

Prop 84 Implementation Grant, **Round 2** Project Selection Process Meeting #2



December 3, 2012

RMC

Water and the Environment

Agenda

- Review Chartering
- 1st Meeting
- 2nd Meeting
- Plan 3rd Meeting
 - Meeting Date – Wed, Dec 12 or Thurs, Dec 13th
- Appeal Process (Matt Naftaly, Matt Van de Linden, and Erin Maker)
- DWR funding area facilitation

Chartering

- **Vision** – projects to be IRWM appropriate and highly competitive
- **Goal** - select integrated projects that implement objectives and Resources Management Strategies
- **Responsibilities of Committee Members**
 - Attend all three meetings
 - Have clear authority to represent agency or organization
 - Represent the region first and your agency/organization second
 - Provide full and accurate information regarding projects
 - Work out issues within the Committee
- **Consensus and Non-Consensus Decisions**
 - Strive to achieve consensus whenever possible.
 - Make non-consensus decisions through open vote - simple majority will be sufficient for moving the topic at hand forward.

Levels of Consensus

1. I can say an **unqualified “yes”** to the decision. I am satisfied that the decision is an express of wisdom of the group.
2. I find the decision **perfectly acceptable**. It is the best of the real options that are available.
3. I can **live with** the decision. However, I am not especially enthusiastic about it.
4. I do not fully agree with the decision and need to register my view about it. However, I do not choose to block the decision and will **stand aside**. I am willing to support the decision because I trust the wisdom of the group.
5. I **do not agree** with the decision and request that it be noted that the decision was not made by consensus.
6. I feel that we have no clear sense of unity in the group. **We need to do more work** before consensus can be achieved.

Considerations for Voting and Consensus

- Strive to achieve consensus - defined as all Committee members voting at Consensus Levels 1 through 4
- If not in consensus (one or more members vote at Consensus Level 5 or 6), continue discussion in an attempt to reach consensus.
- The Consultant will declare "an impasse" and call for a vote
- Make non-consensus decisions by simple majority vote

Today's Handouts

- Project Descriptions (23 projects organized by "ready-to-go" questions, Agency Top Picks)
- "Quantitative Analysis" (23 projects organized by "ready-to-go" scores)
- All Projects Organized by Objectives
- Project Assessment Form
- PowerPoint Presentation

Meeting Schedule

1st Meeting:

Agree on Process
Select Top Tier (23)

2nd Meeting:

Select 10 – 14 Projects
Answer Key Questions
Approve Assessment Form

3rd Meeting:

Prior to Meeting - Review
Assessment Info
Meet with Sponsors
Select Final Projects

1st Meeting Goals

- Chartering: Decision-Making and Operating Guidelines
- Agree on Meeting Goals/Process
 - 1st Meeting
 - Rescore projects based on Plan 2013 criteria
 - Agency/organization submits top 1 or 2 “ready-to-go” projects
 - Select top tier based on “ready-to-go” criteria
 - Agree on process
 - 2nd Meeting
 - Narrow down list to 10 – 14 projects
 - Agree on Project Assessment Form
 - Plan 3rd Meeting
 - 3rd Meeting
 - Review submittals of Project Assessment Forms
 - Interview Project Proponents
 - Select final projects

2nd Meeting Goals

- Select top 10 – 14 Projects – use Quantitative Analysis Handout
- Answer Key Questions
 - Vote on whether to proceed with Round 2
 - Identify agency/organization to manage Round 2 Grant Application
 - What entity will be Lead Agency, if successful
- Plan 3rd Meeting (interviews of project proponents)

3rd Meeting Goals

- Send out Project Assessment Form
- Ad Hoc Committee reviews Project Assessment Forms and scoring PRIOR to meeting
- Interview Project Proponents
- Select projects for Round 2

Starting Point (Quantitative Analysis Handout)

- Current Status of Design (1 pt. = at conceptual design level; 3 pts. = design in progress and 30% submittal is complete; 5 pts. = final design and contract documents are complete)
- "Are funding sources identified?" (yes = 1, no = 0)
- "What percent matching funds from your agency is anticipated?"
 - 0 - 4% = 0
 - 5 - 15% = 1 points
 - 16 - 25% = 2 points
 - 26 - 50% = 3 points
 - 51 - 75% = 4 points
 - 76 - 100% = 5 points
- "Are matching funds committed?" (1 pt. = not available, 3 pts. = funding source identified but actions still need to be taken to secure funding; 5 pts. = funds are in capital improvement program)

Select top 10 – 14 Projects

- Compare agency “top picks” to 23 top tier projects and reduce number of projects (review “top picks” that didn’t score well in “status of design”)
- Consider DAC projects (score of above 3)
- Consider “integration” (more than one project sponsor)
- Review feasibility study info available
- Consider objectives (Project Description handout)
- Grant funding amount requested

Key Decisions

- Based on the “Final 10 Projects”, should we apply for Round 2?
- Identify an agency/organization willing to manage the Round 2 grant application
- Identify an agency willing to serve as grant administrator (if we are successful in obtaining grant money)

Contact Information

Kathy Caldwell – 310.566.6474
kaldwell@rmcwater.com



Water and the Environment

Odds 'n Ends

- Inter-regional coordination
- How much should we ask for?
- Appeal process?
- Next meetings – in person - 1 -4 pm at CCWA on 12/5 and 12/12
- Other

Keep in Mind...

- \$7.6 M for Funding Area (6 regions)
- Cost of \$20,000 to \$25,000 per project
- Ap must be HIGHLY competitive
- Need agency to manage grant application



Lessons Learned – Round 1

- Last process was too costly and time intensive
- Stick to the schedule
- Conduct initial benefit:cost analysis BEFORE selecting
- Meet with sponsors to screen projects
 - Assume project is “not-ready” until proven “ready”
 - Require all information at meeting – no exceptions
 - Set sponsor expectations (grant ap info and project follow-thru)
 - Resolution required to certify matching funds obligated