

# Monitoring Checklist

TOTAL SCORE:

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has developed a Monitoring Checklist to assist in the monitoring of subrecipients of federal funds and recipients of *TransNet* Senior Mini-Grant funds, collectively referred to as "Grantees." The elements will monitor the consistency of the grantee's project delivery with that which is reflected in the original grant proposal and the grantee's compliance with the terms of the grant agreement. The Monitoring Checklist is used at desk reviews and/or site visits to assess the performance of the grantees and during the competitive process to determine a past performance adjustment to the scores of the applicants. Each question below is derived from the grant agreement and therefore, a question checked "no" indicates the grantee is out of compliance with the terms of the grant agreement. SANDAG will send a final version of the Monitoring Checklist, including a total score (between positive 2% and a negative 10%) within one week of the date of the desk review and/or site visit. This score can be used by the grantee as an indicator of performance. When the Monitoring Checklist is used to determine a past performance adjustment, SANDAG will make the completed Monitoring Checklist available to grantees as part of the debriefing process after projects have been awarded funding.

Initial Review       Annual Review       Final Review       Performance Based Adjustment

Review Period: \_\_\_\_\_

Grantee: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Site Visit: \_\_\_\_\_

Contract No(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Contract Start/  
End Dates: \_\_\_\_\_

Modified scope of work in effect?  Yes  
 No

Modified scope start date: \_\_\_\_\_

Subcontractor(s) (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Grantee Staff: \_\_\_\_\_

SANDAG Staff: \_\_\_\_\_

## Section 1 – Quantity of Service Delivered (25%)

For projects performed during the COVID-19 pandemic, this Section will be scored based on the number of units delivered between March 1, 2019 to February 29, 2020 in comparison to the proportion of units delivered for that period identified in the project scope of work. No score will be given for projects that started on or after March 1, 2020 due to the stay-at-home order.

Types of units of service: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed number of units of service delivered: \_\_\_\_\_

Actual number of units of service delivered: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage (above/below) proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

## Score

More than 10% over proposed number of units of service	+ 0.5%
+/- within 10% of proposed number of units of service	0%
10 – 15% under proposed number of units of service	- 0.5%
15 – 20% under proposed number of units of service	- 1.0%
20 – 25% over proposed cost per unit	- 1.5%
25 – 30% under proposed number of units of service	- 2.0%
30% or more under proposed number of units of service	- 2.5%

Section 1 Score

## Section 2 – Cost/Unit (25%)

For projects performed during the COVID-19 pandemic, this Section will be scored based on the cost per unit of service delivered between March 1, 2019 to February 29, 2020 in comparison to the proportional cost per unit for that period identified in the project scope of work. No score will be given for projects that started on or after March 1, 2020 due to the stay-at-home order.

Proposed cost per unit of service delivered: \_\_\_\_\_

Actual cost per unit of service delivered: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage (above/below) proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

## Score

More than 10% under proposed cost per unit	+ 0.5%
+/- within 10% of proposed cost per unit	0%
10 – 15% over proposed cost per unit	- 0.5%
15 – 20% over proposed cost per unit	- 1.0%
20 – 25% over proposed cost per unit	- 1.5%
25 – 30% over proposed cost per unit	- 2.0%
30% or more over proposed cost per unit	- 2.5%

Section 2 Score

## Section 3 - Project Management (50%)

Scope of Performance		YES	NO
1. Did the grantee exhibit timely progression on each task included in the scope of work?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Task 1			
Task 2			

Task 3			
Task 4			
Task 5			
Task 6			
Task 7			
Project Management		YES	NO
2.	Did the grantee work to implement the scope of work as proposed or receive SANDAG approval for any changes to the project? If a modified scope of work was approved by SANDAG, did the grantee make reasonable efforts to provide a high level of service to the target population and demonstrate efforts to reduce the cost per unit over time during the modified scope period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	Are all services being delivered eligible under federal grant requirements and/or the grant agreement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Insurance		YES	NO
4.	Has the grantee submitted and maintained evidence of compliance with insurance requirements (general liability, automobile liability, workers compensation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Principles / Financial Management		YES	NO
5.	Were all project expenditures allowable and accounted for in accounting records? SANDAG will inspect equipment records if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	Did the grantee maintain adequate financial control mechanisms (e.g. financial management system, mileage logs, expense ledgers, etc.) containing all required information available for inspection by SANDAG upon request?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	Did the grantee charge allowable costs during the monitoring period and, if non-budgeted purchases in excess of \$500 were incurred, did grantee request prior authorization?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Did the grantee provide sufficient documentation to support project expenses and, if indirect costs were included, were the necessary indirect costs methods used?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	Did the grantee provide adequate cash or in-kind match contributions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	Were all expenses in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles including, but not limited to per diem rates and Title 2 Code of Federal Regulations Part 200: Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Did the grantee maintain an accounting system and records that separate expenses from non-project-related expenses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	Did the grantee review, whether in a formal or informal audit, the financials of its agency, officials, and program, including, but not limited to its Single Audit, Program Audit, or annual financial audit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Did the grantee receive no material findings or, if material findings were identified, work to rectify those said findings within the timeline listed in the report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Records	YES	NO
14. Are project documents and accounting records readily accessible and available for review by SANDAG upon request and kept separate from documents not related to the project? SANDAG staff to review any third-party contractor project documents and accounting records to ensure necessary requirements are included.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Does the grantee's record retention policies align with the grant agreement's records retention requirement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Was ridership and associated program data tracked adequately and available to SANDAG?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Was program participation tracked sufficiently to fulfill requirements for tracking for the needs accommodation policy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Schedule	YES	NO
18. Did the grantee remain on schedule as outlined in the original agreement such that no extensions beyond 6 months were granted at the request of the grantee for any major milestones or the project completion date?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invoicing and Reporting	YES	NO
19. Did the grantee submit invoices at least quarterly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Were sufficient materials including required documentation consistently submitted with the invoice packet? (at least 75% submitted with all required documentation, and invoice forms filled out correctly)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Are required grant reports submitted in a timely manner (at least 75% invoices submitted on time)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title VI and ADA Compliance	YES	NO
22. Does the grantee have a nondiscrimination policy, a written complaint form, and complaint procedures that are posted and, if required, a Title VI plan (current which has not lapsed) accepted by SANDAG?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Did the grantee receive neither discrimination, ADA, nor Title VI complaints or, if complaints were received, did the grantee provide written notice to SANDAG within 72 hours of receiving the complaint and work toward a resolution?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Does the grantee have a method for recording service, discrimination, and/or Title VI-related complaints and documenting the steps taken towards resolution?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Did the grantee adequately track client demographic data, including frequency of client access, and provide the data on an annual basis to SANDAG?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. If the grantee held public meetings, were they accessible to individuals with disabilities and by public transportation (or was transportation provided)? Mark yes if no public meetings were held during the monitoring period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. Are outreach materials translated into appropriate languages given the communities served?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. Does the grantee make reasonable modifications to their service to accommodate individuals with disabilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outreach	YES	NO
29. Did the grantee submit project marketing materials to SANDAG for review?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. Did the grantee provide SANDAG with project information and photos to support media and communication efforts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Score

More than 95% affirmative answers for applicable responses	+ 1%
90 – 95% affirmative answers for applicable responses	0%
85 – 89.9% affirmative answers for applicable responses	- 1%
80 – 84.9% affirmative answers for applicable responses	- 2%
75% – 79.9% affirmative answers for applicable responses	- 3%
70% – 74.9% affirmative answers for applicable responses	- 4%
Less than 70% affirmative answers for applicable responses	- 5%

Section 3 Score	
Total affirmative responses	
Total questions	
Percentage of affirmative responses	
Section 3 Score	

## Section 4 – Summary and Identification of Deficiencies

SANDAG staff uses the following tables to review any “NO” responses to questions in the Monitoring Checklist, indicating a deficiency. A deficiency is an area in which the grantee is deficient in meeting its obligations under the grant agreement. Should a deficiency be found, SANDAG staff will determine appropriate follow-up actions using the tables below. Grantees are required to submit a recovery plan within ten (10) days of the site visit/desk review at which a deficiency or deficiencies were identified. Recovery plans must include the steps the grantee will take to correct each deficiency and comply with grant provisions. Grantees must implement the corrective action(s) as outlined in their recovery plan within 30 days of identification of the compliance deficiency.

Boxes Checked “No”	Explanation
<b>Identified Deficiencies</b>	<b>Responses and Solutions</b>
<b>Follow Up Items</b>	


---

**SANDAG Project Manager**

---

**Grantee Project Manager**