

March 28, 2022

Bay Area Integrated Water Resources Management Plan
Planning and Process Committee

Subject: Project Screening Committee Decision Criteria Memo

Dear Coordinating Committee:

The purpose of this memo is to document the process that will be used by the Project Screening Committee (PSC) to select projects for the San Francisco Bay Area region's 2022 Proposition 1 Grant Solicitation Proposal and to publicize the final list of recommended projects. In the event the PSC encounters an unforeseen issue outside the guidance of this memo or within it, the PSC will address the issue internally and bring the final recommendation to the CC for approval.

The PSC is a volunteer body composed of members active on the Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Coordinating Committee (CC) and representing local public agencies, Tribes, disadvantaged communities (DACs) and Economically Distressed Areas (EDAs), and other stakeholder organizations.

To reduce the administrative burden on the Round 2 grant proposal administrator, the PSC will target approximately 10 eligible projects for the Proposition 1 Round 2 Grant Proposal but may add additional projects to meet regional needs and/or to spend all available grant funds. In addition, the PSC will balance funding distribution by including at least one project from each Functional Area (Flood Protection-Stormwater, Wastewater-Recycled Water, Water Supply-Water Quality, Watershed-Habitat, DAC) and one project from each Subregion (North, South, East, West) in the Funding Area, as defined in the 2019 Bay Area IRWM Plan Update, if such projects could be considered competitive (i.e. top 33% of ranked projects). The PSC will also elevate eligible projects that provide benefits to Tribes/DACs/EDAs through the General Implementation Project funding as well as the 10% minimum reserved for DACs/EDAs and tribal projects benefitting DACs/EDAs as defined by DWR. In addition, competitive projects that bring additional match to the benefit of the regional proposal may be considered for higher priority.

Project Scoring and Selection Process

The PSC will convene through a series of preparatory Zoom/Teams/BlueJeans meetings and a final Zoom/Teams/BlueJeans 'Scoring Review and Project Selection' meeting. To ensure the scoring and selection process is fair and equitable, PSC members considered to be directly affiliated with a project proponent will not score their own project. In addition, project scores that are not submitted by the agreed-upon internal deadline will not be included in the review process. Similarly, PSC members who are not present at the final 'Scoring Review and Project Selection' meeting must defer to the final decision of the convened PSC.

March 28, 2022

PSC Decision Criteria Memo

Review Process:

- PSC will use the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Round 2 Grant Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Project Level Evaluation scoring criteria (Attachment 1) in combination with additional regional scoring criteria approved by the CC (Attachment 2) to evaluate all project submittals. This quantitative scoring process will be referred to as the “Combined Criteria.”
- Each individual PSC scorer will compile point scores for each project based on the Combined Criteria, and then these individual scores will be sorted by rank (with 1 being the highest scoring project on the 27-point scale). Final project scores will be calculated by average rank, thus avoiding skew and outliers (i.e. fairness issues with universally high-scorers versus universally low-scorers) to provide all scorers with an equal voice. The project with average rank closest to 1 will therefore be the top choice.
- PSC will review the updated highest-ranked projects for Functional Area representation.
- PSC will review the updated highest-ranked projects for Subregion representation.
- PSC will review the updated highest-ranked projects for Tribal/DAC/EDA representation.

Managing Conflict of Interest

As mentioned above, to ensure the scoring and selection process is fair and equitable, PSC members representing agencies or organizations that have submitted a proposal will not score their own projects. In addition, the accepted ground rules for the in-person ‘Scoring Review and Project Selection’ meeting will include a verbal agreement by all present not to lobby the group or advocate on behalf of their project, and to only provide additional information about a project if requested. Lastly, no member of the PSC will receive any additional information on how to put together a competitive project application compared to other applicants: the review process will follow the “Combined Criteria” scoring criteria exactly and any additional selection requirements will be based on preestablished direction from the CC.

DWR caps Proposition 1 Round 2 grant administration costs at a maximum of 10% of the total grant request (or \$2.275M for Round 2). This 10% maximum includes the combined grant administrator costs for administration of the regional Proposal as well as any administration grant funding requests within the individual projects. The PSC will set aside a 10% placeholder value for grant administration costs; the CC and grant administrator will come to an agreement on the total administration cost and how these costs will be allocated among the selected projects, including redistribution of any funding remaining after administration costs are formally determined.

Communication and Transparency with Project Proponents:

The Planning and Process Committee (PPC), in collaboration with the PSC, will hold a workshop (date TBD) for applicants to ask questions and for the PPC and PSC to provide an overview of DWR’s eligibility criteria as well as the Combined Criteria used in scoring. The PSC will also provide the following materials to the CC to be posted on the public-facing Bay Area IRWM website:

- Links to the 2019 Bay Area IRWM Plan Update, the 2022 PSP, and the 2022 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines

March 28, 2022

PSC Decision Criteria Memo

- A definitions sheet of key terms used in DWR's IRWM scoring criteria. For example, what the term “leveraged funds” means.
- The scoring criteria to be used by the PSC to score Proposition 1 Round 2 projects (the Combined Criteria)
- The PSC Decision Criteria Memo dated March 28, 2022 (this memo)
- A comprehensive list of what applicants must submit to PSC as well as the dates/schedule for submission. This will include the Project Information Form (PIF) as well as all additional materials required for project review including detailed budgets, project schedules, and proof of DAC eligibility (if submitting as a DAC).
- The final list of projects recommended by the PSC, as well as a breakdown of grant funding between all recommended projects, to be posted upon approval by the CC.
- The final PSC spreadsheet showing the aggregated point scores for each project submitted, but not individual ratings per reviewer per project.

The PSC will also require an email address for a Point of Contact from applicants for questions/feedback to be submitted along with the project application. The PSC will send confirmation emails to these addresses upon receipt of the required project application materials. Once the scoring process is complete, the PSC will present a list of recommended projects to the CC for final approval. The PSC will provide general feedback on proposals during the PSC proposal evaluation meeting. This information will be recorded by a scribe in the evaluation meeting and can be made available upon request by applicants.

Internal PSC Requirements:

The CC will approve the members who will serve in the PSC. The CC will also consider potential compensation for community representatives to participate. Once the PSC for Proposition 1 Round 2 projects is formed, the PSC will host a technical training for all PSC members that will introduce the materials and technology to be used to review and score project applications. PSC members will be instructed on how to access, add information to, and save the shared Google Docs. The PSC will have a mockup scoring session to ensure all scorers can access the shared Google Docs and successfully enter the full range of scores for a hypothetical project. The PSC will also consider assigning a subset of the volunteer PSC to review and eliminate any proposals that do not meet DWR eligibility criteria to save the full PSC time scoring them.

Sincerely,

Brian Mendenhall, Valley Water (on behalf of the Project Screening Committee)

| Final DWR Scoring Criteria | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Proposition 1, Round 2 | | | | | |
| Scoring Criteria - Proposal Level Evaluation | | | | | |
| Q# | Questions | Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain: | Leg Citation | Form/Question No. | Maximum Points Available |
| 1 | If the IRWM region has been identified as an area where contaminants listed in AB 1249 exist, does the proposal contain project(s) that address the contaminant(s)? | Provide specific explanation of how the project(s) addresses existing AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point) If the requirements of AB 1249 do not apply to the applicant 's IRWM region(s), full points awarded. | 10541 (e)(14) | GRanTS Application | 1 |
| Maximum Possible Proposal Score | | | | | 1 |
| Scoring Criteria - Project Level Evaluation | | | | | |
| Q# | Questions | Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain: | Leg Citation | Form/Question No. | Maximum Points Available |
| 2 | Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources? | Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/ or other fund sources. (1 point) | 79707 (b) | Attachment 3 | 1 |
| 3 | Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified? | Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Work Plan appears to be sufficiently complete, with all deliverables identified, and reasonable given the intent of the project. (3 points) The Work Plan is generally complete and/ or deliverables generally listed, but it appears pertinent information is missing or gaps in the scope of work are identified. (2 points) The Work Plan is sparsely filled out, with minimal information and/or minimal deliverables listed. (1 point) | | Attachment 2 | 3 |
| 4 | Collectively, are the Work Plan , Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other? Considerations include: Are the tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget consistent? Are the costs presented in the Budget backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? Is the Schedule reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan? | Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR, including: Tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) Costs presented in the Budget are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) A Schedule that is reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan, which indicates the project will likely be completed by the end date listed in Attachment 6. (1 point) | | Attachment 2,3, and 4 | 3 |
| 5 | Is the primary benefit* claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? * For Decision Support Tools, non-physical benefits will be considered. | A properly completed quantification of at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project. For physical (quantitative) benefit(s) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.)? (1 point) Is the benefit description and <u>quantitative</u> measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? Does the claimed benefit use industry standard units of measure (as described in D.2)? (1 point) For non-physical (qualitative) benefit(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.)? (1 point) Is the benefit description and <u>qualitative</u> measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? (1 point) | N/ A | GRanTS Application | 2 |
| 6 | Does the project provide physical benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area? | A sufficient description of the benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area . The description must include an explanation of the benefits to various IRWM regions and/or Funding Areas. (1 point) | 79742(a) | GRanTS Application | 1 |
| 7 | If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB 1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small, disadvantaged community? | Provide specific explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2022 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point) Full points awarded if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. | 10545 | GRanTS Application | 1 |
| 8 | Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices? | A reasonable explanation of how a project employs new or innovative technology or practices, including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc. Technologies that were developed and/ or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g., Smart Meters , new apps , etc.) New applications of existing technologies Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects | 79707(e) | GRanTS Application | 1 |
| Maximum Possible Project Score | | | | | 12 |
| Max possible DWR Criteria | | | | | |
| | | | | TOTAL | 13 |

| Draft Bay Area IRWM Regional Scoring Criteria | Questions | Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain: | Leg Citation | Form/Question No. | Maximum Points Available |
|---|---|---|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| 9 | Is the project consistent with the IRWM plan and Bay Area IRWM identified needs focused on the following: climate change? | Project includes consideration for climate change. (2 points if climate adaptation is the primary project purpose, 1 point if it is an additional benefit) | | | 2 |
| 10 | Does the project provide benefits to underrepresented communities (e.g. disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, Tribes)? | <p>The applicant demonstrates* (points are additive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project supports a DAC or Tribe generally. (1 point) • Project supports an identified need from the Prop 1 DACTIP needs assessment. (1 point) • Project includes a support letter from the affected community. (1 point) <p>* Applicants shall provide documentation demonstrating at least 20% of the project benefits are for underrepresented communities via publicly available data tools to determine eligibility for Q#10 points</p> | | | 3 |
| 11 | Does the project include training and communication between the community and agencies planning, implementing, operating and maintaining a project? | Project includes a component of training and communication between the community and agencies where applicable, including aspects related to planning, implementation, and/or operations and maintenance of the project. (1 point) | | | 1 |
| 12 | Does the project raise an issue of impacts to cultural resources? | Project raises concerns of impacts to cultural resources and provides proof of communication with an affected Tribe, including response and endorsement from the Tribe. (1 point) | | | 1 |
| 13 | Does the project provide safe, clean water from contaminants other than those listed in AB1249? | <p>Project considers safe, clean water and impacts by contaminants not listed in AB1249. (2 points for communities meeting at least 20% threshold* as underrepresented communities [e.g. disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, Tribes], 1 point for any applicant addressing contaminants).</p> <p>* To be eligible for 2 points on Q#13, applicants shall provide documentation demonstrating that at least 20% of the project benefits are for underrepresented communities via publicly available data tools</p> | | | 2 |
| 14 | Is the project being planned and implemented as a partnership (e.g. multiple organizations, counties/areas)? | Bay Area IRWM recognizes the benefit of partnering and/or covering an extended area with a project. Point for the project clearly describing a collaborative element either across multiple areas (i.e. cities, counties, watersheds, IRWM subregions), multiple jurisdictions (i.e. multiple cities or counties), or multiple organizations (e.g. cities, counties, water districts, non-profits, communities, Tribes). (1 point) | | | 1 |
| 15 | Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits? | Project provides for multiple (more than one) benefits, with focus on meeting statewide priorities and regional needs. (2 points) | | | 2 |
| Maximum Possible Project Regional Score | | | | | 12 |