



Round 3 Implementation Project Evaluation and Ranking Process

April 2015

Instructions to project proponents

We are now ready to embark on the project evaluation and ranking process for the Round 3 Implementation Grant. This process has been approved by the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group and is required for all projects. Read the instructions and information in this document carefully before you decide to take the next step in the process. You should also review the RWMG evaluation criteria in this document and make sure you respond to each of the questions in some part of your proposal. Finally, ***it is absolutely imperative that you become familiar with the requirements in the DWR Prop. 84 Project Solicitation Package and are prepared to commit to fulfilling those requirements.***

In order for the RWMG to be able to more fully evaluate and rank projects, more information is required of each project. We still have the project information you provided in the online upload form, and that information will be provided to the RWMG reviewers. The additional information required by this document will add detail to what you have already submitted. We have done our best to minimize redundant work on your part.

Considerations for Project Proponents

For project proponents that submitted multiple projects for the April 3 deadline, please give serious consideration to how many projects you could reasonably develop full proposals for. Again, look at the requirements in the PSP. We estimate that full project proposals require 50-100 hours of project proponent time *per project*. It is expected that the bulk of proposal preparation will take place June 1 – August 1, 2015.

Also give consideration to whether any of your multiple projects could be combined, or whether your projects could be combined with any other proponent's projects. Similarly, could your project be phased if there is an opportunity to only fund a portion of it? Finally, consider how you would prioritize your multiple projects if several are going to go into the project evaluation process.

Several of the projects submitted for this round are planning projects or studies. We have recently received additional clarification from DWR that the only planning/study projects that are allowable in this funding round are those that solely benefit one or more disadvantaged communities. Please review your project and determine, if it is a planning project, whether it will

provide benefits to non-DAC areas or communities. If so, it cannot be included in the Inyo-Mono application.

What to submit

We are now asking that you complete a short work plan, budget, and schedule *for each project*. This material will provide the basis for your full project application should your project be included in the overall proposal.

Work Plan: The work plan for your project should provide a succinct overview of the need and purpose of the project, the tasks that will be necessary to successfully complete the project, and a short, quantitative description of the intended products, deliverables, or outcomes of the projects (e.g., number of meters installed, length of pipe replaced, etc.) We ask that you **list** main tasks of your project within the budget categories provided in the Budget section below. Provide a descriptive, relevant, place-based title.

The work plan should also address the following questions:

- 1) If you have claimed that your project benefits a disadvantaged community (DAC), explain *how* it directly benefits an identified water need in one or more DACs. We suggest that you refer to DWR's DAC mapping tool to view the most recent income data for your community (http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_dac.cfm).
- 2) What is status of your project? What tasks need to be done before the project can be implemented (such as, but not limited to, CEQA, NEPA, permitting, approvals)?
- 3) Is your organization in compliance with the following regulations, as applicable? (Taken from the top of page 13 of the PSP):
 - ◇ Urban Water Management Plan
 - ◇ Agricultural Water Management Plan
 - ◇ Surface Water Diverter
 - ◇ Groundwater Management Plan (high and medium-priority basins only; only for projects directly affecting groundwater)
 - ◇ CASGEM
- 4) If your organization is submitting multiple projects, how does this project rank among them?
- 5) Can your project be phased? Please explain.
- 6) Has your organization received Prop. 84 planning or implementation funding in previous rounds?

Keep your work plan to three pages or less.

Budget: We encourage you to submit a budget that is as detailed as possible. An example of the budget table that all project proponents will be required to complete for the full proposal is shown below. We strongly suggest you begin to fit your project's tasks into these categories. *If you would like to have your proposal preparation costs reimbursed, you must explicitly include them in your budget as a line item under Direct Project Administration.* There is no cap on the maximum amount you can request for proposal preparation, but consider that your project will be evaluated in comparison with ~18 other projects and that your budget will be weighed as a

primary factor in the evaluation.

For now, we are moving forward with the assumption that the Program Office will be the grant proposal coordinator. Program Office staff will develop a budget for the proposal preparation process and will seek reimbursement for that work through the grant award.

Budget table adapted from Table 8 on p. 22 of the PSP

Category	Requested Grant Amount	Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source	Cost Share: Other State Fund Source	Total Cost
(a) Direct Project Administration				
→ Proposal preparation				
(b) Land Purchase/Easement				
(c) Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation				
(d) Construction/Implementation				
(e) Grand Total				

Schedule: You can either provide a task-based schedule table or, for now, a short schedule narrative. At the very least, the schedule should indicate:

Proposed start date:

Proposed end date:

Estimated useful life of project:

Timeline

- Wednesday, April 22, 2015, RWMG meeting: project evaluation and ranking process approved
- Wednesday, May 6, 2015, 5:00 pm, project evaluation submissions due to Program Office
- Friday, May 8, 2015, Program Office distributes proposals, evaluation materials, ranking form
- Friday, May 15, 2015, 5:00 pm, Members' rankings due to Program Office
- Wednesday, May 20, 2015, final RWMG agenda and ranked project list sent to RWMG
- Wednesday, May 27, 2015, RWMG meeting: list and ranking of projects for application approved
- June 1 – August 1, 2015, proposal preparation
- Assume August 1, 2015, proposal deadline

Instructions to project reviewers

- Must be an RWMG Member to participate
- If you are going to participate, you must evaluate and rank all projects
- A pre-populated Excel form will be provided to you for entering your scores
- The original project submission information will be provided to you
- You can award partial credit for any criterion, but it must be in whole integers
- Please set aside time the week of May 11 to perform the project evaluations; this will likely require several hours of work
- Scores for each project will be averaged across the reviewers, and based on the outcome of these average scores, projects will be ranked
- We will need to determine a cutoff of projects around \$1.65 million
 - This is based on the full allocation of \$1.88 million minus administration fees

Scoring criteria

- Will the project be complete by October 31, 2020? (4 points)
- Does the schedule indicate that the project can start by April 1, 2016? (4 points)
- How well does the project assist the region in meeting the Human Right to Water? (4 points)
(http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201120120AB685)
- Description of the project with major components and intended purpose? (10 points)
- How well does the project effectively address long-term drought preparedness? (6 points)
- How well does the project provide a direct water-related benefit to a DAC? (4 points)
- How reasonable is it that the work will be completed in the time allotted given the current status of the project? (4 points)
- Are the costs presented in the budget reasonable for the project type and the current state of the project? (8 points)

Total is 44 points.

Contacts

Mark Drew, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Director

760-924-1008, mdrew@caltrout.org

Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Manager

760-709-2212, holly@inyo-monowater.org