

## GUIDANCE FOR UPDATING THE IRWM PLAN

### **Existing Project Review Process**

A summary of the 2014 IRWM Plan Section G. Project Review Process (**Table 1**) is intended to provide a starting point for updating the project review process for the 2018 IRWM Plan update.

*Table 1. Existing 2014 IRWM Plan Section G Project Review Process Summary*

Criteria	Scoring
<b>Phase 1a: Abstract Form (screening only)</b>	
<p><b>Condition #1:</b>            Is it IRWM Related? Does it satisfy one of more of the questions below?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it regional? (geographically, or has regional benefit)</li> <li>• Is it being sponsored or developed by multiple agencies?</li> <li>• Is it a multi-benefit project or program?</li> <li>• Is it a project supporting a critical water supply or water quality need within a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) boundary) (note: must serve within the DAC boundary)</li> </ul>	<p>If project meets both <b>Condition #1</b> &amp; <b>Condition #2</b>, then project passes.</p>
<p><b>Condition #2:</b>            Does it Include Related Goal and Objectives? Does the project meet one or more IRWM goals (i.e., Water Supply, Ecosystem/Watershed, Groundwater, Flood Management, and Water Management) and can it be used to satisfy multiple Objectives?</p>	
<b>Phase 1b: Objective Worksheet</b>	
<p><b>Project Attributes Points:</b>            Projects responding affirmatively to question is assigned 5 points each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there multi-agency support or sponsorship?</li> <li>• Is the concept regional or inter-regional (i.e., includes adjacent IRWM areas)?</li> <li>• Does the concept support a DAC?</li> </ul>	<p>Total possible score: 15 points</p>
<p><b>Objective Points:</b>            Each goal assigned a total of 20 points. Each objective within a goal is proportionally assigned. The following points are assigned per Objective within each Goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Supply (10 Objectives): 2.00 points</li> <li>• Ecosystem and Watershed (7 Objectives): 2.86 points</li> <li>• Groundwater Management (6 Objectives): 3.33 points</li> <li>• Flood Management (7 Objectives): 2.86 points</li> <li>• Water Resources Management (8 Objectives): 2.50 points</li> </ul>	<p>Total possible score: 100 points</p> <p>Based on how many Objectives a project/program meets and how well it aligns with the IRWM Goals.</p>

San Luis Obispo County 2014 IRWM Plan  
 Section G. Project Review Process Guidance

Criteria	Scoring
<p><b>Goal Points:</b>            Additional, projects that response to a specific Goal's Objective are given a Goal point of 5 as a means of tracking how the project offer cross-goal benefits. The sum of Goal Points (max. 25 points for 5 Goals) is added to Objective Points to achieve the total score.</p>	<p>Total possible score: 25 points</p>
<p><b>Readiness-to-Proceed (RTP) Points:</b>            Readiness-to-Proceed (RTP) is based on five subjective questions related to the project activities, each having a possible maximum score of 5 points. Results for RTP are reported as "high", "medium", and "low" categories.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeliness: Do project partners have the ability to act quickly to implement the project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?</li> <li>• Technical Feasibility: Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>• Environmental Compliance: Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?</li> <li>• Permitting: Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?</li> <li>• Funding: Are the project funding sources well defined?</li> </ul>	<p>Total possible score: 25 points</p> <p>Overall Characterization by Score:</p> <p>High (18-25)            Medium (10-17)            Low (0-9)</p>
<p><b>Total possible score for Phase 1b</b></p>	<p><b>165 points &amp; "High" RTP</b></p>
<p><b>Phase 2: Project Descriptions ("Long Form")</b></p>	
<p><i>(see 2014 IRWM Plan Chapter G.2.5 Phase 2 Project Descriptions)</i>            The resulting top-ranked projects/programs are requested to submit Phase 2 Project Descriptions ("Long Form"). The Long Form is a detailed description of the project/program, its benefits, the economic analyses performed, how the project aligns with State RMSs and requirements, local IRWM Plan Objectives, etc. For that reason, <b>only the top-ranked projects, which are more likely to be implemented within the 5 year period between updates due to their high RTP status are asked to develop this information</b> to be included in the IRWM Plan Update.</p> <p>The number of projects included in the Phase 2 Project List is approximately 20 percent of the total projects submitted or approximately 10 to 15 projects, whichever is smaller. The portfolio of selected projects must meet the highest standards in addressing the IRWM Plan's Goals and Objectives, and the State RMS. Direction from the RWMG will help to guide the number of projects/programs ultimately collected at Phase 2.</p>	<p>Top-ranked projects</p> <p>Total number of projects in Phase 2 (<i>Project Short List</i>): Fewer than 20% of total number of projects, or 10 to 15 projects, whichever is smaller</p>

**Proposed Project Review Process for 2018 IRWM Plan update**

The proposed 2018 IRWM Plan Section G. Project Review Process (**Table 2**) summary is intended to facilitate a discussion on the review factors necessary to provide a thorough process to promote and prioritize develop the projects that will implement the IRWM Plan, thereby achieving the Goals and Objectives.

*Table 2. Proposed 2018 IRWM Plan Section G Project Review Process Summary*

Criteria	Scoring	
<b>Full Project List - Screening</b>		
Project abstracts submitted during an update of the <b>Full Project List</b> are screened on a pass/fail basis. To be included on this list, projects or programs including concepts, ideas, needs for projects, studies, as well as programs and implementation projects must pass each of the following project review factors.		
How a project contributes to the IRWM Plan Objectives	<b>Pass</b> , if project satisfies <u>at least one</u> IRWM Plan Objective	
Technical feasibility of the project	<b>Pass</b> , if sufficient knowledge of the project location, systems, materials, methods, or processes proposed is provided to indicate that the project will likely result in a successful outcome.	
Plan Adoption	<b>Pass</b> , if project proponent had adopted or will adopt the IRWM Plan.	
<b>Implementation Project List - Scoring and Ranking</b>		
Projects abstracts that are accepted to the Full Project List may submit a detailed project information form to be consider for inclusion on the <b>Implementation Project List</b> . The projects on this list are evaluated individually and compared to each other. Projects are scored on each of the following project review factors to provide a prioritization of projects necessary to implement the IRWM Plan.		
A. How a project contributes to the IRWM Plan Objectives	Contributes to multiple Plan Objectives	0 – 20 points
	Provides detailed documentation for quantitative and/or qualitative measurements to Plan Objectives	0 – 10 points
B. How the project is related to resource management strategies	Increases the diversification of the sub-regional water management portfolio	0 – 10 points
C. Technical feasibility of the project	Provides detailed documentation for demonstrating technical feasibility	0 – 10 points

San Luis Obispo County 2014 IRWM Plan  
 Section G. Project Review Process Guidance

	including reconnaissance and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs	
	Documentation indicates that project will result in a successful outcome	0 – 10 points
D. Specific benefits to critical DAC water issues	Specifically addresses water-related needs of disadvantaged communities (DACs). Project may include work that leads to a formal project (e.g., needs assessments, engineering design, feasibility studies)	0 – 5 points
E. Specific benefits to critical water issues for Native American Tribal communities	Specifically addresses critical water supply and quality needs of Native American Tribal communities. Project may include work that leads to a formal project (e.g., needs assessments, engineering design, feasibility studies)	0 – 5 points
F. Environmental Justice Considerations	Specifically addresses environmental justice (EJ) concerns including inequitable distribution of environmental burdens (e.g., pollution, industrial facilities) and access to environmental goods (e.g., clean water and air, parks, recreation)	0 – 5 points
G. Project Costs and Financing	Provides detailed documentation for the project costs and financing including funding sources, well defined financial planning and commitments, and clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations	0 – 10 points
	Provides detailed documentation for the project costs and financing including funding sources, well defined financial planning and commitments, and clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations	0 – 10 points

San Luis Obispo County 2014 IRWM Plan  
 Section G. Project Review Process Guidance

H. Economic Feasibility	Provides detailed documentation for demonstrating economic feasibility, including a preliminary economic analysis conducted within the past five years and updated to most current data available. Economic analysis methods are outlined in DWR's "Economic Analysis Guidebook"	0 – 10 points
I. Project Status	Readiness to proceed including having project partners able to act quickly to implement the project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding	0 – 10 points
J. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan implementation	Demonstrates potential for restructuring or integrating with other projects and/or modifying or selecting alternatives in meeting project goals toward leveraging regional planning and increasing multiple benefits.	0 – 5 points
K. Contribution of the project in adapting to the effects of climate change in the region	Meets IRWM Plan Climate Change Standard requirements and contributes to addressing climate change adaption and mitigation	0 – 20 points
L. Contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives		
N. Reduce Reliance on the Delta	Reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply.	0 – 5 points
<b>TOTAL POSSIBLE SCORE</b>		<b>150 points</b>