NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP

2014 IRWM Drought Project Grant Application

ATTACHMENT 1:

Authorization & Eligibility Requirements

Integrated Regional Water Management Program
Applicant: Humboldt County

Project Consistency with an adopted IRWM Plan

Section 7 of the NCIRWM Plan, Phase III describes the process steps and guidelines developed by the NCRP PRP and TPRC and utilized by the PRP and TPRC to identify, rank, and select priority projects to implement the NCIRWMP. The current NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines standardize the process and are subject to continual review and refinement per recommendations of the PRP, TPRC, NCRP staff, and the DWR's IRWM Grant Program Guidelines. The NCIRWM Plan Phase III can be found at http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002462.

To be included in the NCIRWMP and to qualify for related funding opportunities, projects proposed for PRP and TPRC approval must demonstrate how project implementation will contribute to achieving one or more of the specific NCIRWMP Goals & Objectives outlined in Section 4 of the NCIRWM Plan. Projects must also align with the priorities of local, Tribal, regional, state, and federal stakeholders, as well as the state's IRWM Program Preferences. These and other North Coast priorities provide the foundation for ongoing refinement of the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines.

The NCRP is committed to transparency, stakeholder inclusion and process improvement. At the July 21, 2011 NCRP meeting, the Policy Review Panel (PRP) directed the formation of an ad hoc committee comprised of PRP and Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) members and staff to evaluate the existing approach to project evaluation and ranking and to develop a draft approach for consideration at future NCRP PRP meetings. An on-line survey and interviews were conducted of ad-hoc committee members, TPRC members, and project proponents to gather information about the existing process and to make recommendations for improvement of the process. The interview summary and summary of recommendations can be found at (http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002175). With this information as the basis, the ad-hoc committee developed the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines. The Guidelines were used during the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Proposition 84 Round 2 Implementation project solicitation. On March 1, 2012 the TPRC conducted a NCRP project review and selection process debriefing meeting and developed a listing suggested process improvements. These were presented to the PRP during the April 2013 NCRP quarterly meeting. The TPRC project review and selection process debriefing meeting summary and presentation can be found at http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002449.

In March 2014, the ad-hoc committee reviewed and refined sections of the Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines based on input from the TPRC project review de-brief meeting and the Draft 2014 IRWM Guidelines and Draft 2014 Drought Proposal Solicitation Package. The draft NCRP 2014 Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines and draft NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation Project Application were approved by the PRP during the April 17, 2014 meeting with the provision that they would be finalized based on input from the TPRC. The meeting materials and summary can be found at: http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002542

In late April, the TPRC finalized the NCRP 2014 Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines and NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation Project Application and the NCRP announced the 2014 IRWM Drought Project Solicitation. A copy of the ***NCRP Review and Selection Process Guidelines*** are included as Appendix C of this Attachment.

On May 26, 2014 the NCRP received 23 Drought Project Proposals with a total project cost of $26,503,309 and a request of IRWM funds totaling $19,581,530. Projects were individually reviewed and scored by the TPRC using a score sheet based upon NCRP and IRWM program criteria as defined in the *NCRP Review and Selection Process Guidelines*. On June 9 &10 the TPRC conducted two days of productive meetings to review the Drought Project Proposals. Information about the proposed Drought Projects in the North Coast can be found at the following webpage and includes project proposal applications, summary, project locations map, NCRP TPRC Drought Project Review Meeting Summary and TPRC Recommendation. http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/Content/10447/preview.html

During the NCRP PRP meeting on June 13, the PRP reviewed and considered the TPRC recommendation and finalized the portfolio of NCRP IRWM 2014 Drought Priority Projects. The NCRP conforms to Brown Act requirements and all NCRP meetings are open to the public; meeting schedules are publicized in advance, and meeting agendas are publically posted at the meeting location, NCIRWMP website and calendar and include standing agenda items for Public Comment. Appendix D of this Attachment includes the NCRP PRP Meeting Summary for June 13 that includes the record of approval, by majority vote, of the Priority Project portfolio for inclusion in the NCRP 2014 IRWM Drought Project Grant for submittal to DWR.

The total budget for the proposed NCRP 2014 IRWM Drought Project Grant is $8,700,000, the cap established for the drought project grant by the PRP during the NCRP Meeting on during the April 17, 2014. All eligible projects are included in the NCIRWM Plan and the project list, scores and review summaries are listed at http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/Content/10447/preview.html. All of the projects that were ranked by the TPRC and PRP are important projects for the region – individually and comprehensively addressing the goals and objectives of the NCIRWMP, as well as DWR's program preferences and statewide priorities. Following is a list of Priority Projects and their project proponents approved for inclusion in the NCRP 2014 IRWM Drought Project Grant proposal.

North Coast Resource Partnership 2014 IRWM Drought Projects

#	Project Sponsor, Project Name	County / Tribe
1	City of Rio Dell, Rio Dell and Scotia Community Service District Emergency Water Intertie Project	Humboldt
2	City of Ukiah, Ukiah Valley-Redwood Valley Water Supply Reliability Intertie and Well Development Project	Mendocino
4	Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma-Mendocino Immediate Drought Relief Project	Mendocino, Sonoma
5	Lewiston Park Mututal Water Company, Meter Installation Project	Trinity
7	City of Fort Bragg, Summers Lane Reservoir Project	Mendocino
8	Gualala River Watershed Council, The Flow Bank - Protecting Stream Flow in the Gualala River	Mendocino, Sonoma
9	Sanctuary Forest Inc., Mattole Flow Program: Storage and Forbearance	Humboldt, Mendocino
12	Yurok Tribe, Weitchpec Water Station Project	Yurok Tribe
13	Westhaven Community Services District, Water Loss Reduction Project	Humboldt

20	California Land Stewardship Institute, Agricultural Water Conservation and Water Supply Reliability Program - Russian and Navarro River Watersheds	Mendocino
21	City of Crescent City, Elevated Water Tank Rehabilitation Project	Del Norte
	Humboldt County, Contract Administration	

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP

2014 IRWM Drought Project Grant Application

ATTACHMENT 1:

Authorization & Eligibility Requirements

APPENDIX C

NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, 2014

Integrated Regional Water Management Program
Applicant: Humboldt County

North Coast Resource Partnership

Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines

2014

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP

Table of Contents

Background 2

Schedule for development and approval of the Project Review and Selection Process 3

Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles 4

NCRP Project Application, Review & Selection Process 5

Guidelines for Public Input and Project Proponent Input during the Project Review Process 7

NCRP Conflict of Interest Policy 8

On-Going Project Inclusion Process into the NCIRWM Plan 9

Project Budget Under-runs and Funding Reallocation Process 10

PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection 11

Background

The North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) is committed to transparency, stakeholder inclusion and process improvement. At the July 21, 2011 NCRP meeting, the Policy Review Panel (PRP) directed the formation of an ad hoc committee comprised of PRP and Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) members and staff to evaluate the existing approach to project evaluation and ranking and to develop a draft approach for consideration at future NCRP PRP meetings. An on-line survey and interviews were conducted of ad-hoc committee members, TPRC members, and project proponents to gather information about the existing process and to make recommendations for improvement of the process. The interview summary and summary of recommendations can be found at (http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002175). With this information as the basis, the ad-hoc committee developed the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines. The Guidelines were used during the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Proposition 84 Round 2 Implementation project solicitation. On March 1, 2012 the TPRC conducted a NCRP project review and selection process debriefing meeting and developed a listing suggested process improvements. These were presented to the PRP during the April 2013 NCRP quarterly meeting. The TPRC project review and selection process debriefing meeting summary and presentation can be found at http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002449.

In March 2014, the ad-hoc committee reviewed and refined sections of the Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines based on input from the TPRC project review de-brief meeting and the Draft 2014 IRWM Guidelines and Draft 2014 Drought Proposal Solicitation Package. The draft NCRP 2014 Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines and draft NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation Project Application were approved by the PRP during the April 17, 2014 meeting with the provision that they would be finalized based on input from the TPRC. The meeting materials and summary can be found at: http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/docs.php?ogid=1000002542

Schedule for NCRP 2014 Drought Project Solicitation, Project Proposal Review and Selection Process

This schedule is subject to change based on new information and the final 2014 IRWM Guidelines and final 2014 Drought Proposal Solicitation Package expected to be released by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in June.

- March – April 2014: The Project Review Ad-hoc Committee and staff refine the Project Review and Selection Process based on TPRC input; develop portions of the application, developed review and selection process based on the draft IRWM 2014 Guidelines and draft Proposition 84 Expedited Drought Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package (announced by Department of Water Resources (DWR) on April 3, 2014.

- April 17, 2014 NCRP meeting: Report out of ad-hoc committee actions; PRP and TPRC review and provide direction and approve NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines, 2014

- April 2014: Ad-hoc committee and staff refine the final NCRP 2014 Drought Project Application materials and NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines
- Late April – May 2014: NCRP project solicitation for IRWM Proposition 84 Expedited Drought Implementation Project grant funding
- Early May - Informational & Assistance Workshops held throughout the North Coast Region
- May – early-June: TPRC project review period & project review meeting; selection of priority proposals; a TPRC project evaluation conference call or meeting will be held prior to the TPRC project review period
- Mid-June: PRP consider/approve TPRC suite of Priority North Coast Projects for IRWM Proposition 84 Expedited Drought Implementation Project funding
- July (subject to change): regional application due to DWR for IRWM Proposition 84 Expedited Drought Implementation Project grant funding
- Late 2015 (subject to change): Expected grant proposal for remaining Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation Grant funds

---

Description of the NCRP Project Evaluation Roles

Policy Review Panel

The Policy Review Panel (PRP) is the governing and decision-making body for the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP). The composition of the PRP and decision-making process is defined in Section 5.4 of the NCIRWMP Memorandum of Mutual Understandings (MoMU). The role of the PRP 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 PRP provides direction about how the project evaluation and selection process aligns with the NCRP priorities by defining project review and selection guidelines (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*). Taking into account review and recommendations from the Technical Peer Review Committee, the PRP approves all projects included in the NCRP and approves the region's highest priority projects for grant submittals. As defined in the MoMU, the PRP is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act and 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 PRP and evaluates and makes recommendations based on technical expertise and scientific data. The composition of the TPRC is defined

in the NCRP MoMU and is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. 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 PRP and set by the funding solicitation. The TPRC prepares a draft suite of priority projects for review by the PRP. Scoring criteria and evaluation outcomes from the TPRC are available for public review.

NCRP Staff
The role of NCRP staff during the project application, review and selection process is to facilitate and ensure the integrity of the process. Staff develops and coordinates project application materials; performs outreach and makes information available to the PRP, 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 PRP (NCRP meeting, July 2013) staff will support project proponents in coordinating and potentially integrating projects in the same watershed or project area (e.g., informing project proponents of opportunities to partner or gain economies of scope and scale by combining projects) where timing allows and in accordance with the source funding proposal process and eligibility requirements.

NCRP Project Application, Review & Selection Process

The NCRP project application, review and selection process is a multi-step process:

1. **NCRP Projects, Preliminary Project Information**
   Project proponents will upload Preliminary Project information to the NCRP website on an ongoing basis; project proponents will submit a signed MoMU; staff will publish eligible NCRP Projects (*see On-Going Project Inclusion Process below*).

2. **NCRP Project Solicitation, Supplemental Project Information**
   At the direction of the PRP and when there is a funding opportunity, a call for proposals will be announced to North Coast stakeholders. 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, all of which will be reviewed by the TPRC and PRP and approved by the PRP. Project applicants will provide application materials to NCRP staff via email. A Microsoft Word version of 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 technical assistance via workshops and informal meetings by phone, internet and in person.

3. **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. When packaging the project application materials for each TPRC member, staff will randomize chronology of the project applications so that TPRC members are reviewing project

applications in a 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 PRP defined guidelines (*see PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection section*) and their professional expertise and judgment. 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. 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.

4. **Group TPRC review of NCRP Project Applications**
   Staff will compile all TPRC individual scores to determine an initial average project score. In adherence to a high standard of professional conduct, TPRC members and staff will meet to discuss each project and may make adjustments to their individual scores based on the group discussion. To ensure a comprehensive project proposal review process, TPRC member attendance is strongly encouraged at this meeting. Any necessary background information or project-level clarification will be provided to the TPRC by NCRP staff. 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.

5. **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 technical project scores, project scalability and potential funding allowance, as well as the overall balance of projects based on the PRP's defined guidelines for project selection (*see PRP 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.

6. **PRP Review, Consideration and Final Approval of the Suite of NCRP Priority Projects**
   During a NCRP meeting, the PRP will review and amend the draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects recommended by the TPRC, along with the contingency list, and will approve a final suite of NCRP Priority Projects and contingency projects to forward to the funding entity. The PRP – comprised of elected public officials or their designees and elected Tribal representatives – will make their final decision based on TPRC recommendations, PRP guidelines and other factors that they believe represent

the best interest of the North Coast region. For more information on the process by which PRP members are selected, refer to the NCIRWMP Memorandum of Mutual Understanding (MOMU). 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.

7. **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 additional information for a project cannot be provided within the requested timeframe, that project would not be able to be included in the regional application and another project would 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, particularly with rounds of expedited funding. It will contain numerous conditions and default provisions. An example of a DWR grant agreement, from the latest Prop 84 Round 2 funding opportunity, is available online: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/docs/ResourcesLinks/ContractTemplates/GrantAgreement_Template_P84R2_FINAL_2014_02.pdf. The terms of the agreement that will be used for this funding opportunity will likely be similar. However, it is important to note that those specific terms have yet to be determined by DWR.

   Preliminary Project information for all eligible projects will be published to the NCRP website on an ongoing basis as described in "*On-Going Project Inclusion Process*" below and included in the NCIRWM Plan.

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. 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. Project proponents, interested stakeholders and members of the public will be invited to speak on any item on the TPRC's agenda during public comment. The TPRC may ask brief questions of the commenter for clarification, but will not engage in discussion or debate an issue with any member of the public. The TPRC Chair(s) may place time limits on public comment. Public comment and materials delivered to staff from the public will be published on the NCRP website.

In the event that the TPRC requests specific or detailed clarifying information from a project proponent, a request will be made to NCRP staff and conveyed to the project proponent for response. All requests for clarifying information and responses thereto will be documented and made available to the public via the NCRP website.

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 PRP members will disclose any potential financial interest in a project. If a TPRC or PRP 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 PRP 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 PRP 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 PRP or TPRC member may wish to request the advice of their colleagues on the PRP 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 PRP 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, 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, or his/her designee, will be supported by staff to ensure the process adheres to the Conflict of Interest Policy established by the PRP.

On-Going Project Inclusion Process into the NCIRWM Plan

Background

Increasingly, funding opportunities for project implementation require or give preference to projects that are included in an IRWM Plan. The following process will provide a mechanism for including projects on an on-going basis into the NCIRWM Plan.

1. Project proponents will complete preliminary on-line project information:
    - Project Name
    - Organization Name, Type & Contact information
    - Project location address (for mapping purposes)
    - Funding Program names
    - Total project cost & Funding request
    - Start/End dates (tentative)
    - Alignment with NCIRWMP Objectives (selection boxes)
    - Project Summary & Goals
    - Project partners
    - Description of benefits (including if/how the project will benefit DACs)
    - Project management strategies/ project elements (selection boxes)

2. Project proponent will submit a signed MoMU

3. Staff will review the project and follow-up with project proponents regarding any eligibility concerns (Urban Water Management Plan, Agricultural Water Management, Surface Water Diverter, Groundwater Management Plan, CASGEM compliance, proponent type)

4. The TPRC will review and accept eligible projects

5. Staff will 'Publish' eligible NCRP Projects; project summaries will be included on the website; project locations will be included on the interactive map; and staff will report to the PRP at a NCRP meeting

6. Additional project information will be required when funding solicitations and calls for proposals occur; NCRP project proponents will be allowed to edit preliminary project upload information.
7. NCRP Projects will be reviewed and scored by the TPRC if required by a respective funding solicitation; NCRP Priority Projects will be selected by the PRP. NCRP Priority Project proponents may need to adopt the NCIRWM Plan when completed as per the IRWM Guidelines.

Project Budget Under-runs and Funding Reallocation Process

Background: In some cases, a NCRP implementation project may complete under budget or otherwise not expend their entire grant allotment. Typically the funding agencies have allowed reallocation of funds to another project *within the suite* of projects included in the grant agreement for additional work toward the project. In previous instances where there has been funding to reallocate, the PRP has reallocated the funding to the projects within the county where the under-budget project occurred. The PRP members from that county have in turn determined how to reallocate the money to project(s) within that county.

It is expected that with current and future funding there will be projects that are completed under-budget and/or will have remaining funds to reallocate.

NCRP Project Funding Reallocation Process

1. The project funding reallocation will occur within the County where the original project is located and is within the existing suite of projects in the grant agreement.

2. PRP members from the County and Tribal region where the original project is located will determine which projects receive reallocation and the amount of funding

3. If the County of origin option is not available (i.e., no projects from the County of origin within the project suite need additional funding):
    a. Staff will announce the availability of funds to project proponents within the grant agreement suite of projects; staff will solicit project requests and description of need from eligible project proponents
    b. Staff will determine eligible projects
    c. TPRC ad-hoc committee will be formed (at NCRP meeting if timing allows)
    d. Ad-hoc committee will develop criteria for project reallocation selection
    e. Ad-hoc committee will develop project reallocation option recommendations
    f. TPRC will review ad-hoc committee option recommendations
    g. PRP will review and approve recommendations at the next PRP meeting
    h. TPRC ad-hoc committee will be disbanded

4. Future grant applications: During the TPRC and PRP review process, projects will be identified to receive priority should additional funding become available; priority will be given to projects within the County where the original projects are located.

PRP Directed Guidelines for Project Scoring and Selection

Background

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

Regional Representation

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

Economically Disadvantaged Community (DAC) [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 DACs. The PRP reserves the right to prioritize DAC 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.

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 in the relevant watershed, sub-watershed or project impact area.

Programmatic Integration and 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

---

[1] *Definition for Economically Disadvantaged Community (DAC)*: Department of Water Resources defines "disadvantaged community" as a community with an annual household income that is less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income*

d) Projects that provide multi-benefits will be prioritized (where all else is equal)
e) Projects that address specific targets as identified by the PRP, 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 PRP.

North Coast Resource Partnership 2014 Drought Solicitation Project Proposal Scoring Criteria

Please note that all Criteria are scored on a 0 – 5 basis with a weighting factor applied where:

- A score of 5 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.
- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is minimally addressed and not documented.
- A score of 0 points will be awarded where the criterion is not addressed.

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Application Questions Used to Inform Score
Eligibility Criteria 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, does the groundwater basin have a monitoring entity established? Is the organization required to file an Urban Water Management Plan, Agricultural Water Management Plan and/or a Surface Water Diversion Report?		y/n y/n y/n y/n y/n	**Section B: Eligibility** • NCRP Goals/Objectives **(B.1 & B.2)** • Eligible Project Type **(B. 3)** • Water Conservation Law Compliance **(B. 4 all)**
Drought Impacts Does the proposal clearly identify the water management impacts due to the 2014 drought and anticipated impacts if the drought continues in	3	**0 – 15** (0-5 x 3 = 0-15)	**Section D: Drought Impacts** • Drought impacts **(D.1)** • Water conservation measures/restrictions **(D.2)** • Drought impacts addressed by project **(D.4-6)**

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Application Questions Used to Inform Score
2015? Were water conservation measures/restrictions, mandatory or voluntary, that have been implemented as a result of the 2014 Drought identified and uploaded? Does the applicant clearly describe how the proposed project will alleviate the identified drought impacts?			
Project Information Does the Project Description include a clear problem statement and appropriate solution? Do the goals and objectives of the Proposal help to achieve the goals and objectives of the NCIRWM Plan? 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 and reasonable Major Tasks, Deliverables and Timeframe for implementing the project?	2	**0 – 10** (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)	**Section C: Project Information** • Project Description/Summary **(C.2)** • Specific Goals and Objectives **(C.3)** **Section E: Project Tasks, Budget and Schedule** • CEQA and Permitting **(E.5-7)** • Major Tasks, Schedule and Budget **(E.10)** **Section H: Justification & Technical Basis of Project** • Projected physical benefits **(H.5)** • Project monitoring **(H.6)**
Project Budget 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?	1	**0 – 5** (0-5 x 1 = 0-5)	**Section E: Project Tasks, Budget and Schedule** • Major Tasks, Schedule and Budget **(E.10)** • Project Cost Basis **(E.11)** • Financial Need of the Proposal **(E.12)** • Source for Matching Funds **(E.13)**

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Application Questions Used to Inform Score
If the project does not benefit a critical water supply or water quality issue for an economically disadvantaged community, does the project budget include a 25% non-state match that is reliable? 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?			
Project Readiness Does the schedule demonstrate that it is reasonable to expect that the project with start construction/implementation by April 2015? Has the project proponent implemented similar projects in the past? Does the project proponent have the capacity and resources to implement this project? What phase is the project currently in? Are there feasibility studies, assessments and/or design plans for this project? Does the Proposal include an appropriate list of required CEQA and other permits to implement the project?	2	**0 – 10** (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)	**Section E: Project Tasks, Budget and Schedule** • Current Project Phase **(E.1)** • Projected Start/End Date **(E.2-3)** • CEQA and Permitting **(E.5-7)** • Major Tasks, Schedule and Budget **(E.10)** **Section A: Organization Information** • Similar project implementation **(A.6)**
Project Justification & Technical Basis 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 technical analysis support the claimed physical benefits? Does the project include adequate project performance monitoring?	2	**0 – 10** (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)	**Section H: Justification & Technical Basis of Project** • Existing Plans and Reports **(H.1)** • Scientific and Technical Basis **(H.1-3)** • Projected physical benefits **(H.5)** • Project monitoring **(H.6)**

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Application Questions Used to Inform Score
Project Benefits Does the project implement effective strategies and provide multiple benefits? Are the benefits claimed of a magnitude appropriate to the cost of project and the grant request? Does the project appreciably benefit impaired water bodies, sensitive habitats or protected areas (i.e. Areas of Biological Significance, Marine Protected Areas, Critical Coastal Areas or other protected areas)? Will the project effectively improve conditions for salmonids and other endangered/threatened species? Does the project measurably address climate change by reducing GHG emissions, carbon, or water demand or by incorporating energy efficiency or other strategies? Are there likely other benefits not claimed as a result of this project? Are the qualitative benefits significant? Is the Proposal part of a larger multi-phased project that leverages other benefits and resources? Is this project supported locally and/or politically? Is there opposition to this project? Are their collaborative partnerships involved in the project?	2	**0 – 10** (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)	**Section I: Project Benefits (I . 1-5; all)** **Section C: Project Information** • Project Description/Summary **(C.2)** • Specific Goals and Objectives **(C.3)** • Population Served **(C.4 & 5)** • Impaired Waterbodies **(C.6)** • Regulatory Compliance Enforcement **(C.7)** **Section D: Drought Impacts (D.1 -7; all)** **Section F: Collaborative Partnerships (F.1-5; all)**
Project Benefits to Economically Disadvantaged Communities Is the project located in an economically disadvantaged community (DAC)?	2	**0 – 10** (0-5 x 2 = 0-10)	**Section C: Project Information** • Project Description/Summary **(C.2)** • Population Served **(C.4 & 5)** **Section G: Project Location:**

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Application Questions Used to Inform Score
Does the project significantly improve a DACs public health, water supply and/or water quality? Was the description of how the project benefits the economically disadvantaged community adequate? Will this project mitigate an existing or potential Cease and Desist Order or other regulatory compliance enforcement action?			• Is the project located in a DAC? **(G.5)** **Section I: Project Benefits (I . 1-5; all)** **Project Information:** • Regulatory Compliance Enforcement **(C.7)**
Professional Judgment and PRP Directed Criteria 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/NCIRWMP 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? Is this the project proponent's highest priority project submitted to the NCIRWMP?	1	**0 – 5** (0-5 x 1 = 0-5)	**Section B: Eligibility** • NCRP Goals/Objectives **(B.1 & B.2)** • Eligible Project Type **(B. 3)** **Section C: Project Information** • Project Description/Summary **(C.2)** • Specific Goals and Objectives **(C.3)** **Section F: Collaborative Partnerships (F.1-5; all)** **Section I: Project Benefits (I . 1-5; all)**
Total Score		**0 - 75**	

NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP

2014 IRWM Drought Project Grant Application

ATTACHMENT 1:

Authorization & Eligibility Requirements

APPENDIX D

NCRP PRP Meeting Summary for June 13, 2014

Integrated Regional Water Management Program
Applicant: Humboldt County

North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP)

Policy Review Panel (PRP) & Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) Meeting
June 13, 2014; 3 pm; Conference Call
MEETING SUMMARY

Conference call-in number: 1-888-947-3988; Conference code: 371890

Meeting Materials: http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/Content/10447/preview.html

I Welcome and Introductions

PRP Chair, Jake Mackenzie convened the meeting at 3:05 pm and welcomed all participants. Meeting participant introductions were made by noticed location (location addresses – Attachment A).

Attendees:
PRP:
- Del Norte: Supervisors Gerry Hemmingsen & David Finnegan
- Humboldt: Supervisors Ryan Sundberg & Mark Lovelace
- Mendocino: Supervisors John McGowan & Dan Gjerde
- Sherwood Valley Rancheria: Carol Cook
- Siskiyou: Supervisors Grace Bennet & Marcia Armstrong
- Sonoma: Jake Mackenzie & Supervisor Efren Carrillo
- Trinity: Supervisor Judy Morris & Mark Lancaster (alternate)

TPRC:
- Sherwood Valley: Javier Silva, Sherwood Valley Rancheria
- Sonoma: Wayne Haydon, California Geologic Survey & Dale Roberts, Sonoma County Water Agency
- Trinity: Sandra Perez, Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program

Public:
- Del Norte: Eric Wier, Tom Romesburg of Crescent City
- Humboldt: Bill Verick, Westhaven Community Services
- Mendocino: Tim Erickson, Kevin Jones of City of Ukiah; Laurel Marcus, CLSI
- Sherwood Valley: Joy Wildflower, California Department of Public Health
- Siskiyou: None
- Trinity: None

Staff:

- Humboldt: Jennifer Jenkins Kuszmar
- Sonoma: Katherine Gledhill

Public - Other Locations:

- Nicole Sager, Klamath Tribal office
- Tasha McKee, Sanctuary Forest
- Tom Vargas, City of Fort Bragg
- Steve Shupe – Sonoma County Counsel

Chair Mackenzie introduced the topic and purpose of the meeting and provided background information. In 2006 Proposition 84 allocated $37 M to the North Coast; $19.7 M is currently remaining in the allocation. During the April NCRP meeting in Yreka, the PRP unanimously approved the motion that directed staff to move forward with a NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation with a funding cap of $8.7 M. If funded, this would leave $11 M for the final round of Proposition 84 funding. In addition, the PRP approved that the NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation grant would be considered phase one of two funding phases to ensure regional representation in project selection for the remaining Proposition 84 Implementation funding. During the final 2015 Proposition 84 Implementation Funding round, project selection will take into account the location of the NCRP 2014 Drought Projects, if funded.

Supervisor McCowen requested clarification whether geographic equity was to be considered during the expedited drought funding. Chair Mackenzie confirmed that regional representation was not a consideration during this round of funding and that decisions made today will influence the final round of Proposition 84 funding and project selection process. Supervisor McCowen stated that the projects were to be reviewed on merit during the drought round of funding.

Chair Mackenzie continued to provide background information and described that on May 26, 2014 the NCRP received 23 Drought Project Proposals in response to a NCRP 2014 Drought Project Solicitation that was announced in late April. The project cost of the project proposals totaled $26.5 M and the total request of IRWM funds was $19.6 M. The TPRC received this information which consisted of over 1200 pages (3” binder) and thoroughly reviewed this material in a 2 week period. The TPRC consists of qualified and dedicated individuals with wide-ranging and relevant expertise. The TPRC evaluated the project proposals according to the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines which were developed by the TPRC and Project Review Ad Hoc Committee which consisted of Supervisor McCowen, Toz Soto, Sandra Perez and Wayne Haydon. The Guidelines have been updated and refined by stakeholder, TPRC and Project Review Ad Hoc Committee interviews and input and approved by the PRP in April 2012 & April 2014.

Chair Mackenzie explained that the purpose of the meeting is for the NCRP Policy Review Panel to consider, amend and finalize the Priority Drought Projects for inclusion in the North Coast 2014 IRWM Drought Project grant application due to California Department of Water Resources on July 21, 2014.

II. Review and Approve Agenda

Chair Mackenzie requests approval of the agenda. No comments.

Motion: Supervisor Sundberg

Second: Supervisor Lovelace

Decision: Unanimous

III Public Comment for items not on the agenda

No Public Comment

IV NCRP Proposition 84, 2014 Drought Grant Priority Project Selection

Chair Mackenzie introduced TPRC Co-chairs, Wayne Haydon and Sandra Perez.

Co-chairs, Wayne Haydon described that on June 9 & 10, 2014 the NCRP TPRC met to review the project proposals and select a recommended portfolio of Priority Drought Projects. Seven TPRC members were in attendance with 2 participating via conference call. The meeting was a public meeting and 15 members of the public participated representing 11 proposed projects. At the request of TPRC members, staff provided input provided by California Department of Public Health and Indian Health Services regarding the proposed projects standing on their 'critical' and 'vulnerable' lists based on drought risk assessments. The Guidelines processes were reviewed by the TPRC members during a project proposal review preparation meeting prior to their proposal review on May 2 and again at the beginning of the TPRC Project Review meeting on June 9. The Guidelines were strictly adhered to.

Wayne Haydon described the review process per the Guidelines. Staff compiled all TPRC individual scores received by the due date to determine an initial average project score. He explained that this preliminary score is meant as a gut check and only included the TPRC scores received by the specified due date. TPRC members and staff met to discuss each project. If the TPRC had questions regarding a project, staff relayed these questions to the project proponent and project-level clarification was provided to the TPRC by NCRP staff. TPRC made adjustments to their individual scores based on the group discussion. Staff compiled all updated TPRC individual scores including scores from TPRC members that provided scores later than that specified due date to determine an updated average project score. The TPRC reviewed the new average scores and determined that many of the lower scored projects (those that scored less than 50) were less competitive under the Drought Expedited Funding Guidelines.

Wayne Haydon stated that the TPRC thoroughly deliberated and selected a draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects and draft budget amounts. The selection process is not based solely on project scores and Wayne quoted from the NCRP Guidelines:

> *"The selection will be based on technical project scores, project scalability and potential funding allowance, as well as the overall balance of projects based on the PRP's defined guidelines for project selection and the collective ability of the projects to meet NCRP goals and be competitive for the funding opportunity."*

Wayne Haydon introduced the TPRC Recommendation for 2014 Drought Priority Projects (see Attachment B).

- The TPRC has consensus on recommending funding $6,039,720 for the listed Priority Projects of the available funding: $8.7 M – 5% admin cost = $8,265,000. The TPRC could not come to consensus on the remaining $2,225,280 for a variety of reasons. Present the TPRC recommendation table.
- The next highly ranked projects exceeded the remaining amount of funds available
- The TPRC felt that many of the lower scored projects (scored less than 50) were less competitive under the Drought Expedited Funding Guidelines

The PRP discussed the TPRC recommendation and the funding cap of $8.7 M. Wayne Haydon explained that the $8.7 M includes the 5% contract administration for Humboldt County leaving $8,265,000 for project implementation funding. Wayne also explained that project proponents were formally asked in the application if their project was scalable. If a project budget was not flexible the TPRC was left to either accept the presented budget or not. Wayne also explained that as this is a state-wide competition it was important to the TPRC to include the most competitive drought-related projects into the recommended portfolio at risk of lowering the over-all regional application.

Supervisor Armstrong asked about shat outreach was conducted regarding the Newell project, not recommended for funding. Wayne explained that the project proponent sent a letter to the TPRC during the review meeting to request revising their entire proposal. TPRC felt that the new proposal could not be accepted at the time that it was presented.

Supervisor Gjerde stated that he had attended the TPRC meeting and listened to the deliberations throughout. Many excellent questions and points were made. It was clear that there were projects that were very strong. Unfortunately there were time constraints in the deliberation process.

Motion: Supervisor Lovelace – to approve the slate as recommended by the TPRC and secondly consider augmenting individual applications up to the $8.7 M limit.

Second: Supervisor Morris: 2nd

Public Comment on the motion:

- Tom Vargas, City of Fort Bragg appreciates ability and consideration to allocate the remaining $2.2 million.
- Eric Wier, Crescent City restated Tom's comments for consideration of funding additional process. Commended the TPRC on their efforts and the responsibility that they have. Crescent City project doesn't necessarily address drought as the first consideration, but water reliability is a DWR eligibility criteria. The elevated tank is a critical component of the Crescent City system serving 15,000 people. This project meets the intent of this grant.

Discussion:

Supervisor Mc Cowan introduced a proposed listing of projects that Supervisor Gjerde emailed to the PRP and TPRC prior to the meeting. He explained that Gjerde prepared an alternative portfolio that result in funding all of the projects from the TPRC recommendation minus one project in Mendocino County. The proposal deducts some funding to 2 Mendocino projects but adds to 2 additional Mendocino projects, as well as funds the Crescent City project, and increases funding to the Westhaven and Sonoma County Water Agency project. Supervisor Gjerde's proposal takes a global approach and funds more projects over a broader geographical area. The proposal would also provide funding to the California Land Stewardship Institute project which involves a recycled water project which if funded, would reduce 200 AF from withdrawal from the Russian River. The City of Ukiah project representatives are in support of Supervisor Gjerde's proposal.

Supervisor Lovelace described that the purpose of the motion was to move forward with a baseline. Given that the projects that would be adjusted are primarily located in Mendocino, defers to the Mendocino PRP members. Supervisor Lovelace withdrew his motion. Supervisor Morris rescinded her motion. Steve Shupe, Sonoma County Counsel confirmed that the motion was dead.

Supervisor Armstrong expressed support for the TPRC's efforts and recommendation.

Motion: Supervisor Armstrong – to approve the slate as recommended by TPRC

***Second*:** Supervisor Bennett

Decision by roll call:
Approved: Chair, Mackenzie, Supervisor Morris, Carol Cook, Supervisor Armstrong, Supervisor Bennett

Opposed: Supervisor Hemmingsen, Supervisor Finigan, Supervisor Sundberg, Supervisor Lovelace, Supervisor McCowen, Supervisor Gjerde, Supervisor Carrillo, Mark Lancaster

Motion fails.

A new motion is made by Supervisor McCowen.

***Motion*:** Supervisor McCowen – to fund the following projects and funding amounts:

- Yurok Tribe, Weitchpec Water Station: $201,770, as recommended
- City of Rio Dell, Rio Dell and Scotia CSD Emergency Water Intertie: $783,000, as recommended
- Lewiston Park Mutual Water Company, Meter Installation: $224,604, as recommended
- Sanctuary Forest Inc., Mattole Flow Program: $255,200, as recommended
- Gualala River Watershed Council, the Flow Bank Program: $594,226, as recommended
- Westhaven Community Services, Water Loss Reduction Project: $493,500, adding <u>$118,000</u>
- Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma-Mendocino Immediate Drought Relief: $1,050,000, adding <u>$300,000</u>
- City of Crescent City, Elevated Water Tank Rehabilitation: $438,000 [100% requested], adding <u>$438,000</u>

- Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Implementing On-Farm Water Conservation Strategies in the Navarro Watershed: 0%, *deducting $144,171*
- City of Ukiah, Ukiah Valley-Redwood Valley Water Supply Reliability Intertie and Well Development Project: $1,554,450 ($836,000 – 100% -- for interties), *deducting $1,156,800 from wells*
- California Land Stewardship Institute, Agricultural Water Conservation and Water Supply Reliability Program: $1,970,251, adding $1,970,251
- City of Fort Bragg, Summers Lane Reservoir Project: $700,000, adding $700,000

***Second*:** Supervisor Gjerde

Public Comment on the motion:

Tim Ericson, City of Ukiah recommends the motion.

Decision by roll call:
Approved: Chair Mackenzie, Supervisor Morris, Supervisor Hemmingsen, Supervisor Finigan, Supervisor Sundberg, Supervisor Lovelace, Supervisor McCowen, Supervisor Gjerde, Supervisor Carrillo

Opposed: Carol Cook, Supervisor Armstrong, Supervisor Bennett, Mark Lancaster

Decision Approved.

Public Comment:

Tom Vargas, Fort Bragg thanked the committee.
Eric Wier, Crescent City thanked the committee and stated it was a good use of funding.
Bill Verick, Westhaven Community Services thanked the committees for their attention to this matter.

Chair Mackenzie reminded everyone that the next NCRP meeting date was October 16 in Eureka. The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Attachment A

Conference call locations:

Del Norte County Administration Building
Multi Purpose Room
981 H Street, Suite 130
Crescent City, CA 95531

Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District
828 Seventh Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Mendocino County Administration Building
Board of Supervisors Conference Room A
501 Low Gap Road
Ukiah, CA 95482

Sherwood Valley Rancheria Tribal Office
190 Sherwood Hill Drive
Willits, CA 95490

Siskiyou County Administration Office
Conference Room
1312 Fairlane Road,
Yreka, CA 96097

Sonoma County Water Agency
Redwood Room
404 Aviation Blvd.
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Trinity County Board of Supervisor Office
11 Court Street, Room 224
Weaverville, CA 96093

Attachment B

TPRC RECOMMENDATION:

- The TPRC has consensus on $6,039,720 for funding the projects below (see projects below)
- The TPRC felt that many of the lower scored projects (those that scored less than 50) were less competitive under the Drought Expedited Funding Guidelines
- The next highly ranked projects exceeded the remaining amount of funds available

North Coast Resource Partnership Technical Peer Review Committee Recommended 2014 Drought Priority Projects

#	Organization Name, Project Name	County / Tribal Land	Total Cost	Match	IRWM Funding Request	TPRC Recommended Funding	AVG SCORE
12	Yurok Tribe, Weitchpec Water Station	Yurok	$294,576	$92,806	$201,770	$201,770	62.7
1	City of Rio Dell, Rio Dell and Scotia CSD Emergency Water Intertie	Humboldt	$913,449	$0	$913,449	$783,000	58.3
2	City of Ukiah, Ukiah Valley-Redwood Valley Water Supply Reliability Intertie and Well Development Project	Mendocino	$4,820,000	$1,205,000	$3,615,000	$2,711,250	56.8
5	Lewiston Park Mututal Water Company, Meter Installation	Trinity	$224,604	$0	$224,604	$224,604	56.1
13	Westhaven Community Services District, Westhaven Community Services District Water Loss Reduction Project	Humboldt	$605,500	$112,000	$493,500	$375,500	55.8
9	Sanctuary Forest Inc., Mattole Flow Program: Storage and Forbearance	Humboldt	$693,993	$438,793	$255,200	$255,200	55.5
8	Gualala River Watershed Council, The Flow Bank - Protecting Stream Flow in the Gualala River	Mendocino, Sonoma	$1,052,032	$259,731	$792,301	$594,226	53.7
16	Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Implementing On-Farm Water Conservation Strategies in the Navarro watershed to Address Critical Low Flows	Mendocino	$266,374	$80,155	$192,219	$144,171	53.6
4	Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma-Mendocino Immediate Drought Relief Project	Mendocino, Sonoma	$2,000,000	$500,000	$1,500,000	$750,000	51.2
			$26,503,309	**$7,352,761**	**$17,346,620**	**$6,039,720**	