

CFI Process Overview

EVALUATION SHEET

District staff review CFI applications and develop concise one-page evaluations of potential projects. The staff evaluation is divided into six sections: project identification, description, evaluation, strategic goals, overall ranking and recommendation, and funding.

Project Identification: Project Number, Title, Cooperating Entity (Cooperator), Risk Level, and whether it is a Multi-Year Project.

Description: Concise description of the project including benefits and costs.

Evaluation: Includes six sections (Application Quality, Resource Benefit, Cost Effectiveness, Past Performance, Complementary Efforts, and Project Readiness) with ranking options of High, Medium, and Low.

Strategic goals: Separate section tied to the SWFWMD Strategic Plan. Ranked High if project meets both a Regional Priority and Strategic Initiative, Medium if it only meets one, and Low if it meets none.

Overall ranking and recommendation: Based on staff evaluation of the applications ranking in evaluation and strategic goals section. Projects ranked 1A, High, and Medium are recommended for funding. Low projects are not recommended for funding. A project with a 1A ranking means it is an ongoing project approved for multiple years. With multi-year projects applicants are required to request funds through the CFI cycle each year.

Funding: Identifies the funding sources for the project including the District's share, Cooperator's share, as well as any other outside funding. Funding from prior, proposed and future fiscal years is provided.

CFI SCHEDULE

August:
CFI Workshop & Application Period Open

October:
Application Period Closes

October – February:
Applications Review and Preliminary Rankings Assigned

February:
1st Subcommittee – Preliminary Rankings Presented

April:
2nd Subcommittee – Final Rankings Presented/Subcommittee Recommendations

June:
Full Governing Board reviews all projects for inclusion in the preliminary budget

August-September:
Final Budget Approved

RISK LEVELS

Type 1

Requires the least amount of involvement of District staff time to track the progress, ensure the project is consistent with the contract scope of work and sign off on reimbursements to the cooperator.

Type 2

Requires more staff involvement to review the cooperator's contracts with consultants and contractors to ensure the scope and budgets are consistent with the District's cooperative funding contract.

Type 3

District staff involved in the design phase of the project and may provide meaningful guidance based on the District's experience, expertise and regional understanding that would lead to opportunities to enhance the water resource benefits and efficient use of limited funding.

Type 4

District is the lead in managing the project activities.

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

CFI Process Overview

METRICS FOR RANKING COST EFFECTIVENESS

Water Supply Projects			
Project Type	High	Medium	Low
Reuse (cost/gpd)	<\$10	\$10-\$15	>\$15
Brackish (cost/gpd)	<\$8	\$8-\$10	>\$10
Surface Water (cost/gpd)	<\$15	\$15-\$20	>\$20
Seawater (cost/gpd)	<\$20	\$20-\$25	>\$25
Other AWS (cost/gpd)	<\$10	\$10-\$15	>\$15
Conservation (cost/1000 gallons saved)	≤\$3	\$3.01-\$6	>\$6
Water Quality Projects (cost/lb of pollutant removed)			
Project Type	High	Medium	Low
Total Nitrogen (cost/lb)	<\$176	≥\$176 ≤ \$475	>\$475
Total Phosphorus (cost/lb)	<\$1498	≥\$1498 ≤ \$4152	>\$4152
Total Suspended Solids (cost/lb)	<\$5	≥\$5 ≤ \$13	>\$13
Wastewater Total Nitrogen (cost/lb)	<\$100	≥\$100 ≤ \$176	>\$176
Natural Systems Restoration Projects (cost/acre restored; cost/linear foot restored)			
Project Type	High	Medium	Low
Shoreline Restoration	≤\$269 per linear feet	N/A	>\$269 per linear feet
Upland (Exotics removal)	≤\$2,348 per acre	N/A	>\$2,348 per acre
Dredging	TBD on similar projects	TBD on similar projects	TBD on similar projects
Hydrologic Restoration	≤\$1,775 per acre	N/A	>\$1,775 per acre
Combined elements	≤\$53,326 per acre	N/A	>\$53,326 per acre
Flood Protection Projects			
Project Type	High	Medium	Low
BMPs (benefit/cost ratio)	≥1	0.7-0.9	<0.7
BMPs (when benefit/cost ratio is not available)	N/A	Costs based on design. Estimates appear reasonable.	Costs based on conceptual level, or, Costs high compared to similar projects
Watershed Management Plan (cost/sq. mile) Excludes LiDAR and Peer Review costs	Urban: ≤\$66,000 Rural: ≤\$12,000 Mixed: ≤\$20,000	Urban: \$66,001-\$87,000 Rural: \$12,001-\$20,000 Mixed: \$20,001-\$41,000	Urban: >\$87,000 Rural: >\$20,000 Mixed: >\$41,000
Watershed Management Plan Updates (cost/sq. mile) (Watershed Evaluation, Floodplain Analysis, and Alternatives Analysis)	Urban: ≤\$25,000 Rural: ≤\$6,000 Mixed: ≤\$15,000	Urban: \$25,001-\$40,000 Rural: \$6,001-\$10,000 Mixed: \$15,001-\$22,000	Urban: >\$40,000 Rural: >\$10,000 Mixed: >\$22,000

Cooperators' past performance is evaluated. If 75 percent of cooperator's projects were on schedule and budget, the cooperator receives a high ranking. Less than 75 percent results in a medium ranking. More than 25 percent of the cooperators' projects need amendments to extend the termination date or increase project funding results in a low.