

Table 4: Scoring Criteria⁴

-	Proposal Level Evaluation	-	-	-	-
	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
1	If the IRWM region has been identified as an area where contaminants listed in AB 1249 exist, does the proposal contain project(s) that address the contaminant(s)?	Provide specific explanation of how the project(s) addresses existing AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point) If the requirements of AB 1249 do not apply to the applicant’s IRWM region(s), full points awarded.	10541 (e)(14)	GRanTS Application	1
				Maximum Score:	1
	Project Level Evaluation				
	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	79707 (b)	Attachment 3	1
3	Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified?	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Work Plan appears to be sufficiently complete, with all deliverables identified, and reasonable given the intent of the project. (3 points) • The Work Plan is generally complete and/or deliverables generally listed, but it appears pertinent information is missing or gaps in the scope of work are identified. (2 points) • The Work Plan is sparsely filled out, with minimal information and/or minimal deliverables listed. (1 point) 		Attachment 2	3
4	Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, justified, and consistent with each other? Considerations include: Are the tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget consistent? Are the costs presented in the Budget backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? Is the Schedule reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan?	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR, including: Tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) Costs presented in the Budget are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) A Schedule that is reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan, which indicates the project will likely be completed by the end date listed in Attachment 6. (1 point)		Attachment 2,3, and 4	3

⁴ These scoring criteria will not be used for applications from Cooperative Funding Areas and are consistent with the requirements included in Attachment 7.
 Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package

5	<p>Is the primary benefit* claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan?</p> <p>*For Decision Support Tools, non-physical (qualitative) benefits will be considered. For example, if a decision support tool will contribute to the design or operation of an implementation project, planned or potential quantitative benefits will also be considered.</p>	<p>A properly completed quantification of at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project. For physical (quantitative) benefit(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.)? (1 point) Is the benefit description and <u>quantitative</u> measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? Does the claimed benefit use industry standard units of measure (as described in D.2)? (1 point) <p>For non-physical benefit(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.)? (1 point) Is the benefit description and measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? (1 point) 	N/A	GRanTS Application	2
6	Does the project provide physical benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	A sufficient description of the benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area. The description must include an explanation of the benefits to various IRWM regions and/or Funding Areas. (1 point)	79742(a)	GRanTS Application	1
7	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small, disadvantaged community?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide specific explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2022 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point) Full points awarded if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. 	10545	GRanTS Application	1
8	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	<p>A reasonable explanation of how a project employs new or innovative technology or practices, including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc. Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g., Smart Meters, new apps, etc.) New applications of existing technologies Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects 	79707(e)	GRanTS Application	1
-	-	-	-	Maximum Score:	13