

California Department of Food and Agriculture

TITLE: 2014 State Water Efficiency and Enhancement Program Technical Review Scoring Criteria

Question 1: Score this application in terms of being successful, 0 being not successful and 10 being very successful, using the matrix below in assigning a value.

- 0: Overall project will result in neither water conservation nor GHG emission reductions
- 1-3: Overall project has potential, but needs refinement
- 4-5: Project design is practical and will result in either water savings **OR** GHG emissions reductions
- 6-7: Project design is excellent and will result in water savings **AND** GHG emissions reductions
- 8-10: For any project scoring 6 or 7, assign one additional point for each of the following considerations that apply:
 - 1. Environmental co-benefits
 - 2. Benefits to a disadvantaged community
 - 3. Cash Match and/or In-kind Contributions are provided

For example, an excellent design resulting in water savings and GHG emissions reductions that also has environmental co-benefits, benefits to a disadvantaged community, and matching funds will score a 10.

Reviewer Score: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 2: What are the benefits of this project (summary) in terms of water savings, agricultural water efficiency and GHG reductions? Provide explanation.

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 3: Are there any limitations that should be addressed? Provide explanation.

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 4: Are the projected water savings and GHG savings reasonable under the criteria that have been selected? Provide explanation.

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 5: Are the project cost estimates consistent with NRCS payment schedules and with what is being proposed?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 6: Are matching funds and/or in-kind contributions provided?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 7: Is the project design consistent with the proposed water savings, agricultural water efficiency and GHG reductions that were described in the application?

Provide explanation:

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 8: Overall, should CDFA fund this proposal? Provide a brief explanation that supports the response.

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)
