

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

Scoring Criteria - Proposal Level Evaluation (Proposal includes all DAC and General Projects)					
Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
1	Does the proposal support the intent of IRWM? Is coordination and /or collaboration within and between agencies, regions, and/or Funding Areas discussed? Are any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized discussed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal supports the intent of IRWM as discussed in the 2019 Guidelines and the IRWM Planning Act. (1 point) A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal demonstrates coordination and/or collaboration within and between agencies regions, and/or Funding Areas. (1 point) A sufficient description of any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized. (1 point) 	10531; 79741(b)	Proposal Summary/ 8	3
2	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)?	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses 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)	Proposal Summary /PIF/D.5	1
3	Does the proposal include one or more projects that provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. The applicant will receive one (1) point for each project, up to a maximum of two (2) points.	106.3 (AB 685)	PIF/D.6	2 1
Maximum Possible Proposal Score					6

Scoring Criteria – Project Level Evaluation

Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
Meeting Needs of the Region/Nexus to the IRWM Plan					
4	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	79707(a)	PIF/B.2	1
5	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1? Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.? Does the narrative include other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point) The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A) The narrative includes other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits. (1 point) 	NA	PIF/D.1	3 2
6	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point) A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point) 	79741(a); 79742(e)	PIF/B.4	2
Work Plan, Budget, Schedule, and Grant Agreement Readiness					
7	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?	<p>Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR.</p> <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) 	NA	Attachment 4	3

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

8	<p>Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other?</p> <p>Considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the <u>project description</u> clearly and concisely address all required topics listed in section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project? Are the tasks shown in the <u>Work Plan, Schedule and Budget</u> consistent? Are the costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? Is the <u>Schedule</u> reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan? 	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A <u>Project Description</u> that clearly and concisely addresses all required topics listed in Section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project. (1 point) Tasks shown in the <u>Work Plan, Schedule and Budget</u> that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) Costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) A <u>Schedule</u> 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) 	NA	PIF/C and Attachments 4-6	4
9	<p>Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points) Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point) Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points) Full points awarded if not applicable. 	NA	PIF/D.11	2
Project Benefits and Program Preferences					
10	<p>Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point) 	79707(b)	Attachment 5	1
11	<p>Is the primary benefit* claimed in Table 3 of the Project Information Form logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan?</p> <p>*For Decision Support Tools, non-physical benefits will be considered.</p>	<p>A properly completed Table 3 for at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project.</p> <p>For physical (quantitative) benefit(s):</p> <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) <p>For non-physical (qualitative) benefit(s):</p> <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) 	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	2
12	<p>Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?</p>	<p>Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 11? (1 point)</p>	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	1
13	<p>Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?</p>	<p>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)</p>	79742(a)	PIF/D.3	1
14	<p>If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point) Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. 	10545	PIF/D.5	1
15	<p>Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?</p>	<p>A reasonable explanation of how a project employs new or innovative technology or practices, including, but not limited to: Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc. (1 point)</p>	79707(e)	PIF/D.7	1
16	<p>Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?</p>	<p>A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)</p>	NA	PIF/D.8 and/or D.9 and/or D.10 & Attachments 7-9	1
Cost Considerations					

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

17	Did the applicant provide a narrative on cost considerations that is fully explained based on information requested in the Project Information Form?	<p>A narrative on cost considerations that provides at least one of the factors listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were other projects evaluated with similar levels of claimed (quantitative or qualitative) benefits as the proposed project? • In terms of cost, is a justification provided as to why the project was selected? <p>One of the cost considerations listed above is sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (1 point) Both of the cost considerations listed above are sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (2 points)</p>	NA	PIF/D.4	2
Maximum Possible Individual Project Level Score					24
Average DAC Project Score			Average General Project Score		
(Sum of Individual DAC Project Scores/ Number of DAC Projects; rounded to the nearest whole number)		24	(Sum of Individual General Project Scores/ Number of General Projects; rounded to the nearest whole number)		24
DAC Application Score		Maximum Possible Score	General Application Score		Maximum Possible Score
Enter Proposal Score		6	Enter Proposal Score		6
Enter Average DAC Project Score		24	Enter Average General Project Score		24
Bonus Point: At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?		1	Bonus Point: At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?		1
DAC Application Score (Sum Above Three Rows)		31	General Application Score (Sum Above Three Rows)		31