

Upper Kings Basin IRWM Authority Scoring Criteria & relation to IRWMP and State Criteria							
Criteria No.	Proposal Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standard	Purpose of Question.	Relation to State Evaluation Criteria
<b>UKBIRWMA Regional Criteria</b>							
1-a	<b>Support for Upper Kings Basin IRWMP - Adopted Resolution/Letter of Support and Active Participation in the UKBIRWM Authority.</b> <i>Scoring is based on the degree of support to the regional planning effort in terms of participation and funding.</i>	2	2-6	3	A score of 3 will be awarded if the primary project proponent has formally adopted a resolution to join the UKBIRWM Authority, or, has been approved as an Interested Party; has sought coverage under the IRWMP; has <b>significantly</b> contributed to the Upper Kings planning effort via direct 'in-kind' participation and/or financial contribution. <i>Lack of financial support should not affect score if project proponent has been an active participant in the planning process compared to all other stakeholders in the group.</i>	Reward commitment and meaningful participation, draw in support from stakeholders.	Adopted IRWMP Plan and Proof of formal inclusion in the planning process
				2	A score of 2 will be awarded if the primary project proponent has formally adopted a resolution to join the UKBIRWM Authority, or, has been approved as an Interested Party; has sought coverage under the IRWMP; has <b>moderately</b> contributed to the Upper Kings planning effort via direct 'in-kind' participation and/or financial contribution. <i>Lack of financial support should not affect score if project proponent has been an active participant in the planning process compared to all other stakeholders in the group.</i>		
				1	A score of 1 will be awarded if the primary project proponent has formally adopted a resolution to join the UKBIRWM Authority, or, has been approved as an Interested Party; has sought coverage under the IRWMP; has <b>not</b> meaningfully contributed to the Upper Kings planning effort via direct 'in-kind' participation and/or financial contribution. <i>Lack of financial support should not affect score if project proponent has been an active participant in the planning process compared to all other stakeholders in the group.</i>		
1-b	<b>Management Strategies and Integration</b> <i>Scoring will be based on how well the project integrates Goals and DWR Management Strategies applied to projects in the Upper Kings Basin IRWMP</i>	1	1-5		A higher score will be assigned to those projects that include multiple Goals and Management Strategies that were selected for inclusion in the IRWMP. The project proposal must demonstrate how the strategies are integrated with the project. <i>(See Table 6-1 of the IRWMP. Checklist provided in project application template.)</i>	Identify regional goals and required state strategies and method for integration into IRWMP under Planning Framework	Water Management Strategies and Integration Priorities and Schedule Impacts and Regional Benefits Implementation
1-c	<b>Funding</b> <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of projects.</i>	2	2-10		Higher score based on documentation of firm financial commitments and with defined and/or multiple sources of funding; clear resource commitments for ongoing maintenance and operations; a defined local match; ability to complete the project if grant funding is delayed or halted. If the project qualifies as addressing a critical water supply or water quality need of a DAC, and will be submitted as being exempt from the matching funds requirement, the project proponent must provide sufficient documentation to illustrate cash flow flexibility to support project implementation.	Evaluate readiness to proceed, clear financial commitments.	Financing Funding Budget Implementation

1-d	<b>Prior Experience</b> <i>Scoring will be based on prior experience in developing and implementing similar projects.</i>	1	0-5	Higher scores will be assigned to those projects where the proponent has demonstrated experience in designing, developing and implementing similar grant projects. Successful implementation includes a project proponent's ability to follow through with financial commitment, prepare quality reports and invoices, and submit all deliverables in a timely fashion.	Ensure project implementation, contract compliance, and protection of the Water Authority's favorable reputation.	Implementability
1-e	<b>Regional Equitability Balance Points</b> <i>Scoring will be discretionary and based on the ranking of multiple projects in the IRWM region; the developmental state of project proponents in the IRWM region; and past and existing IRWM grants in the IRWM region.</i>	1	0-5	These points will only be applied in a tie-break situation. A higher score will be awarded to projects of project proponents that have never received IRWM grant funding in the past.	Address potential scoring ties, ensure equitability of funding in the region.	None
<b>Statewide IRWM Criteria</b>						
2-a	<b>Work Plan: Collaboration and Multiple Stakeholders</b> <i>Scoring is based on how well the Work Plan demonstrates regional partnerships and collaboration.</i>	1	0-1	One point will be assigned to projects that involve multiple stakeholders and participants in project development and funding, zero points will be assigned to projects that do not.	Document multi- participant, multiple benefit projects and collaboration in the region.	Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination Implementation Benefits; Attachment 3 of Round 1 PSP
2-b	<b>Work Plan: Goals and Objectives</b> <i>Scoring is based on how well the Work Plan addresses Goals and Objectives.</i>	1	0-3	A higher scores will be assigned to a project that demonstrates a clear relationship to multiple IRWMP Goals and Objectives as established by the Water Forum; local objectives linked to the project are clearly stated and explained in detail. Goals and Objectives include; groundwater overdraft, water supply reliability, degradation of water quality, urban development, protection of water rights, sustaining the agriculture economy, protection of life and property from flooding, protection of the environment, environmental justice. (See Section 5.2 of the IRWMP. Worksheet to be provided.)	Document clear relation to IRWMP goals and objectives	Objectives Priorities and Schedule Impacts and Regional Benefits Implementation; Attachment 3 of Round 1 PSP
2-c	<b>Work Plan: Purpose/Need/Problems</b> <i>Scoring is based on how well the Work Plan addresses the problems identified by the Upper Kings Basin IRWMP, and if the project helps avoid or resolve conflicts.</i>	1	0-3	A higher score indicates that the project addresses one or more of the major water related problems and conflicts identified by the Upper Kings Basin IRWMP. (See Section 1.3 of the IRWMP)	Document relation to IRWMP and Forums defined problems, support integrating and prioritizing projects into the regional effort.	Objectives Priorities and Schedule; Attachment 3 of Round 1 PSP
2-d	<b>Work Plan: Completed Work</b> <i>Scoring is based on how well the Work Plan addresses prior work completed.</i>	1	0-5	A higher score indicates that the proposal clearly describes work completed or that is expected to be completed prior to the grant award date. For example, if CEQA/NEPA and other environmental compliance efforts have been completed, the Work Plan discusses the environmental determination made by the lead agency and the documents that were filed.	Readiness to proceed, documentation for mitigation of negative effects.	Implementability Schedule Monitoring Assessment and Performance; Attachment 3 of Round 1 PSP
2-e	<b>Work Plan: Existing Data and Studies</b> <i>Scoring is based on the quantity, and how well the Work Plan addresses existing data and studies that will be used in support of the project(s).</i>	1	0-3	A higher score indicates that the Work Plan discusses significant data that has been collected and studies that have been performed that support the project(s) site location, feasibility, and technical methods.		Attachment 3 of Round 1 PSP
2-f	<b>Work Plan: Tasks</b> <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Work Plan contains a detailed Tasks section that correctly corresponds to the overall project.</i>	1	1-3	A higher score indicates that the Work Plan contains a detailed Tasks section that correctly corresponds to the overall project.		Attachment 3 of Round 1 PSP

3	<b>Budget</b> <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project proposal has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the proposal.</i>	1	0-5	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded where the Budget for the project in the Proposal has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 of the PSP; the costs are reasonable, and all the Budget categories of Exhibit B of the PSP are thoroughly supported.	Evaluate readiness to proceed	Attachment 4 of Round 1 PSP
				4	A score of 4 points will be awarded where the Budget for the project in the Proposal has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 of the PSP; the costs are reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the Budget categories of Exhibit B of the PSP are not fully supported or lack detail.		
				3	A score of 3 points will be awarded where the Budget for the project in the Proposal has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 of the PSP, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B of the PSP.		
				2	A score of 2 points will be awarded where the Budget for the project in the Proposal contains partially detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 of the PSP, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking for all of the Budget categories described in Exhibit B of the PSP.		
				1	A score of 1 will be awarded where there is no detailed Budget information provided for the proposed project.		
				0	A score of 0 will be awarded where there is no Budget information provided.		
4	<b>Schedule</b> <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project proposal has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the project and on the readiness to proceed with the project.</i>	1	0-5	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of the Proposal no later than six months (December 1, 2011) after the anticipated award date (June, 1, 2011).	Evaluate detailed project milestones, and readiness to proceed	Attachment 5 of Round 1 PSP
				3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation between six and 12 months after the award date (December 2, 2011 – June 1, 2012).		
				1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the schedule does not follow the work items presented in the Work Plan and Budget, is clearly not reasonable, or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation more than 12 months after the award date (June 2, 2012).		
				0	A score of 0 will be awarded if the schedule was omitted.		

5	<p><b>Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures</b>  <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project proponent has presented an adequate monitoring and assessment program including performance measures that will allow a determination of whether the objectives are met</i></p>	1	0-5	<p>Higher scores will be assigned to projects that are consistent with the Regional Board Basin Plan; have output indicators that effectively track output; have outcome indicators that adequately evaluate change resulting from the work; have adequately planned for and incorporated relevant data management, and monitoring and performance standards of the IRWMP; have targets that are feasible within the life of the Schedule. <i>(Standard IRWM Scoring Criteria. See Guidelines, pg 26, Section V.G. See IRWMP Sections 10.1.1 and 10.1.2)</i></p>	<p>Ensure project objectives have been described and quantified, and project performance monitoring and reporting measures meet IRWMP Performance objectives.</p>	Attachment 6 of Round 1 PSP										
6	<p><b>Economic Analysis: Water Supply Costs and Benefits</b>  <i>Scoring will be based on the Economic Analyses – Water Supply Costs and Benefits. The scores will be assigned relative to all other Proposals. Scoring is designed to not bias types of projects with respect to each other.</i></p> <p><i>Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the costs and water supply benefits of the Proposal?</i></p> <p><i>Are the costs and benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?</i></p>	3	0-15	<p>Points will be allocated based on: 1) the Water Supply benefits realized through implementation of the Proposal and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits. Points will be awarded based on a comparison of qualitative and quantitative information describing the benefits of the Proposals. Unsubstantiated or poor quality analysis or documentation can result in the score being reduced to a minimum score of 1.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="911 558 1390 891"> <tr> <td data-bbox="911 558 911 623">4-5</td> <td data-bbox="911 558 1390 623">High levels of water supply benefits will receive 4 to 5 points.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="911 623 911 688">3-4</td> <td data-bbox="911 623 1390 688">Above average levels of water supply benefits will receive 3 to 4 points.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="911 688 911 753">2-3</td> <td data-bbox="911 688 1390 753">Average levels of water supply benefits will receive 2 to 3 points.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="911 753 911 802">1</td> <td data-bbox="911 753 1390 802">Low levels of water supply benefits will receive 1 point.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="911 802 911 891">0</td> <td data-bbox="911 802 1390 891">A score of zero will be awarded to proposals that do not demonstrate water supply benefits or if this criterion is not addressed.</td> </tr> </table>	4-5	High levels of water supply benefits will receive 4 to 5 points.	3-4	Above average levels of water supply benefits will receive 3 to 4 points.	2-3	Average levels of water supply benefits will receive 2 to 3 points.	1	Low levels of water supply benefits will receive 1 point.	0	A score of zero will be awarded to proposals that do not demonstrate water supply benefits or if this criterion is not addressed.		Attachment 7 of Round 1 PSP
4-5	High levels of water supply benefits will receive 4 to 5 points.															
3-4	Above average levels of water supply benefits will receive 3 to 4 points.															
2-3	Average levels of water supply benefits will receive 2 to 3 points.															
1	Low levels of water supply benefits will receive 1 point.															
0	A score of zero will be awarded to proposals that do not demonstrate water supply benefits or if this criterion is not addressed.															

7	<p><b>Water Quality</b>  <i>Scoring will be based on the certainty that the Proposal will provide the benefits claimed, as well as the magnitude and breadth of the Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits.</i></p> <p><i>Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits of the Proposal?</i></p> <p><i>Are the Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?</i></p>	3	0-15	The starting score for this criterion is 1 point. The remaining 4 points will be allocated based on: 1) the Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits realized through implementation of the Proposal and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits. Points will be awarded based on a comparison of qualitative and quantitative information describing the benefits of the Proposals.		Ensure project implementation. documentation of mitigation of negative effects. Clearly define water quality related projects to integrate local project into regional strategy to meet statewide priorities and preferences.	Water Management Strategies State Preferences and Priorities Benefits; Attachment 8 and Exhibit D of Round 1 PSP
				4-5	High levels of Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits will receive 4 to 5 points.		
				3-4	Above average levels of Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits will receive 3 to 4 points.		
				2-3	Average levels of Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits will receive 2 to 3 points.		
				1	Low levels of Water Quality or Other Expected Benefits will receive 1 point.		
				0	A score of zero will be awarded to Proposals that do not have Water Quality or Other Expected Benefits or if this criterion is not addressed.		
8	<p><b>Economic Analysis: Flood Damage Reduction Costs and Benefits</b>  <i>Scoring will be based on the Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction Cost and Benefits. The scores will be assigned relative to all other Proposals. Scoring is designed to not bias types of projects with respect to each other.</i></p> <p><i>Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the costs and Flood Damage Reduction benefits of the Proposal?</i></p> <p><i>Are the costs and benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?</i></p>	3	0-15	Points will be allocated based on: 1) the Flood Damage Reduction benefits realized through implementation of the project and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits. Points will be awarded based on a comparison of qualitative and quantitative information describing the benefits of the Proposals. Unsubstantiated or poor quality analysis or documentation can result in the score being reduced to a minimum score of 1.			Attachment 9 of Round 1 PSP
				4-5	High levels of flood damage reduction will receive 4 to 5 points.		
				3-4	Above average levels of flood damage reduction will receive 3 to 4 points.		
				2-3	Average levels of flood damage reduction benefits will receive 2 to 3 points.		
				1	Low levels of flood damage reduction benefits will receive 1 point.		
				0	A score of zero will be awarded to proposals that do not demonstrate flood damage reduction benefits or if this criterion is not addressed.		

9	<p><b>Program Preferences</b>  <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project will implement one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program Preferences (See Section II.E). Proposals that demonstrate a significant, dedicated, and well-defined project that meets multiple Program Preferences will be considered more favorably than projects that demonstrate a significant potential to meet a single Program Preference or demonstrate a low degree of commitment or certainty to meeting Program Preferences.</i></p> <p><i>Does the Proposal include a project that implements Program Preferences, including Statewide priorities such as preparing for drought conditions?</i></p> <p><i>Did the applicant demonstrate a high degree of certainty that the project will implement the Program Preferences?</i></p> <p><i>Did the applicant document the magnitude and breadth of Program Preferences that the project will meet?</i></p>	2	0-10	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the Proposal will address the following: The Program Preference for addressing long term drought preparedness; includes a project specifically meeting a critical water supply or water quality need of a DAC; demonstrates a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved; AND thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.	Identify projects that are significant in addressing one or more IRWM Grant Program Preferences	Program Preferences, Statewide Priorities, Attachment 11 and Exhibit G of Round 1 PSP
				4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes a project that that implement multiple Program Preferences, but does not address long term drought preparedness or a DAC critical water supply or water quality need. The proposal also needs to demonstrate with a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved, and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.		
				3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes a project that implement multiple Program Preferences, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.		
				2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the Proposal includes a project that implement a single Program Preference, demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.		
				1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the Proposal addresses one or more Program Preference, but it is highly unlikely to be achieved.		
				0	A score of 0 points will be awarded if the Proposal does not address any Program Preference.		