



Suggested Criteria for Workgroup Consideration

The following table presents suggested criteria to be considered by the Workgroup in developing the funding application package. Criteria have been categorized as project-level criteria or proposal-level criteria. Project-level criteria will be used to evaluate individual projects while proposal-level criteria will be used to evaluate the proposal as a whole. It is anticipated that the ability of projects to address project-level criteria will be discussed during the second Workgroup workshop. The ability of the proposed funding application package to address the proposal-level criteria is scheduled for discussion during the fourth (final) Workgroup workshop.

| Criteria | Suggested Workgroup Guidelines |
|---|---|
| PROJECT-LEVEL CRITERIA | |
| Budget | Select projects that have well-developed budgets and exhibit reasonable costs. |
| Scientific and Technical Merit | Select projects that are well supported from a technical standpoint based on supporting studies and data. |
| Cost-effectiveness of grant administration | Recommend including smaller projects as subtasks of other projects as appropriate to increase the cost-effectiveness of grant administration. |
| Schedule | Choose projects that will be ready to proceed by June 2008 (assumed contract execution date). Projects should be ready to proceed no later than December 2008 (anticipated timing of initial funding disbursement). |
| PROPOSAL-LEVEL CRITERIA | |
| Schedule | Proposal must include at least one project that will have CEQA documentation complete prior to June 2008. |
| Work Plan | Develop a proposal that includes projects with synergies and linkages. Proposal should include projects that are well-described. |
| Funding Match | Strive to achieve an overall 60% funding match, or a minimum funding match of greater than 45%. |
| Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits | Develop a proposal that includes projects with quantifiable water supply and water quality benefits. |
| Other Expected Benefits ^a | Develop a proposal that offers a variety of quantifiable and non quantifiable benefits in addition to water supply and water quality benefits. |
| Program Preferences ^b | Choose a suite of projects that addresses a combination of Program Preferences with a high degree of certainty. |
| Geographic Parity | Strive to develop a suite of projects that will benefit hydrologic units across the Region. |
| Regional Objectives | Strive to include projects across all objectives. |
| Degree of Benefit | Include projects that provide a large degree and scale of benefit. |
| Degree of Negative Impact | Include projects that have minimal secondary or cumulative negative impacts, including those that occur over a longer time or distance. |
| Contribution to Measurable Targets | Include projects that contribute to achieving the Region's measurable targets. |

| Criteria | Suggested Workgroup Guidelines |
|--------------------|--|
| Cost-effectiveness | Include projects that are cost-effective on both the short- and long-term, and those that minimize externalized costs to the public. |
| Amount Leveraged | Include projects that allow other projects to move forward. |

- a. Other expected benefits may include ecosystem restoration, flood control, recreation and public access, power cost savings and production, etc
- b. The Proposition 50 program is intended to support proposals that: 1- include integrated projects with multiple benefits; 2- support and improve local and regional water supply reliability; 3- contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards; 4- eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including ASBSs; 5- include safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities; and 6-address environmental justice concerns