

Chapin, Brandon@SSJDC

From: Chapin, Brandon@SSJDC
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 4:23 PM
To: Jim Provenza; Jim Provenza; Mike Eaton; Darla Guenzler; Steve Chappell; Erik Vink; Dan Taylor; Burmester, Daniel@Wildlife
Cc: Ingram, Campbell@SSJDC; Don Nottoli; Todd Ferrara; Karen Finn; Dolly Sandoval; Karen Mitchoff; Katherine Miller; Skip Thomson; 'Nicole Rinke'; Sandra Rodriguez
Subject: For PPS Subcommittee Meeting - Draft Revised Grant Guidelines for Discussion at the PPS on June 15th
Attachments: Grant Guidelines and Application Packet_draft_PPS.DOCX; Grant Guidelines and Application Packet_clean draft_PPS.DOCX

Dear Conservancy Program and Policy Subcommittee Members,

Attached is a draft revised Grant Guideline document (in Track Changes and a clean version) for our second round solicitation this fall. In order to meet public notice requirements and a solicitation date of September 1, we would like to get approval to post a public draft at our June 27th Board meeting. At the PPS meeting we will discuss all changes and alternate schedules. Changes in the document result from our staff debrief and lessons learned from the first solicitation.

A brief summary of key lessons learned and changes made to the document is provided below.

Key Lessons Learned

- Scoring threshold too high
- Two-part solicitation process was time consuming but valuable and appreciated
- Concept proposal scoring criteria excessive and too detailed for a 7 page concept proposal
- Full proposal scoring criteria are numerous and in some cases redundant and don't sufficiently differentiate between planning/implementation
- Monitoring requirement unclear (PM v. environmental)
- County/local agency resolutions guidance not clear
- Long term management requirement not clear
- Cost share calculations confusing
- Indirect rate too low and not consistent with other Prop. 1 funders

Changes Made in Grant Guidelines

- Combine GG/GAP into a single document – separate document resulted in inconsistencies and unnecessary redundancy
- Concept Proposal – Streamlined evaluation criteria; added pass/fail criteria for eligibility (Is this project eligible? Could it be?)
- Drop scoring threshold to 75 points for both concept and full proposals
- Light revamp of scoring criteria

- Clarify (esp. monitoring)
- Reduce redundancy
- Call out planning v. implementation
- Integrate acquisition guidance
- Integrate long-term management guidance (score: more pts for 30-yrs v. 15 yrs)
- Clarify monitoring/performance measure guidance
- Increase and define indirect rate

NOTE: On first glance the document looks as though it has been heavily edited. However, most of the visual change is the result of combining the Grant Guidelines and Grant Application Package. In this process nothing significant has been removed. To help you clearly identify new or revised content, we offer the following key:

Text in track changes (red) was moved from elsewhere in the document, from the Grant Application Packet, or newly drafted. How and why text was changed is noted in comments in the margin. In the clean version of this document, **text that has been moved is in red**, **text from the Grant Application Packet is in green**, and **new text is in blue**.

Thank you,

Brandon Chapin

Associate Governmental Program Analyst and Board Liaison
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy
1450 Halyard Drive, Suite 6
West Sacramento, CA 95691

916.375.2091 office
916.375.4948 fax

"A partner for balanced ecosystem restoration and economic development in the Delta."

www.deltaconservancy.ca.gov



SaveOurWater.com · Drought.CA.gov