

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

Board Meeting
September 25, 1996

**AGENDA ITEM \ **

**ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH STANDARDIZED
GENERAL GRANT REVIEW CRITERIA FOR ALL COMPETITIVE CIWMB
GRANTS**

I. SUMMARY

This item presents a recommendation to establish standardized general grant review criteria for competitive grant programs. Criteria for the Household Hazardous Waste Grant Program were approved in May, 1996, by the Policy Committee and Board. During briefings for the Policy Committee meeting, and at the Committee meeting itself, Board Members noted that they would like to see standard criteria developed for all CIWMB competitive grant programs. The Grants Administration Unit was assigned to develop the Item.

Today's item presents a format for standard general grant review criteria. Additional staff work is needed to further refine the scoring method that will apply the standard criteria.

II. PREVIOUS COMMITTEE/BOARD ACTION

The Policy, Research and Technical Assistance Committee approved the staff recommendation to establish standardized grant review criteria on September 10, 1996.

III. OPTIONS FOR THE BOARD

Board Members may wish to:

1. Approve the establishment of standardized grant review criteria as outlined in Attachment #1; or
2. Direct staff to revise the proposal; or
3. Direct staff to not pursue standardized grant review criteria at this time.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends Option #1; approve the establishment of standardized grant review criteria as outlined in Attachment #1.

V. ANALYSIS

Background

CIWMB currently offers five grant programs, which are administered in three different divisions: Enforcement Assistance Grants and Solid Waste Disposal/Codisposal Site Cleanup (AB 2136) Grants (Permitting and Enforcement Division); Household Hazardous Waste Grants and Used Oil Grants (Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Division); and Tire Recycling Grants (Waste Prevention and Market Development Division).

Criteria for each grant program have been developed based on statute, regulation or internal policy decisions (see Attachment #2 for summary). Since the criteria were developed in different divisions, standardization has never been addressed.

The process for awarding competitive grants, approved by the Board in July, 1994, calls for the appropriate policy committee to approve scoring criteria for each grant program each year. Upon approval of the criteria by the Committee and Board, the grant application packages are finalized and distributed.

Key Issues

A training class was provided for all grants staff last year focusing on ways to improve our current grant administration process. The training was facilitated by Gail McGovern, a professional grants consultant, formerly with the State Library Foundation. The essential elements of a grant proposal on which scoring should be based, were identified.

- Need for the Project
- Objectives

- Methodology
- Evaluation
- Budget
- Organizational Capability

Grant programs have both General Review Criteria and Preference Criteria. In addition, statutes generally specify certain minimum Eligibility Requirements.

1. **Eligibility Requirements** - specify conditions that must be met before an application can even be considered for funding. These are listed in statute and cannot be standardized between grant programs.
2. **General Review Criteria** - address the essential elements of a grant proposal as identified above. General criteria should be standardized for all programs.
3. **Preference Criteria** - are specific to each program and should identify specific Board priorities. It is not practical to standardize Preference Criteria between programs, but it may be beneficial to address multiple year priorities for each program.

Fiscal Impacts

No new costs are associated with implementing the staff recommendation. In fact there should be a significant savings as staff would not need to develop new criteria each year. Developing new criteria has often been a controversial and time consuming process. By establishing standardized criteria, both staff time and review time by Advisors and Board Members will be reduced.

Staff time will still be spent developing Preference Criteria for the various grant programs, but again, no new costs would be associated with this task.

Findings

Advantages - Through discussions with staff in all affected divisions, several advantages of standardized criteria were identified:

1. A streamlined evaluation method will save staff time and Board Member review time.
2. All criteria coming forward to the Board will be in a consistent format.
3. Standard criteria should increase the level of consistency in grant evaluation and scoring.
4. Application packages will reflect the criteria resulting in more consistent, clear grant applications.
5. Service to the public will be improved as consistent formats will make it easier to understand Board priorities and apply for Board grants.

Limitations - This item only presents a recommendation to standardize general grant review criteria. It does not address how to apply the criteria in scoring individual applications. It is acknowledged that any scoring method must allow flexibility for program differences, and annual Board priorities. Evaluation teams however, must be provided a structured scoring method to insure consistent application of the criteria. Additional work is needed before a structured scoring method can be recommended.

Proposed Process

If standardization of the General Review Criteria is approved, the following process is recommended for addressing the Preference Criteria and the points assigned to each criteria. (If a structured scoring method is subsequently approved, process would be modified to address Preference Criteria only.)

1. At the beginning of each grant cycle, staff develops a proposal for establishing Preference Criteria and assigning points to the General Review Criteria. The proposal will

- identify any relevant statutory requirements that affected the criteria development.
2. The Committee and the Board approve and/or revise the staff recommendation.
 3. The application package is prepared and mailed to potential applicants, based on the approved criteria. (Criteria is included in the package.)
 4. Applications are received at the Board by the deadline date.
 5. Grants Administration Unit (GAU) staff performs initial data entry and a completeness review on each application; includes a check for minimum Eligibility Requirements.
 6. Program staff assigns evaluation teams consisting of three members. A meeting is held with all team members to discuss criteria and provide a clear scoring structure. This will generally involve setting parameters for point ranges for each criteria.
 7. Scoring will be done by individual team members first; then each team will meet to determine a group score for each application. If there is more than one evaluation team, the team leaders will meet to merge the rankings, making every effort to insure consistent interpretation by the various teams.
 8. The final ranking of grant applications will be brought to the Administration Committee and the Board for award.

VI. ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed General Review Criteria
2. Chart: Historical Development of Grant Evaluation Criteria by Program
3. Tentative Timeline; Fiscal Year 1996-97 CIWMB Grants

VII. APPROVALS

Shirley Willet Usner 9-2-96
Lead Staff Date

Marij Falgout 9/12/96
Deputy Director Date

Mary Eggink 9/12/96
Branch Manager Date

ITEM REQUIRES LEGAL OFFICE REVIEW/APPROVAL

ITEM REQUIRES OTHER INTERDIVISIONAL REVIEW/APPROVAL
(Please indicate appropriate Division(s))

Judith J. Friedman 9/12/96
Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Date

Kubia E. Packard 9/12/96
Policy and Analysis Office Date

Max Rice 9/12/96
Permitting and Enforcement Date

[Signature] 9/12/96
Waste Prevention and Market Development Date

Kathryn J. Tobias 9/12/96
Legal Office Date

CIWMB GRANT SCORING CRITERIA

ELIGIBILITY and MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS SECTION *(Eligibility requirements or minimum qualifications established in statute for each grant program will be specified here. Only proposals meeting these requirements will be considered for funding.)*

Points	Description
GENERAL REVIEW CRITERIA <i>(must attain a minimum score of 70% to be considered for funding)</i>	
	<p>1. NEED -- Grant proposal clearly describes and demonstrates the local or statewide need for the project and the benefits and end products resulting from the project. For example, proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provides convincing reasons why the project should be funded ■ Addresses identified gap in service availability; current unmet need ■ Describes and document the problem ■ Supports the existence of the problem with surveys, studies ■ Adequately describes any health and safety threats or environmental concerns
	<p>2. OBJECTIVES -- Work Statement and grant narrative are sufficiently detailed to determine that the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Is based on the identified need described in the narrative ■ Describes specific and measurable goals and objectives ■ Demonstrates that objectives can be achieved within indicated time frame
	<p>3. METHODOLOGY -- Grant proposal describes by task the activities to be undertaken to achieve the objectives. For example, proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Describes why the proposed activities are the best way to address the identified need ■ Describes in detail how the objectives will be met with available time and resources ■ Identifies staffing required to carry out the proposed project ■ Describes involvement of cooperating organizations ■ Presents a specific plan for future funding

	<p>4. EVALUATION -- Grant proposal describes a method to evaluate the success of the project and determine whether objectives were accomplished. For example, proposal: Includes both process and outcome evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Describes a method for evaluating and modifying methods during project implementation ■ Describes clearly the criteria for determining success ■ States who will be responsible for the evaluation ■ Explains any statistical tests or questionnaires to be used ■ Describes any evaluation reports to be produced
	<p>5. BUDGET -- Grant proposal demonstrates that the project is cost effective in relation to the location, source, quality, and quantity of targeted wastes. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Budget itemization is sufficiently detailed to determine that proposed expenses are reasonable ■ Quotes, estimates, or other documentation to support the costs claimed are provided ■ All program tasks described in the Work Statement and narrative are itemized in the budget ■ Cost savings are described e.g. use of volunteer labor, in-kind services, recycling options, use of existing promotional materials etc. ■ Budget items for miscellaneous, contingency, or managerial costs are clearly described and kept to a minimum
	<p>6. COMPLETENESS, LETTERS OF SUPPORT, EXPERIENCE, ETC. -- Grant Proposal is clearly presented and complete as required in the application instructions including adherence to all specified deadlines. Includes evidence that the applicant or its contractor(s) have sufficient staff resources, technical expertise and experience successfully managing grant programs, to carry out the proposed project. For example, proposal: Includes letters of support for the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Addresses ability of the applicant to coordinate contracted activities, if applicable ■ Includes resumes, endorsements, references, etc. ■ Describes past grants received from CIWMB and relationship to current proposal
<p>PREFERENCE CRITERIA (<i>Preference criteria will be specific to each grant program and will be brought before the appropriate Committee and Board for approval each grant cycle.</i>)</p>	

**HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF GRANT
EVALUATION CRITERIA BY PROGRAM**

Division	Grant Program	Enabling Legislation	Discretionary/ NonDiscretionary	1995/96 Budgeted Amount	Basis for Criteria	Comments
Permitting & Enforcement	Enforcement Assistance	AB 1220, Eastin, Stats 1993, c. 656, PRC 43230 et seq	Non Discretionary	\$ 1,500,000	Policy	The allocation process was approved by the Board in 1990; process is followed each year.
	2136; Solid Waste Disposal and CoDisposal Site Cleanup	AB 2136, Eastin, Stats 1993, c. 655, PRC 48020 et seq	Discretionary	\$ 5,000,000	Statute, Policy	Statute outlines priorities; Board set allocation limits among the funding categories and approved process for selecting applicants in September 1994.
Diversion Planning & Local Assistance	Household Hazardous Waste	AB 1220, Eastin, Stats 1993, c. 656, PRC 47200 et seq	Discretionary	\$ 3,000,000	Statute, Regulation and Policy	Each year Board approves scoring criteria and process; based on requirements in statute and regulation.
	Used Oil Block Grants	AB 2076, Sher, Stats 1991, c. 817, PRC 48600 et seq	Non Discretionary	\$10,000,000	Regulation	Allocation process and eligibility requirements are specified in statute; no scoring criteria are used as this is a non-discretionary program.
	Used Oil Opportunity Grants		Discretionary	\$ 6,800,000	Policy	Each year Board approves scoring criteria.
	Used Oil Non-Profit Grants		Discretionary	\$ 1,200,000 (94/95 FY)	Policy	Each year Board approves scoring criteria and process; based on requirements in statute.
	Used Oil Research & Demonstration Grants		Discretionary	\$ 1,400,000	Policy	Each year Board approves scoring criteria and process; based on requirements in statute.
Waste Prevention & Market Development	Tire Recycling	AB 1843, Brown, Stats 1989, c. 974, PRC 42860 et seq	Discretionary	\$ 820,000	Statute/Policy	Each year Board approves scoring criteria and process; based on specific selection priorities required in statute.

9

1996-97 Fiscal Year Grants Tentative Timeline

	Jul-96	Aug-96	Sep-96	Oct-96	Nov-96	Dec-96	Jan-97	Feb-97	Mar-97	Apr-97	May-97	Jun-97	Jul-97
TIRE GRANTS \$500,000	Evaluation of the tire program for direction for FY 96/97		Tire Work Shop	Award of tire grants (and/or loans) will be dependent upon the outcome of the Tire Workshop and direction of the Board									
HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE - DISCRETIONARY \$3 million				Application Review and Scoring	Grant Award; Cmt. and Board Action	Performance Period through June 1998			Develop Application Package for FY 97-98		Cmt. Board Action of criteria, scoring for FY 97-98		NOFA and Application mailed for 97/98
USED OIL BLOCK GRANTS \$10 million	Develop Application Package			NOFA and Application mailed mid-month			Application Review			Grant Award; Cmt. and Board Action	Performance Period June 30, 1997 through June 30, 1998		
USED OIL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS est. \$5.5 to \$6.5 million	Perform. Period July 1996 through June 1998	Cmt. Board Action on criteria/scoring	Develop Application Package		NOFA and Applications Mailed mid-month			Application Review and Scoring		Grant Award; Cmt. and Board Action	Performance Period June 30, 1997 through June 30, 1999		
USED OIL NON-PROFIT GRANTS est. \$2 million	Application Review		Grant Award; Cmt. and Board Action	Performance Period for the Used Oil NonProfit Grants October 1996 through September 1998									
USED OIL RESEARCH GRANTS est. \$1.5 million	Performance Period June 1995 through March 1997		Develop Application Package		NOFA and Application mailed mid-month			Application Review		Grant Award; Cmt. and Board Action	Performance Period June 30, 1997 through June 30, 1999		

1996-97 Fiscal Year Grants Tentative Timeline

	<i>Jul-96</i>	<i>Aug-96</i>	<i>Sep-96</i>	<i>Oct-96</i>	<i>Nov-96</i>	<i>Dec-96</i>	<i>Jan-97</i>	<i>Feb-97</i>	<i>Mar-97</i>	<i>Apr-97</i>	<i>May-97</i>	<i>Jun-97</i>	<i>Jul-97</i>
ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE GRANTS \$1.5 million	Implement FY 95-96 Grants		Develop Program Regulations			Develop Application Package		Applications Mailed			Grant Award; no Board Action Needed	Performance Period (Through June 30, 1998)	
AB 2136 MATCHING GRANTS \$1.5 million max.	Continuous Application Period; each grant is brought before the Permitting & Enforcement Committee and the Board individually for award					Tentative Grant Award; Cmt and Board Action		Tentative Grant Award; Cmt and Board Action		Tentative Grant Award; Cmt and Board Action	Performance Period (through June 30, 1999)		
AB 2136 LEA GRANT \$2 million max.	Continuous Application Period; each grant is brought before the Permitting & Enforcement Committee and the Board individually for award					Tentative Grant Award; Cmt and Board Action; dependent on applications received		Tentative Grant Award; Cmt and Board Action; dependent on applications received		Tentative Grant Award; Cmt and Board Action	Performance Period (through June 30, 1999)		

