Proposition 84 2015 IRWM Implementation Grant Solicitation

Application Evaluation Summary

Humboldt County

Number of Projects	**25**
Total Proposal Level Score	**7**
Total Project Level Score	**19**
Tie-Breaker Points from Program Preferences Section (If Applicable)	
Grand Total	**26**

Q#	Proposal Level Evaluation	Attachment	For DWR to award a full score, the application must contain:	Points Available	Answer	Score
1	Is there a map of the IRWM Region that shows the location of the project(s) included in the Proposal?	2	A Proposal Map that contains the IRWM regional boundary and the location of each project included in the application.	1	Yes	1
2	Does the Budget contain a summary budget for the Proposal?	4	A complete Table 9, which summarizes the Proposal Budget.	1	Yes	1
3	Does the Schedule contain a summary schedule for the Proposal?	5	A summary schedule for the Proposal.	1	Yes	1
4	Collectively, do the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule demonstrate that all of the projects will be completed by October 31, 2020?	3, 4, & 5	A proposal where all projects will be completed by October 31, 2020.	2	Yes	2
5	Does the proposal contain projects that assist the IRWM region in meeting the goals of the Human Right to Water Policy?	6	An explanation of how a project assists the IRWM region in meeting the goals of the Human Right to Water Policy (safe, affordable water for drinking, bathing, sanitation, and cooking for all). The applicant will receive one point for each project, to a maximum of two points.	2	Yes	2

Q#	Project Level Evaluation	Attachment	For DWR to award a full score, the application must contain:	Points Available	Bear River Reclaimed #1	Boles Fire Water #2	Lift Station Rehab #3	Working Landscape #4	Gualala R Flow Bank #5	HCCSD Supply #6	HVPUD Conserve #7	HVT Flood & Fish Imp #8	Well & Water Security #9	HCRCD Eel River #10	Lewiston Valley Intertie #11	Mattole River #12	MCRCD Farm Conserve #13	Mendo Co Tribes #14	Montague Instream Flow #15	Trinity River #16	Mattole Flow #17	Shasta River #18	Shelter Cove #19	N Sonoma County #20	Russian River Coho #21	SF Trinity River #22	Weott CSD Storage #23	Westhaven CSD #24	Yurok Tribe #25
6	Does the applicant provide a description of the project that summarizes the major components and the intended purpose of the project?	2	A description of the project that summarizes the: - anticipated physical benefits of the projects - intended outcomes, and - major physical components (i.e., what the project is installing, retrofitting, replacing, etc.)	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Is there a project map that shows the location of the project and the areas and water resources affected by the project?	2	A map of the project that includes the location of the project, the areas affected by the project, and the water resources affected by the project.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
8	Are the anticipated primary and secondary physical benefits of the project described and quantified with the units specified in Table 5?	2	A properly completed Table 5 for at least the primary and secondary benefit of each project. If the primary and secondary physical benefits were not clearly identified or quantified for each year of the project's lifecycle using the specific units provided in the instructions for Table 5, a response of "no" will be given. For DAC projects that do not include construction, benefits do not need to be quantified, but must be qualitatively described.	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
9	Does the technical analysis support the claimed physical benefits?	2	A demonstration that the benefits were quantified correctly: 1. An explanation of project need 2. An explanation of without project conditions 3. A description of how benefits were derived For DAC projects that do not include construction, only #1 (project need) must be described.	2	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	If applicable, does the applicant describe the potential adverse impacts of the project? If none, does the applicant properly explain why there are no impacts?*	2	- A description of all potential adverse impacts of the proposed project. - A reasonable claim of no adverse impacts. For example, if applicant claims A well installation project will have no adverse impacts, it must explain how this is possible.	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
11	Does the proposed project effectively address long-term drought preparedness?	2	A demonstration that the project contributes to sustainable water supply and reliability during water shortages and will achieve one or more of the following: - Promote water conservation, conjunctive use, reuse and recycling - Improve landscape and agricultural irrigation efficiencies - Achieve long-term reduction of water use - Efficient groundwater basin management - Establish system interties - Solutions that yield a new water supply such as seawater desalination Drought preparedness projects do not include drought emergency response actions, such as trucking of water or lowering well intakes.	3	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes
12	Does the project provide a direct water-related benefit to a DAC?	2 & 7	- Proof that at least 25% of the area served by the project (by population or geography) meets the definition of a DAC. - A description of the water-related need(s) of a DAC. - Demonstration that the proposed project addresses the described need of the DAC.	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Is the proposed project performance monitoring plan expected to track progress towards meeting the claimed physical benefits?*	2	- Monitoring targets identified that will assist the implementing agency achieve the claimed benefits. - Monitoring tools that are appropriate for measuring the project's performance.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
14	Is the proposed project the least cost alternative? If not, does the applicant sufficiently explain why it was selected instead of the least cost alternative?*	2	A completed Table 7 that explains why the proposed project is the preferred alternative even if it is not the least cost alternative.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
15	Does the applicant discuss the necessary tasks in the Work Plan that will result in a completed project?	3	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Does the Work Plan include a project status that indicates the current stage of each task (e.g., % complete)?	3	A summary of the work that has been completed to date.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	If applicable, does the Work Plan include a listing of required permits and their status, and the appropriate environmental documentation for the proposed project? (N/A = Yes)	3	- A list of required permits. - Description of appropriate environmental documentation. - Status of required permits and environmental documentation (as applicable). - If permits/environmental docs are not required, an explanation of why they are not required.	1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
18	Are the tasks shown in the Budget consistent with the tasks discussed in the Work Plan?	3 & 4	A budget that is organized/outlined identical to the Work Summary.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	Are the costs presented in the Budget reasonable for the project type and the current stage of the project?	4	A budget that contains costs that are reasonably supported and not significantly higher or lower than industry standard.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Are the tasks in the schedule consistent with the tasks described in the Work Plan?	3 & 5	A schedule that is organized/outlined identical to the Work Summary.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Does the schedule demonstrate that it is reasonable to expect that the project will start construction/implementation by April 1, 2016?	3 & 5	- Reasonable timeframes for the proposed tasks - A project ready to start by April 1, 2016 (For construction projects, ready to start means construction bids will be awarded by April 1, 2016)	1	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
22	Will the project be completed by October 31, 2019?	5	A schedule that demonstrates the project will be completed by October 31, 2019.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Is there sufficient detail in the Work Plan to demonstrate the proposed schedule can be met?	3 & 5	Supporting documentation for the proposed schedule that demonstrates the project could be implemented as promised.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
			Total Points per Project	21	17	16	18	17	19	20	21	22	18	20	19	21	20	22	20	22	20	22	17	17	13	22	16	20
			Total Points for all Projects	**480**																								

* Projects providing direct water-related benefits to a DAC that are in the planning or design phase and not intending to complete construction with this solicitation are not required to complete this section. Such projects were given full points for this question.