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? • 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? • Do the goals and objectives of the Project help to achieve the goals and objectives of the NCRP and the Regional Priority Plan? • Does the proposal describe adequate need for the project? Is this an important project for the project community? region? • 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 	2	0 – 20 (0-10 x 2)



NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting Factor	Range of Points
<p>the critical need (e.g., hazard mitigation, critical infrastructure, etc.)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 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? 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? Is the Proposal part of a larger multi-phased project that leverages other benefits and resources? 		
<p>PROJECT BENEFITS TO ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project located in an economically disadvantaged community (DAC)? Does the project significantly improve a disadvantaged community's economic vitality? Will the project provide important intangible benefits to a DAC such as improvements to watershed & forest health, cultural priorities, Beneficial Uses, or ecosystem services? 	2	0 – 20 (0-10 x 2)
<p>PROJECT BENEFITS TO SEVERELY ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project located in a severely disadvantaged community? 	1	0-10
<p>OTHER PROJECT BENEFITS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project implement effective strategies and provide multiple benefits? Does the project address contamination (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium) per the requirements of AB1249 ? Does the project provide sustainable, clean water supply and reliability; address long-term drought preparedness; expand water storage capacity or improve groundwater management? Does the project significantly improve a community's public health, safety, air quality, water supply/quality? Does the project appreciably benefit impaired water bodies, sensitive habitats or protected areas? 	2	0 – 20 (0-10 x 2)



NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting Factor	Range of Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? ● 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? ● Does the project implement a project with greater watershed coverage relative to other projects? ● Are the benefits claimed of a magnitude appropriate to the cost of the project and the grant request? 		
<p>CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? 	1	0 - 10
<p>PROJECT JUSTIFICATION & TECHNICAL BASIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is the description of the scientific and technical basis for the project adequate considering the size of the project and physical benefits claimed? ● Does the project employ new and innovative technology or practices? ● Does the technical analysis support the claimed physical benefits? ● Does the project include adequate project performance monitoring? 	2	0 – 20 (0-10 x 2)
<p>PROJECT TASKS, SCHEDULE AND READINESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the scope of the project and the projected immediate outcomes of the project provide an adequate solution to the problem? ● Are the Project Description, Major Tasks and Deliverables of adequate detail and completeness that it is clear that the project can be implemented? ● Does the proposal include appropriate environmental documentation and permitting? ● Are the potential adverse impacts reasonable? Can they be mitigated? ● Does the Proposal include appropriate and reasonable Major Tasks, Deliverables and Timeframe for implementing the project? 	1	0 – 10



NCRP PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA	Weighting Factor	Range of Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 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>PROJECT BUDGET</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the budget of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented? Are the task budget and the overall budget reasonable for the project type and current stage of the project? 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? 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? 	2	0 – 20 (0-10 x 2)
<p>PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT AND LC DIRECTED CRITERIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project a good fit for the current funding solicitation? Is this partial funding to complete a quality project, partially funded by other sources? Is this an important project for the North Coast region? Does this project effectively implement the NCRP goals and objectives? Does this project contribute to the goals of programmatic integration and project type diversity at the project portfolio level? Is there general agreement among the TPRC members regarding the ranking of this project? Can the project budget be scaled to be appropriate for this funding solicitation? 	2	0 – 20 (0-10 x 2)
TOTAL SCORE		0 – 150