

**2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program
Stakeholder Workshop Feedback
July 29, 2005 – Riverside**

Feedback on Priorities

- ❖ How will they be reviewed - especially relative to an adopted or local plan?
- ❖ With so many invited back - applicants need to know how many invited back and how much money is requested.
- ❖ Meet criteria.
- ❖ Choose only best; do not invite back if they are not going to make it.
- ❖ Other agency roles in non-Integrated Watershed Management Program (IWMP)/CALFED.
- ❖ Good idea to address multiple benefits. Add extra points.
- ❖ Need to document true working relationships (Memorandum of Understanding letters). Initially can get reference letters.
- ❖ Prioritize priorities.
- ❖ Proposition 13 - Application Reference Document was very helpful in previous grant program(s).
- ❖ Agricultural - broaden to non-irrigated agricultural operators, but not dairies (have own grant program).
- ❖ Proposition 13 Watershed plans - need to leverage not duplicate also coordinate with Chapter 8.
- ❖ How open are agencies to extending time frames – especially for large projects.
- ❖ Project submitted in stages? Phases or pieces should be considered especially where part of an integrated suite of projects.

Feedback on Proposed Minimum and Maximum Grant Amounts and Match Requirements

- ❖ Great to extend match period longer than grant agreement.
- ❖ California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) part of match.
- ❖ No match for planning.
- ❖ Should get more points for additional match.
- ❖ Sliding match based on percent of project for bonus points.

**2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program
Stakeholder Workshop Feedback
July 29, 2005 – Riverside**

Feedback on Proposed Minimum and Maximum Grant Amounts and Match Requirements Continued

- ❖ IWMP does not equal Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) because grassroots need planning money.
- ❖ Think legislature wants integration. Stick with larger maximum grant amount, agencies ready for it; support \$10 Million.
- ❖ Add bonus points if project is part of plan.
- ❖ Encourage keeping percent of planning money up; hard to get planning money.
- ❖ Set aside certain amount/percent for planning; if planning money is leftover, fund implementation.
- ❖ More interest from smaller entities with IWMP (intimidated at IRWM didn't feel as competitive).
- ❖ Regional plan does not equal watershed level. (Regional plans may not meet local need.s)
- ❖ Where do studies fall? [guidelines]
- ❖ Planning vs. Implementation.
- ❖ Should be level of money for research/study (for Total Maximum Daily Loads [TMDLs]).
- ❖ No match required. Disadvantaged communities:
 1. Required documents.
 2. Level of income required to qualify and percentage of community.

Feedback on Technical Review/Selection Process

- ❖ Fair system; independent people (people review → average).
- ❖ People want to see water quality improvement with bond money spent.
- ❖ Want well-rounded reviewers, not specialist.
- ❖ See place for education and outreach.
- ❖ See value for education and outreach.
- ❖ Silly to come up with tests/water quality improvement for education and outreach projects; should score education and outreach projects against other education and outreach projects.

**2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program
Stakeholder Workshop Feedback
July 29, 2005 – Riverside**

Feedback on Technical Review/Selection Process Continued

- ❖ Outreach/Stakeholder involvement criteria for smaller grants.
- ❖ Provide bonus points for education and outreach.
- ❖ Many agencies do not want to do education and outreach because of time and money components.
- ❖ Hard to measure education and outreach.
- ❖ Be realistic and accept it.
- ❖ Concern for burden-some measures of effectiveness (e.g., IRWM Step 2 cost analysis = 10 pages).
- ❖ Highest priority does not equal education and outreach, rather TMDL implementation (water quality implementation).
- ❖ Would like feedback when invited back for Step 2 (full proposal).
- ❖ Be ruthless in 1st round. (It's kinder in the end to be ruthless up front.)
- ❖ Send e-mail after 1st round to find out why proposal didn't go through to invite back.
- ❖ At concept do pass/fail and rank 1,2,3=high, medium, low (with feedback about what is lacking); then applicant can decide/if he/she should proceed.
- ❖ Department of Water Resources provides feedback sheets.
- ❖ Should be pass/fail with feedback, if requested. If fail, send automated e-mail why failed.
- ❖ Pass/fail with points to let the applicant know how competitive the proposal is relative to other submitted.
- ❖ Full proposal must be same as concept proposal.
- ❖ Basic evaluation sheet for Concept Proposal with check box, one sentence to share comments with others (document view point).
- ❖ Discourage requirement for peer review documents because of short time frame.
- ❖ Caution against using past performance as criteria because of high turnover at applicant organizations.

**2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program
Stakeholder Workshop Feedback
July 29, 2005 – Riverside**

Feedback on Technical Review/Selection Process Continued

- ❖ Past performance should be used on case-by-case basis; require additional questions/explanation for good proposals with bad track records.
- ❖ If more proposals than money, use proposal information (which was required by guidelines).
- ❖ Reviewers need to be clear on criteria up front; criteria cannot change during review process.
- ❖ Those who are prepared (submit complete proposals) should be rewarded. Do not close door to communication if applicant has submitted complete proposal.
- ❖ If applicant meets guidelines, can ask for more information.
- ❖ Identify backup person in grant agreement.
- ❖ I think there should be “measurable” criteria to evaluate a project. TMDL or less important part per million (ppm) end results.
- ❖ Lady who commented be “ruthless” at Stage 1 to eliminate projects is an excellent comment. Easier for everyone – people can quit working on projects that won’t be funded and State Water Resources Control Board staff need not spend additional time on these.
- ❖ In Michigan, where I spent 35 years and served on Regional Planning Boards and Watershed Councils, I found that a great deal of money over the years went into “planning” for improvement of water quality, but in the end there was little money available for “implementation” of the plans --- I think “implementation” is important.
- ❖ It would be helpful in the screening process if reviewers give applicants an idea of where the proposal sits relative to the others. Then, applicants can make the choice whether to carry on and spend their resources.
- ❖ Regarding outreach component credited or required in proposal. The voters and consumers will be the ultimate reviewers of the merits of a given project of a micro level. But it is the macro view of the overall grant effort (as perceived by the voters/consumers) that will determine whether we have the means (i.e., political support for future clean water bonds/funding) to achieve our goals. In this light, outreach is essential.