



RECEIVED

2020 SEP 25 AM 11:47

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

MICHAEL P. VICTORINO
Mayor

JEFFREY T. PEARSON, P.E.
Director

HELENE KAU
Deputy Director

DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY
COUNTY OF MAUI
200 SOUTH HIGH STREET
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793
www.mauewater.org

September 23, 2020

Honorable Michael P. Victorino
Mayor, County of Maui
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Maui, HI 96793

APPROVED FOR TRANSMITTAL

Michael P. Victorino 9/26/20

Mayor Date

For Transmittal to:

Honorable Yuki Lei K. Sugimura
Chair, Water, Infrastructure, and Transportation Committee
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Maui, HI 96793

SUBJECT: GRANT MONITORING AND EVALUATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY
FISCAL YEAR 2020 WATERSHED PROTECTION GRANT PROGRAM (WIT 12)

In compliance with Section 3.36.120(6), Maui County Code, below is the Watershed Protection Grants Program Report for Fiscal Year 2020.

COVID-19 continues to affect Grantee performances for Fiscal Year 2020, as they struggle to work on the ground, find volunteers and stay safe working in and out of the field following safety protocols and adhering to social distancing rules. Although some grant agreements were executed during the second quarter of Fiscal Year 2020 which allowed them to accomplish a portion of their field out-plantings, seed collections, plant propagation, and invasive animal and plant control, an initial work slowdown due to the pandemic quickly ensued. Grantees are now actively readjusting in order to optimize what resources and personnel they can put to use. COVID-19 still forced some grantees to halt all activities related to community outreach and volunteerism. The good news is that project staff that were furloughed during the onset of Covid-19 are now back to work to accomplish deliverables as all Grantees struggle to submit their first quarter reports to begin drawing down FY 2020 awards.

The status of grants for Fiscal Year 2020 is as follows:

1. East Maui Watershed Partnership (UH) – Currently benchmarking performance
2. Waikamoi East Maui Upcountry Source Protection Program (TNC) – Currently benchmarking performance
3. West Maui Mountains Watershed Partnership (UH) – Currently benchmarking performance
4. Maui Invasive Species Committee (UH) – with approved FY 2019 no cost extension request until 12/20 and currently benchmarking performance for FY 2020
5. Auwahi Forest Restoration Project - with approved no cost extension for FY 2019 and request until 12/20 and currently benchmarking performance for FY 2020

6. Honokowai and Wahikuli Source Protection (TNC) – Currently benchmarking performance
7. Pu`u Kukui Watershed Preserve – (LP) - Currently benchmarking performance
8. East Molokai Watershed Partnership (TNC) – Currently benchmarking performance
9. Hawaii Agriculture Research Center – Currently benchmarking performance
10. Bio Economic Models for Protection Against Miconia Invasion (UH) - Currently benchmarking performance
11. Leeward Haleakala Watershed Restoration Partnership (UH) – Under re-evaluation due to FY19 non-compliance

A little context from FY 2019 provides insight to some Grantees' current status. Two grantees are currently not in compliance with the terms of their FY 2019 grant agreements:

Maui Invasive Species Committee (UH) did not submit their third quarter report for FY2019, which breached the provisions of their DWS Grant Agreement. Although they received a No-Cost Extension (NCE) to complete their work, the NCE was requested during the fourth quarter of their performance period. This means that they should have been on time for their third quarter report. We are currently reaching out the Grantee to obtain the third quarter report. Their fourth and final quarter report is expected to be submitted by December 2020 at the end of their NCE.

Leeward Haleakala Watershed Restoration Partnership (UH) failed to submit the last three (3) quarterly reports for FY 2019, which breached the provisions of their DWS Grant Agreement. This raised doubts about their ability to transition into and eventually accomplish FY 2020 deliverables. With the start of FY20, DWS is currently evaluating FY 2019 reports that were submitted several months late to determine whether to cancel, suspend or allow further funding for FY 2020 and beyond.

Since DWS cannot reimburse requests for payments that are not accompanied by quarterly reports, it is important to bring all Grantees that are not in compliance back to good standing to prevent further delays that may affect subsequent fiscal year performances. For FY 2020, DWS continues to catch up from past delays cause by late submissions, the Covid-19 pandemic, past contracting delays at the University of Hawaii (UH), and fiscal sponsorship transfer by Auwahi Forest Restoration Project moving from UH to Friends of Auwahi.

To monitor Grantees' performances, DWS continually evaluates according to an internal process and benchmarking procedure. Evaluation criteria falls within four (4) core benchmarks listed here:

1. Deliverables – Grantees are responsible to fulfill the deliverables under their respective contract. DWS ensures that tasks completed reflects the purpose of the program...
2. Expenditures – DWS follows strict auditing and accounting guidelines to insure that grant funds, from water revenue, are being spent in a fiscally responsible way.
3. Due Diligence – Grantees are expected to comply with the GTC and other provisions of the contract.
4. Reporting – Submission of progress/final reports and GIS layers are necessary for evaluating each grantee's performance which determines continuity of DWS funding.

The criteria that fall within these benchmarks include considerations for benefits received by the public, project cost-benefit to enhance water supply and sustainability, project administration and management, ability to complete and accomplish deliverables on time, performance over time, and amount of other secured outside funding.

In addition to the internal evaluation criteria and benchmarking used by DWS to evaluate Grantee performance, the attached benchmarking matrix developed by the Council in 2020 is included. To align the two, DWS referenced its internal benchmarking criteria to the corresponding benchmarking criteria

provided in the Council matrix, and weighted scores equally for consistency. Although the DWS evaluation process is more in-depth for analysis and accounting purposes, this assures that the Council's benchmarks are aligned and supported by our internal evaluation process and benchmarking procedure.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at extension 7834.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey T. Pearson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "J" and a long, sweeping underline.

Jeffrey T. Pearson, P.E.
Director of Water Supply

ADMINISTRATIVE									COMMUNITY NEEDS		SUSTAINABILITY			
GRANTEE	WATERSHED PROTECTION	# OF YEARS REC'D COUNTY FUNDING	GRANT #	FY 20 AWARD	FY 20 PAYMENTS	GRANT APPLICATION (5 pts) DWS Benchmark No.5	RESPONSIVENESS (5 pts) DWS Benchmark No.1	RECORDS & REPORTING (10 pts) DWS Benchmark No.4	MEETING COMMUNITY NEEDS (50 pts) DWS Benchmark No.1	USE OF FUNDS (10 pts) DWS Benchmark No.2	EFFORTS TO SECURE OTHER FUNDING (10 pts) DWS Benchmark No.3	% OF COUNTY FUNDS FOR PROJECT (10 pts)	MAXIMUM SCORE (100 pts)	REMARKS
East Maui Watershed Partnership - UH		15	WC1068	\$415,000	\$0.00	5	5	0	30	10	10	63%	60	Deadline approaching
Waikamoi Source Protection - TNC		24	WC1031	\$240,000	\$0.00	4	3	0	30	8	10	39%	55	Deadline approaching
Leeward Haleakala Watershed Restoratioh Partnership - UH		16	WC1065	\$200,000	\$0.00	3	2	0	20	7	10	37%	42	Deadline approaching
West Maui Mountains Watershed Partnership - UH		23	WC1064	\$480,000	\$0.00	5	5	0	30	8	10	41%	58	Deadline approaching
Puu Kukui Watershed Preserve - LLP		7	WC1044	\$320,000	\$0.00	5	4	3	30	8	8	50%	58	Late
Honokowai & Wahikuli Source Protection - TNC		5	WC1029	\$75,000	\$0.00	4	3	3	25	8	8	31%	51	Late
Auwahi Forest Restoration Project - FAFRP		4	WC1028	\$120,000	\$54,288.21	5	5	8	25	8	8	40%	59	Submitted 1st Qtr
East Molokai Watershed Partnership - TNC		21	WC1035	\$250,000	\$0.00	4	3	3	30	8	10	37%	58	Late
Maui Invasive Species Committee - UH		21	WC1066	\$260,000	\$0.00	4	3	0	25	7	10	22%	49	Deadline approaching
Bio Economic Models for Protection Against Miconia Invasion_ UH		2	WC1070	\$95,186	\$0.00	3	2	2	20	5	0	0%	32	Late
Hawaii Agriculture Research Center		8	WC1013	\$56,500	\$5,478.55	3	5	7	25	6	6	50%	52	Submitted 1st Qtr

Additional Notes:

DWS criteria considered to fall within the DWS benchmarks include considerations for benefits received by the public, project cost-benefit to enhance water supply and sustainability, project administration and management, ability to complete and accomplish deliverables on time, performance over time, and amount of other secured outside funding.

In addition to the internal evaluation criteria and benchmarking used by DWS to evaluate Grantee performance, the benchmarking matrix developed by the Council in 2020 contain benchmarks which have been aligned with the DWS internal benchmarking criteria. Benchmark scores are normalized for consistency. Although the DWS evaluation process is more in-depth for analysis and accounting purposes, this assures that the Council's benchmarks are scaled proportionately and supported by our internal evaluation process and benchmarking procedure.

Grantees may receive a higher score after finishing a quarter as DWS benchmarks based on quarterly reports and responsiveness.

The score of "0" may indicate that a Grantee may not be in compliance **OR** DWS does not have any reporting to evaluate.

Not in compliance with 1st Qtr reporting deadline which also affects Responsiveness and Use of Funds score.

Meeting Community Needs is greatly affected by Covid-19, whereby Grantees are not able to interact with the public as part of their public outreach efforts that DWS supports.

ADMINISTRATIVE									COMMUNITY NEEDS		SUSTAINABILITY		MAXIMUM SCORE (100 pts)
GRANTEE	WATERSHED PROTECTION	# OF YEARS REC'D COUNTY FUNDING	GRANT #	FY 19 AWARD	FY 19 PAYMENTS	GRANT APPLICATION (5 pt) DWS Criteria No. 5	RESPONSIVENESS (5 pts) DWS Criteria No.1	RECORDS & REPORTING (10 pts) DWS Criteria No.4	MEETING COMMUNITY NEEDS (50 pts) DWS Criteria No.1	USE OF FUNDS (10 pts) DWS Criteria No.2	EFFORTS TO SECURE OTHER FUNDING (10 pts) DWS Criteria No.3	% OF COUNTY FUNDS FOR PROJECT (10 pts)	
East Maui Watershed Partnership - UH		14	WC1001	\$330,000	\$241,640.42	5	5	10	50	10	10	53%	90
Waikamoi Source Protection - TNC		23	WC0991	\$250,147	\$184,547.03	5	5	10	50	8	10	62%	88
Leeward Haleakala Watershed Restoratioh Partnership - UH		15	WC0998	\$190,000	\$44,688.50	4	1	2	20	3	10	61%	40
West Maui Mountains Watershed Partnership - UH		22	WC0999	\$450,000	\$363,797.85	5	5	10	50	8	10	40%	88
Puu Kukui Watershed Preserve - LLP		6	WC0996	\$285,000	\$132,469.04	5	5	10	50	8	8	27%	86
Honokowai & Wahikuli Source Protection - TNC		4	WC0989	\$75,000	\$75,000.00	5	5	10	45	8	8	62%	81
Auwahi Forest Restoration Project - FAFRP		3	WC0997	\$60,000	\$11,985.16	5	5	10	40	8	8	24%	76
East Molokai Watershed Partnership - TNC		20	WC0990	\$250,000	\$250,000.00	4	5	10	50	8	10	64%	87
Maui Invasive Species Committee - UH		20	WC1000	\$500,000	\$148,971.19	4	3	6	40	5	10	58%	68
Bio Economic Models for Protection Against Miconia Invasion _ UH		1	WC1007	\$95,186	\$34,961.72	4	3	3	20	5	0	0%	35
Hawaii Agriculture Research Center		8	WC0988	\$56,500	\$13,839.23	3	5	8	40	6	6	50%	68

DWS Evaluation Criteria

- 1. Deliverables** – Grantees are responsible to fulfill the deliverables under their respective contract. DWS ensures that tasks completed reflects the purpose of the program.
- 2. Expenditures** – DWS follows strict auditing and accounting guidelines to insure that grant funds, from water revenue, are being spent in a fiscally responsible way.
- 3. Due Diligence** – Grantees are expected to comply with the GTC and other provisions of the contract.
- 4. Reporting** – Submission of progress/final reports and GIS layers are necessary for evaluating each grantee's performance which determines continuity of DWS funding.
- 5. Quality and completeness of application package**

Additional Notes:

DWS criteria considered to fall within the DWS benchmarks include considerations for benefits received by the public, project cost-benefit to enhance water supply and sustainability, project administration and management, ability to complete and accomplish deliverables on time, performance over time, and amount of other secured outside funding.

In addition to the internal evaluation criteria and benchmarking used by DWS to evaluate Grantee performance, the benchmarking matrix developed by the Council in 2020 contain benchmarks which have been aligned with the DWS internal benchmarking criteria. Benchmark scores are normalized for consistency. Although the DWS evaluation process is more in-depth for analysis and accounting purposes, this assures that the Council's benchmarks are scaled proportionately and supported by our internal evaluation process and benchmarking procedure.

did not submit information