

California Department of Food and Agriculture

TITLE: 2016 State Water Efficiency and Enhancement Program Round 1
Technical Review Criteria

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please use the questions below to guide your evaluation of the 2016 State Water Efficiency and Enhancement Program (SWEET) applications. As appropriate, use a holistic approach taking all relevant factors into consideration during your review.

After completing a review of the application, provide constructive feedback in the FEEDBACK FOR APPLICANT text box (required). Comments made here should emphasize specific issues the applicant can address to improve the quality of future SWEET applications.

Additionally, provide any relevant supplementary feedback in the OVERALL REVIEW COMMENTS text box (required) at the bottom of the review sheet. The intent of these comments are to assist CDFA in determining recommendations for funding. These comments should also reflect your overall assessment and support your numerical score of the application, whether poor, below average, average, good or excellent.

CURRENT WATER USE SYSTEM

Review Section V, questions 8 through 11 of the application to evaluate the applicant's current water use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Evaluate the baseline water use and GHG emissions documentation attached to the application, and determine if the on-farm evidence supports the baseline calculations. Applications must demonstrate the baseline values are directly related to the actual, on-farm documentation.

Baseline Water Use

- 1). Evaluate the on-farm water use documentation attachment(s) to support the baseline water use calculation. Does the water use documentation attached support the baseline water use value calculated by the applicant in question 10(a) of the application?

- a). Does the responses and methodology provided in questions 10(b) through (d) of the application substantiate the baseline water use calculation?

Answer:

- b). If the applicant's baseline water use calculation and methodology are not reasonable and consistent with the on-farm documentation, show re-calculation and provide detailed explanation.

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

Indicate re-calculated baseline water use.

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 0 and 999999999

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

Baseline GHG Emissions

- 2). Evaluate the on-farm GHG emissions documentation attachment(s) to support the baseline GHG emissions calculation. Does the energy use documentation attached support the *baseline GHG emissions* value calculated by the applicant in question 11(a) of the application?

Answer:

- a). Does the response and methodology provided in questions 11(b) through (e) in the application substantiate the *baseline GHG emissions* calculation?

Answer:

- b). If the applicant's *baseline GHG emissions* calculation and methodology are not reasonable and consistent with the on-farm documentation, show re-calculation and provide detailed explanation.

Indicate re-calculated baseline GHG emissions.

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

PROPOSED WATER USE SYSTEM

Review Section VI, questions 12 through 15 of the application to evaluate the applicant's proposed irrigation system, including the Project Design and Budget Worksheet attachments. Evaluate the projected water use and GHG emissions calculations, and determine if those values are reasonable and consistent with the proposed upgrades. Note that the proposed system should be consistent with the project types addressed in Section IV of the application.

Water Use after Project Implementation

- 3). Does the response provided in question 13(b) of the application substantiate the *estimated water usage* calculation?

Answer:

- a). If the applicant's *estimated water use* after implementation is not reasonable and consistent with the proposed upgrades, show re-calculations and provide detailed explanation.

Indicate re-calculated estimated water usage after implementation.

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 0 and 999999999

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

- b). Does the proposed project demonstrate applied water will be measured after implementation (flow meter, measured by water district) in question 13(c)?

Answer:

GHG Emissions after Project Implementation

- 4). Does the response and methodology provided in question 15(b) of the application substantiate the *estimated GHG emissions* calculation in question 15(a)?

Answer:

- a). If the applicant's estimated GHG emissions after implementation are not reasonable and consistent with the proposed upgrades, show re-calculations and provide detailed explanation.

Indicate re-calculated estimated GHG emissions after implementation.

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 0 and 999999999

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

Project Design

- 5). Does the Project Design attachment(s) align with the proposed project described in the application? If no, provide an explanation. Be as specific as possible.

Answer:

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

Budget

When evaluating project costs, technical reviewer should use their professional experience in determining reasonableness. However, the NRCS payment schedule may also be used as a guide, to the extent feasible, to determine reasonable cost estimates.

- 6). Are cost estimates provided in the Budget Worksheet attachment reasonable and consistent with the project elements described in the application, including the Project Design? If no, explain why not. Be specific as possible.

Answer:

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

Water Savings

Indicate *estimated water savings* value provided in question 6(a):

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 0 and 999999999

- 7). Based on the overall assessment of the application, will the proposed project achieve the *estimated water savings*? Show re-calculation if estimates do not appear reasonable and provide detailed explanation.

Indicate the re-calculated *estimated water savings*.

Answer:

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 0 and 999999999

Maximum of 1000 characters.

GHG Emissions Reduction

Indicate *estimated GHG emissions reduction* value provided in question 6(b).

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 0 and 999999999

- 8). Based on the overall assessment of the application, will the proposed project achieve the *estimated GHG emissions reduction*? Show re-calculation if estimates do not appear reasonable and provide detailed explanation.

Indicate re-calculated *estimated GHG emissions reduction*.

Answer:

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 0 and 999999999

- a). Was the attached GHG Calculator Tool(s) completed with the appropriate inputs?

If more than one GHG calculator Tool is attached and one attachment is not completed with appropriate inputs, select no.

Answer:

SCORE

Using your professional knowledge, score the application using the matrix below to assign a value. When determining a score, consider the thoroughness of the application, the quality of the project design, reasonableness of the budget and potential for project to save water and reduce GHG emissions. Use only whole numbers when scoring the application.

Scoring Criteria

Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

Answer:

Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 1 and 5

FEEDBACK FOR APPLICANT

Provide constructive feedback for the applicant. These comments should describe any deficiencies, indicate any limitations and identify specific areas the applicant can address to strengthen the application and improve the quality of future SWEEP applications.

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.

OVERALL REVIEW COMMENTS

Provide an overall assessment of the proposed project and ability to achieve water savings and GHG emissions reduction. These comments should reflect your overall assessment and support your numerical score of the application, whether poor, below average, average, good, or excellent.

Answer:

Maximum of 1000 characters.