San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Cambria Community Services District **DATE:** 8/31/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements	5	16	6	5	5	10	7	10	0	0	3	3	3	0	**73**
												0			**0**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements**		**0**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water				
	Adequate water supply	x	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x	x		
	Sustainable water for agriculture	x	x		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system	x	x		
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x		
	Conservation/water use efficiency				
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x	x		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)	x	x		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x		
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x		
	Reduce contaminants	x	x		
	Public involvement and stewardship	x			
	Protect endangered species	x	x		
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems				
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x			
	Support local GW management	x	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x		
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x	x		
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	x		

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements		**0**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs				
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge				
	Improve infrastructure and operations				
	Implement multiple-benefit projects				
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation				
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	x	x		
	Consider property owner rights	x	x		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x	x		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	x	x		
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs				
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	21	19	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**16**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	x				
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution	x				
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management					
Land use planning and management					
Matching quality to use	x				
Pollution prevention	x				
Recycle municipal water	x				
Salt and salinity management	x				
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency	x				
Water transfers					
Watershed management	x				
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection	X				
Sediment management					
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement					
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	9	0	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - WWTP Improvements"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4	x				
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2	x				
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x				
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	x				
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	x				
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4	x				
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3	x				
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3	x				
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	x				
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2	x				
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2					
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3					
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3					
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3	x				
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3	x				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2	x				
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2	x				
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2	x				
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	50	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	3	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	0	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Cambria Community Services District

Contact Person:

Robert Gresens, District Engineer 805-927-6119, bgresens@cambriacsd.org

Melissa Bland, Management Analyst, 805-927-6116, mbland@cambriacsd.org

General Office Number (24/7): 805-927-6223

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation 5 out of 5 points.

Since our original application to consider our WWTP project for Prop 1 funding via the IRWM program, the Cambria CSD has agreed to work with PG&E as part of its affiliation with County-wide Energy Watch program. Currently, PG&E is assessing an earlier 2014 10% design of the WWTP project improvements, which will result in a design-build solicitation process and associated energy savings. Michael K. Nunley and Associates is working with PG&E in conducting this assessment. To ensure the project is meeting Energy Watch criteria, we have also included a new incoming power switch within our project, as well as a power conditioning module that will substantially improve upon the power quality into the plant.

Because we realize the available funding via the first round of Prop 1 is small compared to County-wide requests, we are also scaling back the magnitude of our original project estimate to focus more on improvements to our secondary treatment process improvements that directly address nutrient removal, as well as energy efficiency. Thus, the revised and lowered cost estimate is for secondary treatment improvements, a new incoming main power switch, and a remote water quality sensing system.

The project's remote sensing instrumentation package is to be mounted on the San Simeon State Parks campground pedestrian bridge to monitor and report on San Simeon Creek water quality parameters. The collected data will be transmitted to a cloud-based server that will be made accessible to resource agencies, and academia. This location is at the same location as the Central Coast RWQCB's Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) station 310 SSC. The CC RWQCB has previously expressed support for this added element of the project. Therefore, besides enhancing and protecting the quality of the San Simeon Creek and lagoon, the proposed WWTP nutrient removal project reaches out to serve multiple agencies and researchers interested in obtaining historical water quality data.

The Cambria CSD also has an existing indirect potable reuse project that uses treated wastewater effluent as source water. Therefore, the WWTP project indirectly serves to conserve and reuse existing water sources to the fullest extent possible.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) 5 out of 10 points.

A 10-percent design was completed during 2014 and is documented within two detailed technical memorandums. The memorandums include cost estimates, modeling results, plans, and major equipment specifications. Due to funding limitations, and to date, District staff were only able to install temporary, partial measures to mimic the nutrient removal measures called out within the 10-percent design. These temporary measures were very rudimentary and need to be removed and replaced because they are not energy efficient, do not achieve a true anoxic zone due to back mixing, and do not properly mix the anoxic zone of the aeration basins. However, the temporary efforts made by plant staff have proven that nitrate removal is indeed feasible using the design measures called out within the 10-percent design. There is also a two-year record of performance data that has been shared with the Central Coast RWQCB.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) 10 out of 10 points.

Recently, work on the District's WWTP influent screen project was found to be within existing permitted criteria following discussions with County planning staff. We similarly expect this same opinion to hold for the proposed WWTP nutrient removal improvements. The proposed off-site work for instrumentation at the pedestrian bridge had a Notice of Exemption filed with the County Clerk's office on August 3, 2016.

Currently, the Cambria CSD is moving forward with PG&E on the completion of a design-build solicitation process via the PG&E Sustainable Solutions Turnkey (SST) program. To date, a kickoff meeting occurred on July 18, 2018 with PG&E representatives, consultant Michael K. Nunley and Associates, and District staff. Completion of a design-build solicitation should conclude within less than a year. Construction would then be completed within less than one year.

F. Project costs and financing 7 out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).

Project costs are estimated at $1,400,000, with a 50-percent local match being $700,000.

The project costs are summarized in the following table

Item	Estimated Cost	Reference	Comment
WWTP Secondary Improvements	$930,000	Engineering Estimate of the November 2014 Engineering Technical Memorandum #1, Carollo Engineers	Construction cost only
35 % mark-up for engineering, legal, & administration	$325,500	(Ditto above)	
Subtotal	$1,255,500		
Cost for Power Conditioning Module	$36,105	8/24/2018 Quote from supplier (Elspec)	Equipment only
Estimated installation cost for conditioning module	25,000	Not bid to date.	CCSD District Engineer R. Gresens preliminary estimate
Estimated installed cost for new incoming power switch between PG&E provided transformer and existing main motor control center.	$75,000	Not bid to date. Based in part on comments received during 7/16/2018 walk through with MKN electrical engineer that implied the switch could be separate and apart from the main MCC.	CCSD District Engineer R. Gresens preliminary estimate.
Total Project Estimate	$1,391,605		
Rounded Estimate	$1,400,000		

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).

Project funding will come from a variety of sources including on-bill PG&E financing, rebates offered by PG&E, wastewater rates, a state revolving fund loan, as well as the potential for a CCSD inter-departmental loan. The CCSD recently completed a proposition 218 rate increase, which will increase revenue for its wastewater enterprise fund by approximately $480,000 per year. A portion of this increase in revenue could be used to help fund a project loan, which would cover the local share. For example, a $700,000, 20-year state revolving fund loan at a 3% annual interest rate would be less than $50,000 per year. The specific local share funding approach used will be subject to future CCSD Board direction and approval

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) 10 out of 10 points.

The earlier 10-percent design found that the project is cost effective. The proposed improvements are also far less expensive then constructing a new WWTP elsewhere. The project will save on operating cost through the reduction of power use. This is primarily due to eliminating inefficient over-aerating of the secondary treatment process due to a lack of automated control. The PG&E SST program that the

Cambria CSD recently embarked on will also complete detailed economic analyses on individual proposed improvements.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations 3 out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)

N/A

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)

N/A

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)

The project further protects the San Simeon Creek and its lagoon area. These areas are accessible to the public, including campers staying at the campground area. Thus, it provides equal benefit and access to all social classes.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) 3 out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)

A 2015 PG&E Large Integrated Audit that was part of a coordinated effort by the San Luis Obispo County Energy Watch Program, commissioned kW Engineering to complete an energy audit of the CCSD's facilities, which included its wastewater treatment plant. Per this earlier report, approximately $53,700 in annual energy savings would result from replacing the plant's blowers with more efficient machines. This same 2015 report showed the treatment plant used approximately 960,049 kWh per year at an annual cost of $133,021. By proportioning the $53,700 savings, the savings from replacing the existing blowers would be about 388,000 kWh in energy savings. Thus, there would be some benefits towards reducing CHG and addressing climate change.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)

Yes, the project will improve upon energy efficiency, particularly within the high energy demanding secondary treatment process that relies upon large, high-horsepower, electrically drive aeration blowers. This will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from our electrical energy provider, PG&E.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)

Yes, see above.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta 0 out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

Not applicable due to the remote location of Cambria.

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Cayucos Sustainable Water Project **DATE:** 31-Aug-18

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Cayucos Sustainable Water Project	5	12	6	0	9	10	10	10	0	3	0	3	2	0	**70**
Cayucos Sustainable Water Project - Phase 2	4	8	6	5	2	2	5	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	**39**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Cayucos Sustainable Water Project**		**Cayucos Sustainable Water Project - Phase 2**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	X	X	X	X
	Adequate water supply	X		X	X
	Sustainable potable water for rural	X		X	
	Sustainable water for agriculture	X	X		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system	x	X	x	X
	Develop/implement water management plans			x	
	Conservation/water use efficiency				
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply	X	X	X	x
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)	X	X	X	x
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x		X	
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	X	X		
	Reduce contaminants	x		X	
	Public involvement and stewardship				
	Protect endangered species				
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems			X	
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	X	X		
	Support local GW management				
	Further local basin management objectives				
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking	X			
	Protect and improve GW quality				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Cayucos Sustainable Water Project		Cayucos Sustainable Water Project - Phase 2	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	X			
	Promote low impact development	X			
	Enhance natural recharge	X			
	Improve infrastructure and operations				
	Implement multiple-benefit projects				
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	X		X	
	Funding for IRWM implementation	X		X	
	Support local control	X	X	X	x
	Consider property owner rights	X	X	X	
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	X	X	X	x
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	X	X	X	
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs			X	
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	21	11	17	7
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**12**	**4**	**8**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Cayucos Sustainable Water Project**	**Cayucos Sustainable Water Project - Phase 2**			
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage					
Conveyance – Regional/Local	**X**	**X**			
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution		**X**			
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management					
Land use planning and management	**X**	**X**			
Matching quality to use	**X**	**X**			
Pollution prevention					
Recycle municipal water	**X**	**X**			
Salt and salinity management					
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local		**X**			
System reoperation		**X**			
Urban water use efficiency	**x**				
Water transfers		**X**			
Watershed management					
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection					
Sediment management					
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement		**X**			
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	5	9	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:
Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).
For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Cayucos Sustainable Water Project	Cayucos Sustainable Water Project - Phase 2			
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	X	X			
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4					
Water-dependent industries (H)	3	x				
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2	X				
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2					
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	X	X			
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4		X			
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	X				
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3		X			
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4		X			
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3		X			
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	X				
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2		X			
Coastal erosion (M)	2	X				
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2	X				
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2	X				
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2	X				
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1	X				
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3					
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3					
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3					

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Cayucos Sustainable Water Project	Cayucos Sustainable Water Project - Phase 2			
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2					
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1		x			
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	27	23	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	2	2	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	X	X			
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	1	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Cayucos Sustainable Water Project

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Cayucos Sanitary District

Contact Person: Rick Koon

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___0___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___9__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Design is in progress and is approximately 95% complete with anticipated completion by end of October. The Project recently broke ground on the new resource recovery facility on August 10th and construction efforts are underway.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __10___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA was completed in January 2017 and the Final EIR was approved by the Cayucos Sanitary District Board of Directors on April 20th, 2017. Land use entitlements were received on June 2017 and permits for construction are in hand.

F. Project costs and financing *__10__ out of 10 points.*

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

A detailed Contractor furnished cost model has been prepared for the Project and the bidding process will be underway in the next few weeks.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The Project is fully funded through USDA grants and low interest loans.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ___10__ out of 10 points.

If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Anticipated O&M costs estimates have been prepared within the last five years and future O&M costs are expected to be in line with or lower than current operating costs.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations ___3___ out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

The Project does not directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

The Project preserves known cultural resources through conservation easements along and in critical habitat areas along Toro Creek.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) ___2___ out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Overall energy consumption at the new plant is anticipated to be lower than the existing facilities. In addition, the Project envisions capturing a water resource through reclamation that is currently lost to Ocean disposal.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Overall energy consumption at the new plant is anticipated to be lower than the existing facilities.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ___0___ out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

Not applicable.

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Cayucos Sustainable Water Project Phase 2 Whale Rock Reservoir Augmentation from the CSWP.

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Cayucos Sanitary District

Contact Person: Rick Koon

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

One of the primary objectives of the Cayucos Sustainable Water Project (CSWP) Phase 2 (Project) is to provide the community of Cayucos with efficient, reliable and adaptable wastewater treatment, while producing a high-quality water supply that will benefit future generations by reclaiming recycled wastewater for reservoir recharge. The Project will require participation between the community of Cayucos and the Whale Rock Commission (Cal Poly, California Men's Colony, the Department of Water Resources, and the City of San Luis Obispo). The project would include necessary sampling and modeling of water quality in the Whale Rock reservoir and the design and development of a Surface Water Augmentation strategy using the effluent of the CSWP first phase.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___2__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

The Project has only been conceptually developed and would be seeking funding to do initial studies and development of agreements. WSC prepared the safe yield analysis for Whale Rock Reservoir that determined the reservoir recharge concept is conceptually feasible.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __2___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The CSWP first phase will come online in 2020. the Project could start at any time following the required two years of in reservoir sampling and completion of the CSWP first phase.

F. Project costs and financing *__5__ out of 10 points.*
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Detailed cost estimates have not been prepared.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The Project is anticipated in the Cayucos Sanitary District's current rate structure.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ___3__ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Economic feasibility has not been performed. O&M is anticipated to be by the CSD.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations ___0___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.

0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

The Project does not directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

The Project does not directly address critical Native America water issues.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

The Project does not address current environmental issues.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) ___0___ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The Project does not reduce GHG emissions.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The Project does not reduce energy consumption.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ___1___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

The Project has the potential to reduce reliance on the State Water Project. Multiple agencies that have connectivity to Whale Rock Reservoir also subscribe to State Water.

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: City of Pismo Beach **DATE:** 8/24/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Central Coast Blue	5	16	10	5	7	5	4	8	4	3	3	5	3	1	**79**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Central Coast Blue**		**0**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x		
	Adequate water supply	x	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x			
	Sustainable water for agriculture	x			
	Water Quality improvements to a water system	x	x		
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x		
	Conservation/water use efficiency				
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x	x		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)	x	x		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs				
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x		
	Reduce contaminants				
	Public involvement and stewardship	x			
	Protect endangered species	x			
	Reduce impacts of invasive species	x			
	Climate change in ecosystems				
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	x		
	Support local GW management	x	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x		
	CASGEM Program	x	x		
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x	x		
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	x		

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Central Coast Blue		0	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs				
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge				
	Improve infrastructure and operations				
	Implement multiple-benefit projects				
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	x			
	Funding for IRWM implementation	x			
	Support local control	x	x		
	Consider property owner rights	x	x		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x	x		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	x	x		
	DAC support and education	x	x		
	Promote public education programs	x	x		
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	26	19	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**16**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	Central Coast Blue	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	x				
Conveyance – Regional/Local	x				
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution	x				
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management					
Land use planning and management					
Matching quality to use	x				
Pollution prevention	x				
Recycle municipal water	x				
Salt and salinity management	x				
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation	x				
Urban water use efficiency	x				
Water transfers	x				
Watershed management					
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation	x				
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection					
Sediment management					
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement	x				
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	12	0	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	10	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:
Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).
For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Central Coast Blue	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4	x				
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2	x				
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x				
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	x				
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	x				
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4	x				
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3	x				
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3	x				
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3					
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2					
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2	x				
Rising sea levels (M)	2	x				
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1	x				
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3					
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3					
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3	x				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Central Coast Blue	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2					
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2	x				
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1	x				
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1	x				
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	45	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	3	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x				
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x				
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	2	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Central Coast Blue

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: City of Pismo Beach

Contact Person: Ben Fine

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

One of the objectives of Central Coast Blue is to facilitate continued water resources collaboration in the NCMA. As part of the project, the Central Coast Blue stakeholders will set the framework for future sustainable management of the shared groundwater basin. The project unites the five agencies as they manage water collaboratively and holistically.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___7__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Preliminary Design is in progress and a Recycled Water Facilities Planning Study, which included a detailed alternatives analysis to identify the current project alternative, has been complete. One groundwater modeling evaluation for the project has been completed and a second is underway. These background studies and analysis all indicate a successful outcome of the project. In addition to this, there is currently

a pilot plant, testing similar technology, that has been in operation since January 2018. Preliminary engineering is 50% complete.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __5___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA is in progress and should be complete by mid-2019 with a Final EIR. Permitting needs have been identified and permitting efforts will start Fall 2018 and will continue into spring 2020.

F. Project costs and financing ___4___ out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

An engineer's estimate was developed as part of the South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District and will be refined as the project enters design. A pilot plant is currently in operation and results from this study will also help to refine the cost estimate.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The project is pursuing grant funding through the Prop 1 Groundwater Grant Program and the Title XVI WaterSMART program. Both programs require match funds. The Central Coast Blue stakeholders plan to receive financing for the match funds through either Clean Water State Revolving Fund, USDA or IBank financing. The project has been preliminarily awarded grant funding through round 1 of the Prop 1 GWGP.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ___8__ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

An economic analysis of the project was done as part of the Recycled Water Feasibility Planning Studies and as part of grant funding applications. Economic analysis indicate that the project is financially feasible

and a finalized financing agreement between the Central Coast Blue agencies is expected early 2019. This agreement will include the O&M schedule as well.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations ___10___ out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

Central Coast Blue benefits the groundwater basin used by Oceano CSD. Oceano is a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) census designated place, and both the Cities of Grover Beach and Arroyo Grande contain DAC census designated block groups that will benefit from the project. Oceano CSD has five production wells that extract up to 900 AFY of groundwater from the SMGB. Protection of Oceano CSD's five production wells will allow the agency to continue providing clean water to its 8,700 residents. Without Central Coast Blue, Oceano CSD's wells would be contaminated by seawater intrusion before the other NCMA agencies due to their location and proximity to the ocean.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

Recycled water produced by Central Coast Blue and extracted from the ground to meet NCMA demands will offset the use of local surface water from Lopez Lake and imported state water from the Bay-Delta, thus helping to protect surface water quality. Maintaining adequate surface water flows is important because habitats, species, and water quality take a hit when flows are altered greatly from natural conditions. Reduced surface water demand will allow more water to remain in these natural surface water systems and protect water quality.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

Central Coast Blue will protect and improve the quality of the groundwater basin which provides clean drinking water to basin users, including Oceano CSD which is a DAC and the Cities of Grover Beach and Arroyo Grande which contain DAC census designated block groups.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) ____3__ out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

It is widely documented that local recycled water projects like Central Coast Blue have lower GHG emissions compared to project alternatives including desalination and imported water deliveries. Based on the Stokes, J. Horvath, (2006) article on life cycle comparisons, desalination was 2-18 times more

emissions than imported or recycled water. Stokes, J. Horvath's study found SWP delivers to Southern California were comparable to GHG emissions produced by recycled water projects, however energy consumption largely impacts the emissions produced by the recycled water project. Because Central Coast Blue energy consumption is estimated to be lower than imported water deliveries, it is assumed the Project will produce less GHG emissions than imported SWP deliveries.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes, when compared to the energy consumption of the SWP, Central Coast Blue will have a lower energy demand. Central Coast Blue is entering the preliminary design phase and therefore has not developed energy consumption estimates. Using observed energy usage data from a similar advanced treatment project in Orange County on a per acre-foot basis, Central Coast Blue will reduce energy consumption by approximately 40 percent compared to the SWP (Embedded Energy in Water Studies, GEI).

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes, as described in Part I and II, the Central Coast Blue Project will be less energy intensive when implemented and when compared to projected GHG emissions for SWP offset.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ____1__ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

Yes, the Project would provide local supply thereby offsetting demand for SWP supply.

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: City of San Luis Obispo **DATE:** 8/6/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine	0	0	0	5	5	5	4	10	4	0	0	1	3	0	**37**
Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion	2	8	6	5	7	10	0	5	4	0	0	1	2	0	**50**
Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	2	2	0	**29**
One Water SLO	4	12	10	5	9	10	8	10	4	3	0	2	3	0	**80**
Mid Higuera Bypass	3	8	10	5	7	10	3	6	4	3	0	2	0	0	**61**
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine**		**Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water			x	x
	Adequate water supply			x	x
	Sustainable potable water for rural				
	Sustainable water for agriculture				
	Water Quality improvements to a water system			x	
	Develop/implement water management plans			x	x
	Conservation/water use efficiency			x	x
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities			x	x
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)			x	x
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs				
	Conserve balance of ecosystem				
	Reduce contaminants				
	Public involvement and stewardship				
	Protect endangered species				
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems				
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions				
	Support local GW management			x	
	Further local basin management objectives			x	
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking				
	Protect and improve GW quality				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine		Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs				
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge				
	Improve infrastructure and operations				
	Implement multiple-benefit projects				
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation				
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control				
	Consider property owner rights				
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts				
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag				
	DAC support and education			x	
	Promote public education programs				
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
Maximum is 37		0	0	10	6
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation		**0**	**0**	**2**	**8**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use**		**One Water SLO**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x		x	x
	Adequate water supply	x	x	x	x
	Sustainable potable water for rural			x	
	Sustainable water for agriculture			x	
	Water Quality improvements to a water system				
	Develop/implement water management plans	x		x	x
	Conservation/water use efficiency	x	x		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x	x	x	x
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)	x	x	x	x
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x		x	x
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x	x	x
	Reduce contaminants	x	x	x	x
	Public involvement and stewardship	x		x	x
	Protect endangered species	x		x	
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems			x	
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions				
	Support local GW management				
	Further local basin management objectives	x		x	x
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking				
	Protect and improve GW quality	x		x	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use		One Water SLO	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	x	x		
	Promote low impact development	x			
	Enhance natural recharge	x			
	Improve infrastructure and operations	x	x		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	x		
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains	x	x		
	Support DAC flood protection	x			
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation			x	
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control				
	Consider property owner rights				
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts			x	
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag				
	DAC support and education			x	
	Promote public education programs			x	x
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
Maximum is 37		20	10	19	11
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation		**4**	**8**	**4**	**12**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Mid Higuera Bypass**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water		
	Adequate water supply		
	Sustainable potable water for rural		
	Sustainable water for agriculture		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system		
	Develop/implement water management plans		
	Conservation/water use efficiency		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x
	Reduce contaminants	x	
	Public involvement and stewardship	x	
	Protect endangered species	x	x
	Reduce impacts of invasive species	x	
	Climate change in ecosystems	x	
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions		
	Support local GW management		
	Further local basin management objectives		
	CASGEM Program		
	Groundwater recharge/banking		
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Mid Higuera Bypass	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	x	x
	Promote low impact development		
	Enhance natural recharge	x	x
	Improve infrastructure and operations	x	x
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	x
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains	x	x
	Support DAC flood protection	x	x
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation		
	Funding for IRWM implementation		
	Support local control		
	Consider property owner rights		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag		
	DAC support and education		
	Promote public education programs		
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	14	9
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**3**	**8**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine	Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion	Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use	One Water SLO	Mid Higuera Bypass
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage					
Conveyance – Regional/Local		x			x
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration			x	x	x
Flood risk management			x		x
Land use planning and management		x		x	x
Matching quality to use		x	x	x	
Pollution prevention			x	x	x
Recycle municipal water		x		x	
Salt and salinity management				x	
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation				x	x
Urban water use efficiency		x	X	x	
Water transfers					
Watershed management			x	x	x
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management			x		x
Recharge area protection					x
Sediment management			x		x
Water and culture				x	
Outreach and engagement				x	
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	0	5	8	11	10
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	0	**6**	**6**	**10**	**10**

"City Of SLO 2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine	Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion	Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use	One Water SLO	Mid Higuera Bypass
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4		x		x	
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4				x	
Water-dependent industries (H)	3		x		x	
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2				x	
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2		x		x	
Seasonal water demand (M)	2		x	x	x	
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4		x	x	x	
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4					
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3				x	
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					x
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4					
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3			x		x
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2					
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3			x		x
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3			x		x
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3				x	
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3				x	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine	Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion	Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use	One Water SLO	Mid Higuera Bypass
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2			x		
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1			x	x	
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1	x				
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	1	15	18	31	11
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	1	1	1	2	1
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1			x		x
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	0	0	1	0	1
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**2**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: City of San Luis Obispo

Contact Person: Aaron Floyd

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation 5 out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The hydro project demonstrates the ability to integrate with the intertie project between Salinas and Nacimiento pipelines. The benefits this project provides resiliency to Cal Poly, the City of San Luis Obispo, and County facilities such as the airport.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) 5 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

This is a design-build contract, the City has already entered into a design-build contract and has completed preliminary plans for budgeting and financing purposes.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) 5 out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The hydro project which was an element of a larger energy efficiency project is exempt from environmental review as a Statutory Exemption under Section 15262, Feasibility and Planning Studies (CEQA Guidelines). The hydro project will need future authorization and environmental review prior to actual project funding and construction, this is estimated to take place by July 2019.

F. Project costs and financing 4 out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

An engineer's estimate has been prepared at $1,436,190.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

8% of the total project cost has been funded through the City's Water Fund. The City is seeking construction funding from SRF and grant opportunities.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) 10 out of 10 points.

If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

An economic analysis of the project has been completed and indicates the project is financially feasible.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations 4 out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

Yes, the project benefits critical water issues of affordability.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

NA

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

NA

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) 3 out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CEQA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This project is designed to reduce GHG emissions. The alternative to this project is to continue utilization of existing energy sources which have higher GHG emissions.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The intent of this project is to utilize the energy that is embedded in water to produce energy needed to treat and distribute water.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta 0 out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description of how the project reduces dependence on the Delta)

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: City of San Luis Obispo

Contact Person: Mychal Boerman

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation 5 out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

This project could easily be modified to integrate with the One Water SLO project and other recycled water expansion projects. This project provides multiple benefits by reducing dependence on surface water and groundwater supplies, providing drought resilient recycled water, and aligning water quality with type of use.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) 7 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

60% design for this project was completed in 2013. This project needs to be updated to comply with 2018 standards. Since the 60% design was completed, the school district has installed a separate landscape meter which was called for in the plans.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) 10 out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

A categorical exemption was completed in 2009 and can be provided upon request.

F. Project costs and financing 0 out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Project costs are currently unknown.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The project is not currently funded and is seeking construction funding. Plan preparation would be completed by the City.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) 5 out of 10 points.

If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

An economic feasibility analysis has not been performed. O&M will be covered by City staff. The City has water distribution operators, wastewater treatment operators, water quality lab staff, and recycled water program management designated for maintenance and operation of recycled water infrastructure.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations 4 out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

This project benefits water supply diversification and drought management efforts of the City of San Luis Obispo which is a DAC.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

NA

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

NA

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) 2 out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No quantitative analysis has been performed.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The project will utilize recycled water which is less energy intensive than pumping water from Nacimiento and treating the water at the City's water treatment plant where it is pumped into the water distribution system

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes, see above.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta 0 out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

NA

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: City of San Luis Obispo

Contact Person: Freddy Otte

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation 0 out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

NA

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) 0 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Conceptual Project – 0 Points

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) 0 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

Unknown timeline – 0 Points

F. Project costs and financing 0 out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Project Costs are unknown

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

Unknown

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) 0 out of 10 points.

If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Unknown

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations 7 out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

This project benefits the City of San Luis Obispo which is a DAC.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

This project directly addresses issues of pollution through filtration of stormwater and reuse of stormwater to supplement Meadow Creek and irrigation at a community park.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

N/A

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) 2 out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

NA

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This project decreases embedded energy costs by reducing the distance that irrigation water for the park must travel.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This project would reduce GHG emissions over a 20 year period by reducing energy consumption related to water treatment and pumping.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta 0 out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

NA

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: One Water SLO

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: City of San Luis Obispo

Contact Person: Mychal Boerman

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation __5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The project has the potential to integrate with several projects throughout the County. Specifically, this project could integrate with other IRWM projects such as:

- The Edna Valley Groundwater Basin Recharge and Steelhead Trout Habitat Enhancement
- The City of San Luis Obispo's Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion

The project also allows the City to partner with agencies on education, pilot studies and opportunities for water transfers and/or water markets to meet our region's water needs.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___9__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Project design is at 95% for all elements except for the storage component.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __10___ out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The EIR was certified by City Council in August 2016.

F. Project costs and financing ___8____ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

The Engineer's estimate has been prepared for the 95% design. The estimate prepared is a Class I estimate as defined by the Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering International (AACEI). Contractor bids will be available in early 2019.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The base financing for the project is a Clean Water State Revolving Fund loan. The City's funding package has been approved by the State Water Resources Control Board and the initial agreement is expected in fall 2018.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ____10___ out of 10 points.

If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

A lifecycle cost assessment has been conducted. The capital and O&M costs have been incorporated into the City's fund analysis and financial plan.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations ___7____ out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

The project benefits the City of San Luis Obispo.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

The project will improve water quality discharged to the San Luis Obispo Creek, which is habitat for endangered steelhead.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

N/A

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) ____3___ out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes, two main treatment alternatives were analyzed that meet desired water quality requirements (MBR and UV vs MLE and UV). The annual energy consumption of the selected alternative (MBR and UV) was less than the other alternative. Documentation can be provided.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes, the energy intensity of recycled water is less than treatment and distribution of potable water from distant surface sources.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes, a lifecycle cost analysis considering energy usage was conducted for 10, 20 and 30 year horizons and can be provided.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ____0___ out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description of how the project reduces dependence on the Delta)

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Mid Higuera Bypass

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: City of San Luis Obispo/County of San Luis Obispo

Contact Person: Brian Nelson

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation 5 out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

This project could potentially be combined with another project to expand the Bob Jones trail from Marsh to Madonna to allow for alternatives modes of transportation. This would reduce GHG emissions and help with climate change reduction. The bike path is outlined in the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) 7 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

The Mid Higuera Bypass project is at 30% complete. Technical studies have been completed and are available upon request (Final Technical Memorandum including the drainage hydraulic model). Waterway management plan has also been completed (background studies).

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) 10 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The EIR for this project is completed and certified.

F. Project costs and financing 3 out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

An Engineer's estimate has been produced for this project

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

This project is not currently funded.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) 0 out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

NA

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations 6 out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

This project will directly benefit flood control issues of a DAC, the City of San Luis Obispo

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)

Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

Yes, this project will lead to water quality and habitat improvements in San Luis Obispo Creek which is a steelhead waterway.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

NA

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) 0 out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

NA

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

NA

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

NA

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta 0 out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

NA

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District **DATE:** 8-Aug-18

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Livestock & Land Prog	4	12	6	5	10	8	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	**53**
Remediation and BMP Implementation in the Oso Flaco Watershed	5	16	6	5	7	5	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	**53**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Livestock & Land Prog**		**Remediation and BMP Implementation in the Oso Flaco Watershed**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water			X	
	Adequate water supply			X	X
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x	x	x	
	Sustainable water for agriculture	x		X	X
	Water Quality improvements to a water system	x		X	
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x	X	X
	Conservation/water use efficiency	x	x	X	X
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities			X	X
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x	X	X
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x		X	X
	Reduce contaminants	x	x	X	X
	Public involvement and stewardship	x	x	X	X
	Protect endangered species	x	x		
	Reduce impacts of invasive species			X	X
	Climate change in ecosystems			X	X
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	x		
	Support local GW management			x	
	Further local basin management objectives			X	X
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking				
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	x	X	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Livestock & Land Prog		Remediation and BMP Implementation in the Oso Flaco Watershed	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs			X	
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge	x			
	Improve infrastructure and operations			X	
	Implement multiple-benefit projects			X	X
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains			X	X
	Support DAC flood protection			X	
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	x	x	X	
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	x		X	X
	Consider property owner rights	x	x	X	X
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts			X	X
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag			X	X
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs	x	x		
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	17	12	27	18
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**4**	**12**	**5**	**16**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	Livestock & Land Prog	Remediation and BMP Implementation in the Oso Flaco Watershed	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency		X			
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage					
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration		X			
Flood risk management		X			
Land use planning and management					
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention	x	X			
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management	x				
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency					
Water transfers					
Watershed management	x	X			
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection	x				
Sediment management	x	X			
Water and culture	x	X			
Outreach and engagement	x	X			
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	7	8	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:
Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).
For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Livestock & Land Prog	Remediation and BMP Implementation in the Oso Flaco Watershed	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4					
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2					
Seasonal water demand (M)	2					
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4					
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	x	X			
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3					
Invasive species management issues (M)	2		X			
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4					
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3		X			
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	x	X			
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2	x	X			
Coastal erosion (M)	2		X			
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2					
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3		X			
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3		X			
Changes in species distributions (H)	3		X			
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3	x				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Livestock & Land Prog	Remediation and BMP Implementation in the Oso Flaco Watershed	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2	x	X			
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2		X			
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1		X			
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1		X			
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	18	31	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	1	2	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x	x			
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	1	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Land & Livestock Program

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Coastal San Luis RCD

Contact Person: Larissa Clarke

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___**5**___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

This purpose of this program is to achieve immediate and lasting reductions in nutrient, sediment and pathogen pollution to surface and groundwater through implementation of BMPs on livestock facilities. Where small property landowners may be adjacent to or abut a city or CSD boundary that is implementing water conservation, rainwater catchment or groundwater quality projects, this program would enhance and further the water resources in their immediate area.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___**10**___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.
For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

In 2011, a pilot program was completed in our County including 2 workshops and one demonstration project of a manure composting unit. The success and value of the L&L program can be demonstrated by its implementation in Santa Cruz, San Mateo and Monterey Counties. Our final project report and information available from other counties' projects can be used to verify its ability to achieve results.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) **__8___** out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?
For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

Preliminary design and construction documents for BMP installation can be designed within 1 year. Most projects will be exempt or fit into Neg Decs or Mitigated Neg Decs and will not require permits. Projects can be designed, permitted and implemented within 1 year.

The program planning and design is complete, BMPs for reducing pollution from livestock facilities in the region have been significantly identified and the project partners are all committed. However, since the implementation sites have not been selected, the specific project planning and design for each of the implementation sites has not been completed. Based on past experience, and the readiness and commitment from the project team to the process, we are confident that there is ample time with the grant scope and timeline to ensure the completion of selection, design and implementation of all projects within the grant period.

F. Project costs and financing **__0__** out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Due to site specific BMP design & build requirements, costs per project cannot be determined. The program is requesting funding that will allow it the discretion to select projects within the grant award.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.
(insert brief description of funding sources, including the percent complete of the funding for the project)

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) **__0__** out of 10 points.

If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

N/A. The BMP installations are relatively low cost. Perhaps a different type of Economic Feasibility requirement should be made available to ecosystem (Green Infrastructure)

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations **__6__** out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)

Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

If a L&L project were implemented in coordination with, and adjacent to, one of the DAC areas, a benefit may occur. It is not possible to determine at this time.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

The project will make significant progress toward project area watershed goals in watershed plans. Numerous beneficial uses are identified in the Basin Plan for the surface waters in the watersheds in our region. Some of the critical beneficial uses include municipal and domestic supply, agricultural supply, ground water recharge, freshwater replenishment and wildlife habitat. Our program will promote the reduction of nutrient, sediment and pathogen pollution currently impairing these beneficial uses. This will be achieved by implementing BMPs on livestock facilities on or near listed waterways and by giving livestock owners the tools to complete water quality site assessments and implement BMPs on their property now and into the future.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

Yes . Please refer to the statement in Part II above.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) **__0___** out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Unknown at this time.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Unknown.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Unknown.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta **__0___** out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description of how the project reduces dependence on the Delta)

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Remediation and BMP Implementation in the Oso Flaco Watershed

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District

Contact Person: Larissa Clarke

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation 5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The Project accomplishes legacy pesticide remediation and reduction of sedimentation through source control, by implementing on-farm BMPs, as well as non-point load reduction, by sediment removal in Little Oso Flaco Lake. This approach incorporates both individual land owners as well as State Parks, and is a collaborative effort of Cachuma Resource Conservation Districts and Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District to work towards TMDL goals set they the State Water Resource Control Board for Pesticides and Toxicity. The Project builds off of the findings in the Oso Flaco Planning and Assessment grant (CSLRCD/State Parks 2019), the Oso Flaco On-Farm Water Quality Implementation and Demonstration Project (CSLRCD 2015), Oso Flaco Creek Nonpoint Source Pollution Assessment (CSLRCD 2012), and The Nitrate and Sediment Assessment of Oso Flaco watershed (Cachuma RCD 2004).

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) _7__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

The Project includes 60% technical design plans and Implementation Cost Estimate. Timeline, permitting framework, and draft Initial Study will be complete by November 2018. On-farm demonstration BMPs have been implemented and are operating effectively. Monitoring efforts are currently recording baseline water quality data that will be used to quantify the achievement of project goals.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __5__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

A draft Initial Study, Permitting Framework and Implementation Timeline will be completed by November 2018. A final Initial Study and EIR will be completed by State Parks by 2020.

F. Project costs and financing _3__ out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

An Engineers Estimate is included. Project costs are estimated to be between $540,000 and $2,000,000. The project is comprised of 5 discrete components that will be bid upon separately, depending on available implementation funds and timelines. It is not anticipated that implementation funds will be sought for all components simultaneously.

Two primary components, including Sediment Removal in the Creek and Implementation of On-farm BMPs are estimated to cost $540,000. Following the primary components, three 'additive bids' for phased removal of sediment from Little Oso Flaco Lake are estimated to cost $1,400,000 cumulatively.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

Funds are not yet secured. Matching funds will come from State Parks and the SWRCB.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) __0__ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Project costs are estimated to be between $540,000 and $2,000,000. The project is comprised of 5 discrete components that will be bid upon separately, depending on available implementation funds. An Engineers Cost Estimate is attached.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __3__ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

The Project directly benefits farms and residences in the Oso Flaco Watershed. This is not considered a DAC.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

The project directly addresses water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration in the Oso Flaco Watershed. (3pts)

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

The Project does not directly address an Environmental Justice issue.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __0__ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The Project does not reduce GHG emissions compared to project alternatives.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The Project does not reduce energy consumption.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The Project does not reduce GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ___0__ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

The Project does not reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply.

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: County of San Luis Obispo **DATE:** 8/7/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Oceano Drainage Project	3	8	6	5	10	10	8	10	4	0	0	2	1	0	**67**
Mountain Springs Road Sediment Control	3	8	6	5	5	0	3	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	**37**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Oceano Drainage Project**		**Mountain Springs Road Sediment Control**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water				
	Adequate water supply				
	Sustainable potable water for rural				
	Sustainable water for agriculture				
	Water Quality improvements to a water system				
	Develop/implement water management plans				
	Conservation/water use efficiency				
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply				
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x		x	
	Conserve balance of ecosystem			x	
	Reduce contaminants			x	x
	Public involvement and stewardship	x			
	Protect endangered species				
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems			x	x
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions				
	Support local GW management				
	Further local basin management objectives				
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking			x	
	Protect and improve GW quality				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Oceano Drainage Project		Mountain Springs Road Sediment Control	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	x	x	x	x
	Promote low impact development	x			
	Enhance natural recharge	x	x	x	x
	Improve infrastructure and operations	x	x	x	x
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	x	x	x
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection	x	x	x	x
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation				
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	x		x	
	Consider property owner rights	x		x	
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x	x	x	
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag			x	
	DAC support and education	x			
	Promote public education programs				
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	12	6	14	7
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**3**	**8**	**3**	**8**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Oceano Drainage Project**	**Mountain Springs Road Sediment Control**			
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage					
Conveyance – Regional/Local	x	x			
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management	x	x			
Land use planning and management		x			
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention		x			
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management					
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local	x				
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency					
Water transfers					
Watershed management	x	x			
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management	x				
Recharge area protection					
Sediment management	x	x			
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement	x				
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	7	6	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Oceano Drainage Project	Mountain Springs Road Sediment Control			
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4					
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4					
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2					
Seasonal water demand (M)	2					
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4					
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4					
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3					
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4					
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	x				
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2	x				
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2	x				
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4		x			
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3	x	x			
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	x	x			
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3					

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Oceano Drainage Project	Mountain Springs Road Sediment Control			
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2	x	x			
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	15	12	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	1	1	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x	x			
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	1	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Oceano 13th Street Drainage Project

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: County of San Luis Obispo

Contact Person: Genaro Diaz

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation __5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

SLOCOG, CalTrans, Oceano CSD, FAA, UPRR,

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) _10___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

100% Construction Docs done. Specs done.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __10_ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA and NEPA are done. MND.

F. Project costs and financing _8___ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Engineer's Estimate complete. One bid round complete. (5pts)

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

Currently ~55% financed. (3pts)

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) 10___ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

A cost-related project feasibility and alternatives analysis was performed by the design consultant. Maintenance costs are known and will be paid by Roads maint. Budget.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations 4___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

Oceano is directly benefited by this project.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

n/a

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

n/a

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) _1___ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Alternatives to fix the problem include a pumping unit being placed at the flood area each winter. This project is all gravity flow with no pumping required.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta _0___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

n/a

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Mountain Springs Road Sediment Control

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: County of San Luis Obispo

Contact Person: Sarah Crable

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation _5____ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

A multi agency effort between County, City of Paso, and US-LT RCD. The Paso Robles Cemetery district is also a project partner.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) __5___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Prelim drawings and calcs are complete. Hydrology study is complete.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) _____ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA not started yet.

F. Project costs and financing __3__ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

A cost estimate was prepared as a part of the preliminary engineering effort.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

No financing at this time.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) __5___ out of 10 points.

If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

City of Paso Robles will be performing the O&M. No economic analysis has been performed.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __0__ out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

(insert brief description if project directly benefits one or more DAC)

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

(insert brief description if project directly addresses one of the above critical water issues for Tribal communities)

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

(insert brief description if project directly addresses an Environmental Justice issue)

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) ___0__ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description)

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description)

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description)

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta _0___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description of how the project reduces dependence on the Delta)

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Estrella-El Pomar-Creston Water District **DATE:** 8/29/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Huer Huero Recharge	5	16	6	5	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	**48**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Huer Huero Recharge Project**			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x		
	Adequate water supply	x	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x	x		
	Sustainable water for agriculture	x	x		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system				
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x		
	Conservation/water use efficiency	x	x		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x	x		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x		
	Conserve balance of ecosystem				
	Reduce contaminants	x			
	Public involvement and stewardship				
	Protect endangered species				
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems				
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	x		
	Support local GW management	x	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x		
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x	x		
	Protect and improve GW quality	x			

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Huer Huero Recharge Project		**0**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	x	x		
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge	x	x		
	Improve infrastructure and operations	x	x		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	x		
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation				
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	x	x		
	Consider property owner rights	x	x		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x			
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	x			
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs	x			
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	23	18	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**16**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Huer Huero Recharge Project**				
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	**x**				
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management	**x**				
Land use planning and management					
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention	**x**				
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management					
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local	**x**				
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency					
Water transfers					
Watershed management	**x**				
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection	**x**				
Sediment management	**x**				
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement	**x**				
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	8	0	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Huer Huero Recharge Project				
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4	x				
Water-dependent industries (H)	3	x				
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2	x				
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2	x				
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x				
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4					
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	x				
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4					
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3	x				
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3					
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2					
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4	x				
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3					
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	x				
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3					

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Huer Huero Recharge Project				
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2					
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2	x				
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	36	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	2	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x				
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Huer Huero Recharge Project

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Estrella-El Pomar-Creston Water District

Contact Person: Hilary Graves

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation __5__ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

Project picks up from the Flood Control & Water Conservation District's planning efforts.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___4_ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Feasibility and alternatives analysis are complete. Design will proceed once an alternative is selected.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __0__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

No permitting complete, no timeline currently.

F. Project costs and financing __4___ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Planning efforts included estimated costs for alternatives. (3pts)

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

District has started collecting funds for the project. (1pt)

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) __5__ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Analysis of alternatives is complete (5pts), but O&M has not been accounted for yet.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations _0___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

n/a

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

n/a

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

n/a

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __0___ out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta __0___ out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

n/a

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Los Osos Community Services District **DATE:** 13-Aug-18

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
8th Street Well Construction	4	8	6	5	10	10	8	5	0	0	3	2	0	0	**61**
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**8th Street Well Construction**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x
	Adequate water supply	x	x
	Sustainable potable water for rural		
	Sustainable water for agriculture		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system	x	x
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x
	Conservation/water use efficiency		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply	x	
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs		
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	
	Reduce contaminants	x	
	Public involvement and stewardship	x	
	Protect endangered species		
	Reduce impacts of invasive species		
	Climate change in ecosystems	x	
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	
	Support local GW management	x	
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x
	CASGEM Program	x	
	Groundwater recharge/banking		
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		8th Street Well Construction	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs		
	Promote low impact development		
	Enhance natural recharge		
	Improve infrastructure and operations		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects		
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains		
	Support DAC flood protection		
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation		
	Funding for IRWM implementation		
	Support local control	x	
	Consider property owner rights		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x	x
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag		
	DAC support and education		
	Promote public education programs		
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	16	6
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**4**	**8**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS.
Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**8th Street Well Construction**
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)	
Agricultural water use efficiency	
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	
Conveyance – Regional/Local	**x**
Desalination	
Drinking water treatment & distribution	**x**
Ecosystem restoration	
Flood risk management	
Land use planning and management	
Matching quality to use	
Pollution prevention	
Recycle municipal water	
Salt and salinity management	**x**
Surface storage – CALFED/State	
Surface storage – Regional/Local	
System reoperation	
Urban water use efficiency	
Water transfers	
Watershed management	**x**
Precipitation enhancement	
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation	**x**
Urban stormwater runoff management	
Recharge area protection	
Sediment management	
Water and culture	
Outreach and engagement	
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	5
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:
Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing.
Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).
For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		8th Street Well Construction
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**	
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4	
Water-dependent industries (H)	3	
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2	
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2	x
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	x
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	
Invasive species management issues (M)	2	
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1	
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4	
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3	
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3	
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2	
Coastal erosion (M)	2	
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2	x
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2	
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2	
Rising sea levels (M)	2	x
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1	
Coastal structures (L)	1	
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4	
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3	
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	
Changes in species distributions (H)	3	
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3	
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	8th Street Well Construction
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2	
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2	
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2	
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1	
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1	
Future hydropower plans (L)	1	
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	18
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	1
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1	**x**
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**2**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: 8th Street Well Construction

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Los Osos Community Services District

Contact Person: Renee Osborne

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives
(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)

B. *Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS)*
(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)

C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation **5** out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The Los Osos Community Services District (Los Osos CSD) is part of the Los Osos Basin Management Committee (BMC). The BMC consists of 4 different entities; Golden State Water, S&T Water, County, and Los Osos CSD. The BMC has collectively established a ground water management program to secure and preserve the only source of water that serves the entire Los Osos Community. The Los Osos BMC focuses on projects that will remedy the water quality degradation the community has with their groundwater basin. The first is the nitrate contamination of the upper aquifer and the second deals with seawater intrusion into the lower aquafer.
As part of the BMC plan, the above agencies need to establish a Basin Infrastructure Program that will:

- Try to reverse seawater intrusion
- Provide sustainable water supplies for existing consumers
- Establish a strategy for maximizing beneficial use of the Basin's water resources
- Provide sustainable water supplies for future development

The program would focus on transferring groundwater production from the lower aquifer to the upper aquifer and shift production within the lower aquifer from the Western area to the Central and Eastern areas respectively.

Each entity was given a list of tasks/projects that they would be responsible for, which would fulfill their obligation to the BMC. The projects build on and overlap each other to help accomplish the overall goal for the Los Osos Community.

The Los Osos 8th Street Well project would help shift water production from the Lower Aquifer to the Upper Aquifer assisting with the issue of seawater intrusion.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) **10** out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.
For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

MNS Engineering completed Design in August of 2018. Design is attached to this email.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) **10** out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?
For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA was performed. Documents attached.
The project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. Mitigation measures were made a condition of the approval of the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was not adopted for this project. Findings were made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

F. Project costs and financing **8** out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

An Engineer's estimate has been prepared. The total of our project is estimated at $283,983. Document attached. (3pts)

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The District passed a Prop 218 in June of 2017 to assist with the necessary BMC projects and can use reserves to back the project while waiting for reimbursement. (5pts)

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) **5** out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

There is no daily or annual financial impact maintenance of the 8th Street Well Project. The project consists of:

A. Construction of a well; casing is based off of material life span.
B. Pump/motor is based off of manufacturer warranty.
C. Above ground equipment- Valves, check valves, electronic components, chemical feed pumps, water quality monitoring equipment also based off of equipment life span.
D. Daily monitoring would be absorbed by the utility crew.

The District has reserves in place in case of an emergency to replace any equipment failure.

There has not been an economic analysis of alternatives performed for this project. It's a mandated project.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations **3** out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

N/A

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

N/A

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

The project directly correlates and supports the IRWM to the "right to clean water act" for the community of Los Osos. The construction of the 8th "Street Well, will assist with nitrate and salt water intrusion currently contaminating the water supply.

I. Climate Change Adaption
(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) **0** out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

N/A

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

N/A

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

N/A

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta **0** out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

N/A

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Morro Bay National Estuary Program **DATE:** 8/22/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Los Padres CCC Center - Stormwater LID Treatment Project	4	12	6	5	5	2	3	7	0	3	0	3	2	0	**52**
Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley	3	8	6	5	7	5	4	5	0	3	0	2	0	0	**48**
Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management	4	12	6	5	3	0	2	3	0	3	0	2	0	0	**40**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Los Padres CCC Center - Stormwater LID Treatment Project**		**Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water				
	Adequate water supply	x		x	
	Sustainable potable water for rural				
	Sustainable water for agriculture			x	x
	Water Quality improvements to a water system				
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x	x	
	Conservation/water use efficiency			x	
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x		x	
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x		
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x	x	x
	Reduce contaminants	x	x		
	Public involvement and stewardship	x	x	x	x
	Protect endangered species	x	x	x	x
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems	x		x	x
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions				
	Support local GW management				
	Further local basin management objectives				
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x			
	Protect and improve GW quality				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Los Padres CCC Center - Stormwater LID Treatment Project		Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs				
	Promote low impact development	x	x		
	Enhance natural recharge	x	x		
	Improve infrastructure and operations	x	x		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	x	x	x
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains	x	x		
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	x		x	
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	x	x	x	x
	Consider property owner rights			x	x
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x	x	x	
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag			x	x
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs	x	x		
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	19	14	15	9
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**4**	**12**	**3**	**8**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water		
	Adequate water supply		
	Sustainable potable water for rural		
	Sustainable water for agriculture		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system		
	Develop/implement water management plans		
	Conservation/water use efficiency		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x	
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x
	Reduce contaminants	x	x
	Public involvement and stewardship	x	x
	Protect endangered species		
	Reduce impacts of invasive species		
	Climate change in ecosystems	x	x
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	
	Support local GW management	x	
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x
	CASGEM Program		
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x	x
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	x

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs		
	Promote low impact development	x	x
	Enhance natural recharge	x	x
	Improve infrastructure and operations		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains		
	Support DAC flood protection		
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	x	
	Funding for IRWM implementation		
	Support local control		
	Consider property owner rights		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag		
	DAC support and education		
	Promote public education programs	x	x
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	16	11
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**4**	**12**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Los Padres CCC Center - Stormwater LID Treatment Project**	**Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley**	**Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management**
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)			
Agricultural water use efficiency		x	
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage			
Conveyance – Regional/Local			
Desalination			
Drinking water treatment & distribution			
Ecosystem restoration	x	x	x
Flood risk management	x		
Land use planning and management			
Matching quality to use			
Pollution prevention	x	x	x
Recycle municipal water			
Salt and salinity management			
Surface storage – CALFED/State			
Surface storage – Regional/Local			
System reoperation			
Urban water use efficiency			
Water transfers			
Watershed management	x	x	x
Precipitation enhancement			
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation			
Urban stormwater runoff management	x		x
Recharge area protection			
Sediment management	x		x
Water and culture	x	x	
Outreach and engagement	x	x	x
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	8	6	6
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**6**	**6**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets - Morro Bay NEP"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Los Padres CCC Center - Stormwater LID Treatment Project	Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley	Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management		
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4			x		
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4	x	x			
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2					
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x	x			
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4					
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4					
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3					
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4	x	x			
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	x		x		
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2	x				
Coastal erosion (M)	2			x		
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2			x		
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3	x				
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	x				
Changes in species distributions (H)	3	x				
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3		x			
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3	x	x			

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Los Padres CCC Center - Stormwater LID Treatment Project	Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley	Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management		
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2	x				
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2	x	x			
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1	x				
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	32	18	11	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	2	1	1	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x	x	x		
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	1	1	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Los Padres CCC Center - Stormwater LID Treatment Project

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Morro Bay National Estuary Program

Contact Person: Lexi Bell

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

MBNEP, CCC, National Guard… implementing the CCMP.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___5__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Demonstration and pilot project exist in the area. Design of this specific project is at 25%.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ___2__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA and other Env. Permitting is being planned.

F. Project costs and financing __3___ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Estimate has been prepared. (3pts)

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

No funding secured at this time.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) __7___ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Implementation will be through the CCC and their existing budget structure. CCC has planned and budgeted for O&M after implementation.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __3___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

No.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

Northern Chumash Tribal Council is project partner.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

(insert brief description if project directly addresses an Environmental Justice issue)

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __2__ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Passive heating and cooling by landscaping plan. (1pt)

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Reduces transportation needs of corps members. (1pt)

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta __0___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

N/a

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Morro Bay National Estuary Program

Contact Person: Lexie Bell

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

This project would support integrating efforts between planning agencies relevant in Chorro Valley (County of SLO, city of Morro Bay), public landowners, and private landowners. It would produce both water supply benefits for individual properties and habitat/water quality benefits to creek flow.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___7___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

This project is non-infrastructure and focused on building partnerships to support the implementation of water conservation projects in the Chorro Valley on individual (private and public) properties to benefit creek flow. There have been some demonstration projects completed already in the Valley that demonstrate both techniques and partnerships. There have also been past efforts to convene a Chorro Valley Water Users group.

Given the experience and examples in the watershed, this project is likely to be technically feasible.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ___5___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

Staffing, landowner engagement, and funding need to be address for the project to proceed. Likely these can be addressed within a 1-2 year timeframe.

F. Project costs and financing ___4___ out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

We have costs for the previous demonstration projects available and can estimate staff time for convening a partnerships stakeholder group. (3pts)

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

Project is not yet funded but there is likely to be match funding for staff time available from NEP, CCC, CCSE, and others. (1pt)

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ___5___ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Economic feasibility is not relevant to the program but to individual projects that may be implemented in the future.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations ___3___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)

Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

No DAC in Chorro Valley.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

The program would address increasing creek flow for fish migration and improved water quality in surface waters. It would also support habitat restoration. (3pts)

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

No EJ issues directly addressed by the project.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __0____ out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No relevant GHG reduction

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ___0___ out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description of how the project reduces dependence on the Delta)

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Morro Bay National Estuary Program

Contact Person: Lexie Bell

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

Project will improve stormwater management, benefit water quality in the bay (a state and national estuary and an MPA), and help recharge groundwater through infiltration at a location that is currently experiencing saltwater intrusion

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___3___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Concept design is complete.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ___0___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

No project timeline, no CEQA completed.

F. Project costs and financing ___2___ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Brief cost estimate has been prepared but not reviewed by an engineer.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

No funding lined up yet.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ___3___ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

In general, LID projects can be cost effective but this project has not been evaluated specifically.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations ___3___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

No DAC present.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

Address water quality (due to stormwater runoff) of surface waters in Morro Bay and through improved water quality, will have a positive impact on bay habitats such as eelgrass.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

No direct connection to EJ issues.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) ___0___ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No GHG reductions

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No energy consumption reductions

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No future GHG reductions.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ___0___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

(insert brief description of how the project reduces dependence on the Delta)

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Nipomo CSD **DATE:** 8/82018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Nipomo SWP	3	12	6	5	10	10	7	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	**65**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Nipomo SWP**			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x		
	Adequate water supply	x	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x	x		
	Sustainable water for agriculture				
	Water Quality improvements to a water system	x	x		
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x		
	Conservation/water use efficiency				
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply	x	x		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)	x	x		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs				
	Conserve balance of ecosystem				
	Reduce contaminants				
	Public involvement and stewardship				
	Protect endangered species				
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems				
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x			
	Support local GW management	x	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x		
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking				
	Protect and improve GW quality	x			

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Nipomo SWP			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs				
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge				
	Improve infrastructure and operations				
	Implement multiple-benefit projects				
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation				
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	x			
	Consider property owner rights				
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x	x		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	x	x		
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs				
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	14	11	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**3**	**12**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Nipomo SWP**				
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage					
Conveyance – Regional/Local	**x**				
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution	**x**				
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management					
Land use planning and management					
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention					
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management					
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency					
Water transfers	**x**				
Watershed management					
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation	**x**				
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection					
Sediment management					
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement					
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	4	0	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets Completed"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Nipomo SWP				
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4					
Water-dependent industries (H)	3	x				
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2	x				
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x				
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	x				
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3					
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4	x				
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3					
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2					
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3					
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3					
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3					

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Nipomo SWP				
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2					
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	23	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	2	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	0	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 - Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies the "2018 IRWM Scoring Summary" and embedded worksheets.

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: NIPOMO SUPPLEMENTAL WATER PROJECT (Nipomo SWP)

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Contact Person: MARIO IGLESIAS

A. *Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives* *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheets)*
B. *Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS)* *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheets)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5__ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The NSWP, when completed, will redistribute groundwater from a health section of the Santa Maria Groundwater basin to a stressed section of the basin. The project is a collaborative effort shared by the City of Santa Maria, Golden State Water Company, Woodlands Mutual Water Company and the Nipomo CSD. The project demonstrates how agencies can develop agreements, build infrastructure, and execute a regional solution to address a shared problem.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___10__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

The NSWP is made up of multiple elements that include pipes, pumps, interties, and storage tanks. Some of the elements have been completed, other elements are designed, while some elements are in the design process. The District is seeking grant funding for a $3.2 million pipeline element that has completed the design process.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ___10__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is in process, what is the timeline and how complete is it?

The District's $3.2 million pipeline project has completed the CEQA documentation process.

F. Project costs and financing __7__ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
2 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

The project costs have been estimated by an engineer based on related work and current pricing. Bids have not yet been solicited because full funding of the project has not been established.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The project is being funded by three entities, Golden State Water Company, Woodlands Mutual Water Company, and Nipomo CSD. The $3.2 million pipeline project is 60% funded.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) __10__ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

The NSWP was studied extensively as one of many alternative solutions for bringing water onto the Nipomo Mesa. There are financial resources built into rates to sustain the project now and into the future.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __0__ out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

NO

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

NO

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

NO

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheets)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __0__ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduces GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

NO

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduces energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

NO

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

NO

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta __0___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

NO

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Oceano Community Services District **DATE:** 9/12/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Oceano LID Project	5	16	10	5	4	3	4	5	4	3	0	3	2	0	**64**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Oceano LID Project**			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	X			
	Adequate water supply	X	X		
	Sustainable potable water for rural				
	Sustainable water for agriculture				
	Water Quality improvements to a water system				
	Develop/implement water management plans	X	X		
	Conservation/water use efficiency	X	X		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply	X	X		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)	X	X		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	X			
	Conserve balance of ecosystem				
	Reduce contaminants	X	X		
	Public involvement and stewardship	X			
	Protect endangered species				
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems	X			
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions				
	Support local GW management	X			
	Further local basin management objectives	X			
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking	X	X		
	Protect and improve GW quality	X	X		

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Oceano LID Project		**0**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	X	X		
	Promote low impact development	X	X		
	Enhance natural recharge	X	X		
	Improve infrastructure and operations	X	X		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	X	X		
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection	X	X		
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	X			
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	X			
	Consider property owner rights	X			
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	X	X		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag				
	DAC support and education	X	X		
	Promote public education programs	X	X		
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	26	17	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**16**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Oceano LID Project**				
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	**X**				
Conveyance – Regional/Local	**X**				
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management	**X**				
Land use planning and management	**X**				
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention	**X**				
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management					
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency	**X**				
Water transfers					
Watershed management	**X**				
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management	**X**				
Recharge area protection					
Sediment management	**X**				
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement	**X**				
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	10	0	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	10	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:
Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).
For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Oceano LID Project				
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	X				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4					
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2					
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	X				
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4					
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	X				
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3					
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4					
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	X				
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2	X				
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1	X				
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3	X				
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	X				
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3					

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Oceano LID Project				
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2	X				
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	24	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	2	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	X				
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Oceano LID Project

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: Oceano Community Services District (OCSD)

Contact Person: Paavo Ogren

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5____ out of 5 points.

For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The project is a community-scale approach for incorporating low impact development (LID) features into public lands to maximize capture of stormwater across Oceano, to provide water quality improvements for receiving waters, reductions to historic flooding, and groundwater recharge. The project is comprised of four green streets and one subsurface stormwater capture facility. Each sub project is strategically located at the lower elevation in relation to drainage management areas known to contribute to localized flooding. The proposed subsurface capture facility is located at Oceano Elementary School and incorporates filters, pumps, and irrigation equipment to provide additional benefit of reusing stormwater for playfield irrigation. Where LID facilities are proposed within street right-of-ways they are colocated with pedestrian and bicycle routes to improve safety and access for members of the community, including providing safe routes to school and to access bus routes. The proposed projects are associated with the County of San Luis Obispo's "Oceano Revitalization Plan" effort and will be carried out in coordination with the County.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) __4__ out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Concept plans have been developed for the four street corridors and the subsurface capture and reuse school project. The designs are accompanied by stormwater calculations and estimates of probable cost.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ___3___ out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The project is not located in the Coastal Zone, so no Coastal development permit is needed. A Road Right-of-Way Easement and Road Encroachment Permit will be needed from the San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Works Department. This process is estimated to take between four and six months. CEQA is estimated to be completed prior to completion of the construction documents.

Conceptual Design Completed, Fall 2018
Community Engagement (Review Concepts and Provide Feedback to identify Preferred Alternatives), Spring 2019 (During this phase, you can route the checklist for the CEQA, to avoid protesting the CEQA document)
Construction Documents, Fall 2019

F. Project costs and financing ___4__ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

A cost estimate has been prepared and will be attached.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

This project is dependent upon grant funding. The Oceano CSD has limited reserves available in the District's water fund that may be applied toward project costs and for project match.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ___5_ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

There is no completed economic analysis.

The projects will have new landscape and drainage O&M requirements. The OCSD will be able to fund the O&M utilizing its operation and maintenance budget.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __7___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

The project is located in the community of Oceano and directly benefits multiple critical water issues including water quality, groundwater availability, and known flooding.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

The project provides water quality treatment for stormwater runoff that currently flows untreated to Arroyo Grande Creek and the Pacific Ocean.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

Does not apply to Oceano.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) _2_ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The project includes multiple climate change mitigation strategies including, replacement of paved streets and parking lanes with new bioretention and drought tolerant landscape areas, Class II bike lanes, accessible sidewalks, and new trees.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The project will provide Class II bicycle lanes and accessible pedestrian sidewalks that will offer residents safe and comfortable alternatives to driving to the downtown area and Oceano Elementary School.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta _0_ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

No

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: San Miguel CSD **DATE:** 8/30/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion	5	20	10	5	3	0	3	8	4	0	0	2	1	0	**61**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion**		**0**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x		
	Adequate water supply	x	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x			
	Sustainable water for agriculture	x	x		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system				
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x		
	Conservation/water use efficiency	x	x		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply	x	x		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)	x	x		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x			
	Conserve balance of ecosystem				
	Reduce contaminants	x	x		
	Public involvement and stewardship				
	Protect endangered species	x			
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems	x			
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	x		
	Support local GW management	x	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x		
	CASGEM Program	x	x		
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x	x		
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	x		

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	x			
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge	x	x		
	Improve infrastructure and operations	x	x		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	x		
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection	x	x		
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	x			
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	x			
	Consider property owner rights	x	x		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	x	x		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	x	x		
	DAC support and education	x			
	Promote public education programs	x			
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	30	21	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**20**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion**				
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency	x				
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	x				
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management	x				
Land use planning and management					
Matching quality to use	x				
Pollution prevention	x				
Recycle municipal water	x				
Salt and salinity management	x				
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation	x				
Urban water use efficiency	x				
Water transfers					
Watershed management					
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation	x				
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection	x				
Sediment management					
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement					
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	11	0	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	10	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets"

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:
Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).
For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion	0	0	0	0
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4					
Water-dependent industries (H)	3	x				
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2	x				
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x				
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4					
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	x				
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4					
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3					
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2					
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2					
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3					
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	x				
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3					

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion	0	0	0	0
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2					
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	21	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	1	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x				
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: San Miguel CSD

Contact Person: Blaine Reely

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation __5__ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

Part of SMCSD GSP implementation strategy. Nearby Ag community has already been engaged regarding treated effluent use.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___3__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Capacity Study of existing plant is complete. Upgrade report is in process.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __0__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA and permitting has not yet begun.

F. Project costs and financing ___3__ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

An engineer's estimate was prepared in April 2018.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

No financing complete at this time.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) __8__ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

A draft economic feasibility analysis has been completed, but not accepted by the Board yet. Analysis included O&M costs as well.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __4__ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

Project directly benefits the community of San Miguel.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

n/a

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

n/a

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __1__ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No analysis at this time.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Upgraded Plant will consume less energy than the current plant based on the types of aeration for the current vs proposed conditions.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

No analysis at this time.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta __0___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

n/a

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: San Miguelito Mutual Water Company/Central Coast Salmon Enhancement **DATE:** 8/30/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Instrusion Barrier Planning and Implementation Project	5	12	6	5	4	2	4	10	0	3	0	4	0	1	**56**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Instrusion Barrier Planning and Implementation Project**			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	X			
	Adequate water supply	X	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	X			
	Sustainable water for agriculture				
	Water Quality improvements to a water system	X			
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x		
	Conservation/water use efficiency				
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities of water supply	X	X		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	X	X		
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	X	X		
	Reduce contaminants				
	Public involvement and stewardship	X			
	Protect endangered species	X	X		
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems	X	X		
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x			
	Support local GW management	X	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	X			
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking	X			
	Protect and improve GW quality	X	X		

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Instrusion Barrier Planning and Implementation Project			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	**X**	**x**		
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge	**X**			
	Improve infrastructure and operations	**X**	**x**		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	**X**	**x**		
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains	**X**	**X**		
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation	**X**			
	Funding for IRWM implementation	**X**			
	Support local control	**X**	**X**		
	Consider property owner rights	**X**			
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts	**X**	**X**		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	**X**			
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs	**X**			
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	28	15	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**12**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater				
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	X				
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration	X				
Flood risk management	X				
Land use planning and management	X				
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention					
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management	X				
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency					
Water transfers					
Watershed management	X				
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection	X				
Sediment management					
Water and culture	X				
Outreach and engagement	X				
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	9	0	0	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets_SMMWC"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Instrusion				
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	X				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4					
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2					
Seasonal water demand (M)	2					
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	X				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	X				
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	x				
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4					
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	x				
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2	x				
Coastal erosion (M)	2					
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2	X				
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2	X				
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2	X				
Rising sea levels (M)	2	X				
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1	X				
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3	x				
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	x				
Changes in species distributions (H)	3	X				
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3	X				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Instrusion				
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2					
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2	X				
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2	X				
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1	X				
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	46	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	3	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1	X				
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Intrusion Barrier Planning and Implementation Project

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: San Miguelito Mutual Water Company (SMMWC)/Central Coast Salmon Enhancement (CCSE)

Contact Person: Rick Koon/Steph Wald/Justin Sutton (WSC)

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Intrusion Barrier Planning and Implementation Project consists of planning, permitting, preparation of 100% design, modifications to maintain the Marre Weir, downstream fish passage improvements, and integration of a Steelhead Life Cycle Monitoring Station (LCMS). The project includes the San Miguelito Mutual Water Company, Central Coast Salmon Enhancement and California Department of Fish and Wildlife Coastal Monitoring Program. The integration of fish passage improvement, water supply protection from sea level rise and long-term Steelhead monitor demonstrate agency (private water company, local nonprofit and state agency) cooperation of protecting freshwater habitat and groundwater from seawater intrusion and increasing fish passage for Lamprey eel and Steelhead trout.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___4___ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

An inspection of the weir has been conducted to assess the condition and structural integrity. It has been found that the weir requires maintenance but that the project is feasible to maintain the weir in place. The fish passage design has not yet been initiated. However, the following steps have occurred that demonstrate progress:

1. A technical advisory team has been formed and has met to inform the design process for weir maintenance and fish passage.
2. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Fish Passage engineer has visited the weir and provided concept level input to the team.
3. CCSE has generated a funding plan and existing conditions document to guide implementation and permitting.
4. CDFW has conducted fish surveys in the San Luis Obispo Creek watershed to inform fish passage design and LCMS placement.
5. The impacts of sea level rise have been analyzed.
6. Conceptual design approaches to protect upstream water supplies, improve fish passage, and install a life cycle monitoring station have been discussed, but not yet formalized.
7. Initial permitting outreach has been conducted with regulatory agencies.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ____2___ out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The Project has been vetted by the technical advisory team and resource agencies through the conceptual planning phase. The project has momentum and support of local experts and it is anticipated that preliminary planning and design efforts will advance in 2018/2019. Preliminary design and analysis will assist with identifying required project permits. Design and permitting is anticipated to advance concurrently to expedite project implementation. With IRWM funding the project is less than two years away from implementation.

F. Project costs and financing ____4___ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Final project costs have not been determined as the project is in the preliminary planning and design phase. However, the preliminary engineer's estimate is $1.2M.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

The District has $40,000 allocated for planning in 2018. The Districts 2019 budget will include additional funding to advance the project. It is estimated that between 1% - 19% of the project cost has been secured.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) _10_____ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

An economic analysis of the project has not been completed; however, the project is necessary to protect the Districts groundwater supplies. Outside funding will be pursued and implementation costs will be analyzed to reduce impacts to the District's rate payers to the greatest extent feasible. Project implementation will result in minor O&M costs in regard to maintaining adequate fish passage. Future O&M costs will be less than the existing O&M costs after implementation of the project. A project goal is to reduce efforts required to maintain upstream and downstream fish passage compared to the original Denil ladder design.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __3____ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

The project will not directly benefit one or more DAC's.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

Fish passage improvements address critical Native American water issues. (3pts)

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

The Project does not directly address an Environmental Justice issue.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*

J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) ____0___ out of 3 points.

Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The Project does not specifically reduce GHG emissions; however, should the District's water supply become impacted by seawater intrusion alternative water supply options may need to be pursued which will likely have greater GHG emissions.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Not applicable.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Not applicable

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ____1___ out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

The protection of SMMWC groundwater wells reduces their reliance on the State Water Project and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region
2018 IRWM Project Evaluation Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: San Simeon CSD **DATE:** Ju;y 8, 2018

Instructions:
For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.
For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

		Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			
	Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of contribution	Resource Management Strategies	Strategic consideration for plan implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced dependence on Delta	**Total Project Score**
	Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name																
Reservoir Expansion Project		4	8	6	0	8	7	4	10	4	0	0	4	1	0	**56**
																0
																0
																0
																0
																0
																0
																0
																0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Reservoir Expansion Project**			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 If yes, is it documented?**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 If yes, is it documented?**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x		
	Adequate water supply	x	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x	x		
	Sustainable water for agriculture				
	Water system WQ improvements	x	x		
	Implement water management Plans	x	x		
	Conservation/water use efficiency				
	Plan for vulnerabilities of water supply	x	x		
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x			
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x		
	Reduce contaminants	x	x		
	Public involvement and stewardship				
	Protect endangered species				
	Reduce impacts of invasive species				
	Climate change in ecosystems	x			
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x			
	Support local GW management	x	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	x			
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking				
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	x		
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	x			
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge				
	Improve infrastructure and operations				
	Implement multiple-benefit projects				
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains				
	Support DAC flood protection				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Reservoir Expansion Project			
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributes to Objective? (y/n)**	**Column A2 If yes, is it documented? (y/n)**	**Column A1 Contributes to Objective? (y/n)**	**Column A2 If yes, is it documented? (y/n)**
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation				
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control	**x**			
	Consider property owner rights				
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts				
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag				
	DAC support and education	**x**			
	Promote public education programs				
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
Maximum is 37		17	10	0	0
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation		**4**	**8**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	**Reservoir Expansion Project**				
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage					
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution	**x**				
Ecosystem restoration					
Flood risk management					
Land use planning and management					
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention					
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management	**x**				
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local					
System reoperation	**x**				
Urban water use efficiency					
Water transfers					
Watershed management	**x**				
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection					
Sediment management					
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement					
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	4	0	0	0	0
	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Reservoir Expansion Project				
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x				
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4	x				
Water-dependent industries (H)	3					
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2					
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2					
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x				
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	x				
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	x				
Invasive species management issues (M)	2					
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4	x				
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	x				
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2					
Coastal erosion (M)	2	x				
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2	x				
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2					
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2	x				
Rising sea levels (M)	2	x				
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1					
Coastal structures (L)	1					
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4					
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3					
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3					
Changes in species distributions (H)	3					
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3					
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3					

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Reservoir Expansion Project				
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2					
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2					
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2					
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1					
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1					
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	36	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	2	0	0	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	**x**				
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1	**x**				
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	2	0	0	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Reservoir Expansion Project

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: San Simeon CSD

Contact Person: Renee Osborne

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation _0___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

n/a

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) _8__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

Design will be complete by Fall of 2018.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) __7__ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

CEQA/permitting will be close to completion by Fall of 2018. We feel that we will have a mitigated negative declaration.

F. Project costs and financing __4__ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Estimate complete. (3pts)

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

We are applying for a loan through the USDA and some match from the District funds. (1pts)

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) _10__ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Project alternative was identified in the Master Water Report for SSCSD. No other options are feasible. (5pts)

O&M is covered by the district. (5pts)

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations __4__ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

This project directly effects San Simeon CSD

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)

Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

n/a

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

n/a

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __1__ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Yes, alternative would be to purchase water and truck water to the District.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

n/a

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta _____ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

n/a

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: Upper Salinas - Las Tablas RCD **DATE:** 7/31/2018

Instructions:

For the highlighted cells, see the other worksheets within this file for scoring calculations.

For the other cells, in conjunction with the Scoring Rubric, complete the accompanying "2018 IRWM Implementation List Scoring Form" per project.

	Plan Objectives (40 points)				Readiness to Proceed (40 points)				Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score
Category (see Rubric and Form)	A		B	C	D	E	F	G	H			I	J	K	
Evaluation Criteria	Contributes to Objectives	Evidence of Contribution	Resource Mgmt. Strategies (RMS)	Strategic consideration for plan Implementation	Technical feasibility	Project status	Project Costs & financing	Economic feasibility	Benefits DAC	Benefits Tribal Community	Addresses other EJ concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced depend-ence on Delta	
Maximum Point Value	5	20	10	5	10	10	10	10	4	3	3	6	3	1	**100**
Project Name															
Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement	5	20	6	5	3	4	0	5	0	3	0	5	3	0	**59**
Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study	4	12	6	5	5	10	6	10	0	0	0	5	1	0	**64**
SLO County Key Percolation Zone Study	3	8	3	5	10	10	5	10	0	0	0	2	1	0	**57**
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0
															0

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

Instructions:

This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project contributes to meeting the Objectives of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Projects shall be scored in Column A1 on if it qualitatively contributes to an Objective and seperately in Column A2 if the contribution is documented. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project directly contributes to meeting an Objective. *Only enter a 'x' for 'yes'. If the project does not contribute to an Objective, leave the corresponding cell blank.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement**		**Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x		
	Adequate water supply	x	x		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x	x		
	Sustainable water for agriculture	x	x		
	Water Quality improvements to a water system				
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x	x	x
	Conservation/water use efficiency	x	x		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x	x	x	x
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x	x	x
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	x	x	x
	Reduce contaminants				
	Public involvement and stewardship			x	x
	Protect endangered species	x	x	x	
	Reduce impacts of invasive species			x	
	Climate change in ecosystems	x	x	x	x
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	x	x	x
	Support local GW management	x	x		
	Further local basin management objectives	x	x	x	x
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x	x	x	
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	x	x	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement		Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs	x	x	x	x
	Promote low impact development				
	Enhance natural recharge	x	x	x	x
	Improve infrastructure and operations				
	Implement multiple-benefit projects	x	x	x	x
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains	x	x	x	x
	Support DAC flood protection				
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation				
	Funding for IRWM implementation				
	Support local control			x	
	Consider property owner rights	x	x	x	x
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts				
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag	x	x	x	x
	DAC support and education				
	Promote public education programs				
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented	Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	22	22	19	14
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)	Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**5**	**20**	**4**	**12**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project contributes to an objective and if it is documented. Otherwise, leave blank.		**SLO County Key Percolation Zone Study**	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Water Supply	Maximize accessibility of water	x	x
	Adequate water supply		
	Sustainable potable water for rural	x	
	Sustainable water for agriculture	x	
	Water Quality improvements to a water system		
	Develop/implement water management plans	x	x
	Conservation/water use efficiency		
	Plan for climate change vulnerabilities	x	x
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)		
Ecosystem & Watershed	Understand watershed needs	x	x
	Conserve balance of ecosystem	x	
	Reduce contaminants		
	Public involvement and stewardship		
	Protect endangered species		
	Reduce impacts of invasive species		
	Climate change in ecosystems	x	x
Groundwater	Understand GW issues and conditions	x	x
	Support local GW management		
	Further local basin management objectives		
	CASGEM Program		
	Groundwater recharge/banking	x	x
	Protect and improve GW quality	x	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		SLO County Key Percolation Zone Study	
Actions	**Abbreviated Objectives (continued)**	**Column A1 Contributed to Objective**	**Column A2 Documented Contribution**
Flood Management	Understand flood management needs		
	Promote low impact development		
	Enhance natural recharge	**x**	
	Improve infrastructure and operations		
	Implement multiple-benefit projects		
	Restore streams, rivers and floodplains		
	Support DAC flood protection		
Water Resources Management	Public outreach on IRWM implementation		
	Funding for IRWM implementation		
	Support local control		
	Consider property owner rights		
	Agency alignment on water resource efforts		
	Collaboration between urban, rural, and ag		
	DAC support and education		
	Promote public education programs		
		Total Objectives Contributed to by Project	Total Objectives Documented
	Maximum is 37	12	7
		Total Points (max. of 5 points)	Total Points (max. of 20 points)
	See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation	**3**	**8**

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Resource Management Strategies (RMS) Scorecard

Instructions:
This Worksheet is intended to simplify scoring for how a project implements the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) of the 2018 IRWM Plan. Project Sponsors should be prepared to provide documentation to show that a project implements a claimed RMS. *Only enter an 'x' for RMSs implemented by the Project.*

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty if the project utilizes the listed RMS. Otherwise, leave blank.	Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement	Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study	SLO County Key Percolation Zone Study		
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency	x				
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage	x				
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
Ecosystem restoration	x				
Flood risk management	x	x			
Land use planning and management		x	x		
Matching quality to use					
Pollution prevention	x				
Recycle municipal water					
Salt and salinity management					
Surface storage – CALFED/State					
Surface storage – Regional/Local	x				
System reoperation					
Urban water use efficiency					
Water transfers					
Watershed management	x	x	x		
Precipitation enhancement					
Groundwater/Aquifer remediation					
Urban stormwater runoff management					
Recharge area protection	x	x	x		
Sediment management					
Water and culture					
Outreach and engagement					
	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project	Total RMS's Implemented to by Project
Maximum is 25	8	4	3	0	0
1-3 RMS = 3 points *4-9 RMS = 6 points* *10+ RMS = 10 points*	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)	Total Points (maximum of 10 points)
	6	**6**	**3**	**0**	**0**

"2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 - Worksheets"

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Instructions:

Determine if the proposed project(s) address the climate change vulnerability, either qualitatively or quantitatively. If yes, enter the corresponding prioritized value (1 - 4) as shown. Points for each vulnerability are all-or-nothing. Vulnerabilities include Very High (VH), High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L).

For example, if the proposed project address "Coastal Erosion", a medium vulnerability for our region, enter '2'.

WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS: Enter 'x' in the empty cell if the project addresses a vulnerability. Otherwise, leave blank.		Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement	Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study	SLO County Key Percolation Zone Study		
Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization	**Possible Points**					
Drought-sensitive groundwater basins (VH)	4	x	x	x		
Insufficient instream flows (VH)	4	x	x			
Water-dependent industries (H)	3	x				
Climate-sensitive crops (M)	2	x				
Communities with water curtailment efforts (M)	2	x				
Seasonal water demand (M)	2	x	x			
Drought-sensitive water systems (VH)	4	x				
Water supply from coastal aquifers (VH)	4	x	x			
Inability to store carryover supply surpluses (H)	3	x	x			
Invasive species management issues (M)	2		x			
Water supply from snowmelt (L)	1					
Declining seasonal low flows (VH)	4	x	x			
Water bodies impacted by eutrophication (H)	3					
Water bodies in areas at risk of wildfires (H)	3					
Water quality impacted by rain events (H)	3	x	x			
Water bodies with restricted beneficial uses (M)	2	x	x			
Coastal erosion (M)	2	x	x			
Coastal infrastructure in low-lying areas (M)	2		x			
Flooding due to high tides and storm surges (M)	2	x	x			
Low-lying coastal habitats (M)	2		x			
Rising sea levels (M)	2					
Coastal land subsidence (L)	1	x	x			
Coastal structures (L)	1	x	x			
Increased flood risk due to wildfires (VH)	4	x	x			
Aging flood protection infrastructure (H)	3	x	x			
Insufficient flood control facilities (H)	3	x	x			
Changes in species distributions (H)	3	x	x			
Environmental flow requirements (H)	3	x	x			
Estuarine habitats dependent on freshwater flow patterns (H)	3	x	x			

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

Climate Change Vulnerabilties With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points	Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement	Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study	SLO County Key Percolation Zone Study		
Aquatic habitats at risk of erosion and sedimentation (M)	2	x	x			
Climate-sensitive fauna and flora (M)	2	x	x			
Fragmented aquatic habitats (M)	2	x	x			
Aquatic habitats used for economic activities & recreation (L)	1	x	x			
Exposed coastal ecosystems (L)	1	x	x			
Future hydropower plans (L)	1					
Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)	86	70	65	4	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	4	4	1	0	0
Changes in runoff and recharge addressed? (1 point for 'yes')	1	x	x	x		
Impacts of sea level rise addressed, specifically for water supply? (1 point for 'yes')	1					
Climate Change Impacts Subtotal	2	1	1	1	0	0
Total CC Adaptation Score	**6**	**5**	**5**	**2**	**0**	**0**

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: USLTRCD

Contact Person: Devin Best

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation 5 out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

The proposed project will meet multiple IRWM objectives (e.g. water supply, ecosystem and watershed, groundwater, flood management, and water resource management) by implementing groundwater recharge and surface storage projects in Santa Rosa Creek, upstream of the town of Cambria. Although these types of projects will not meet every single objective outlined in the plan, the cumulative benefits of implementing these projects will target key objectives and integrate rural and urban land use management in a cohesive watershed and ecosystem approach.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) 3 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

The first phase of the project is funded through Wildlife Conservation Board – Prop 1 funds. Phase I will evaluate the feasibility of each parcel for groundwater recharge, evaluate the permits needed to

implement, and complete 100% designs to be taken to construction. The design phase is currently underway, thus the project did not receive the full point allocation.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) 4 out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The proposed project would follow NRCS conservation practices. This is important to note as these practices have been reviewed and adopted to streamline permitting processes with ACOE, USFWS, NOAA, RWQCB, and CDFW. In addition, the USLTRCD has a programmatic permit from regulatory agencies that covers these practices, thus reducing the amount of time to review. However, any project in which alteration to a blue line stream would still require a CDFW Streambed and Lake Alteration Agreement which could take between 3-9 months. This permit has not yet been obtained.

F. Project costs and financing 0 out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

The project costs have been developed based on information of similar types of projects and NRCS Conservation Practices. The engineering designs are being developed at the moment so there are no engineer or contractor estimates for the project.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

There are no secured state or federal funding sources for the project. Potential funding could be through Wildlife Conservation Board, NRCS Environmental Quality Incentive Program, CDFW, NOAA, and/or USFWS. USLTRCD will explore other potential funding sources to leverage funds requested once designs are 100% complete.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) 5 out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

The types of projects being proposed require an initial input of funding to implement, but minimal amount to maintain. The projects are designed to be self-regenerating, although it is anticipated environmental factors may require individual landowners to maintain certain elements of the project. USLTRCD will work with landowners to provide the technical oversight for long-term maintenance, though there is no financial funding required for O&M of the projects.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations 3 out of 10 points.

Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

The proposed project does not directly benefit a DAC.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

Implementation of the project will lead to improved watershed function and habitat restoration. These are important elements to critical water issues in Santa Rosa Creek and for steelhead populations that reside there. Because increasing dry season flows is a key limiting factor for Steelhead populations and because working agriculture will continue to be the dominant land use in Middle Santa Rosa Creek in coming decades, this project is the State of California's best chance to protect and restore the steelhead population in Santa Rosa Creek (Core 1 Watershed, South-Central Steelhead Recovery Plan, NMFS, 2013) In addition, the CDFW FRGP funded Santa Rosa Creek Watershed Management Plan lists increases in summer and fall instream flows as the highest priority recommendation for this watershed**.** The landowners in this application have come forth willingly and voluntarily to enhance dry season stream flows in Santa Rosa Creek. The proposed work is the best, scientifically justifiable solution for the middle reach of Santa Rosa Creek**.** The only other hydrologically viable solution that we see would be to purchase agricultural lands and their associated riparian rights and terminate agriculture (or lease water rights and terminate agriculture). This is not an acceptable solution to the community.

The approaches to be utilized to enhance dry season flows in Santa Rosa Creek fall into one of two broad strategies: 1) capturing and retaining water in the watershed from winter storms *that would otherwise flow out into the Pacific Ocean,* and*,* 2) reducing the amount of water being utilized (i.e. consumptive use). Operational schema will be developed to ensure captured and retained water results in measurable dry season instream flow enhancement. Specifically the following approaches will be evaluated and integrated into the design process: (1) Wet season peak flow diversion into recharge basins and infiltration into the ground in locations that result in a measurable dry season instream flow enhancement; (2) Wet season peak flow diversion, storage in closed tanks or covered basins, and release in dry season; (3) Wet season peak flow diversion onto fallow, bermed abandoned floodplains that would not commonly experience natural flooding and infiltration into the ground in locations that result in a measurable dry season instream flow enhancement; and in some cases: (4) Water conservation practices that lead to a decrease in consumptive uses; and (5) Greywater systems and rainfall capture systems for non-potable uses that lead to a decrease in consumptive uses. The first three approaches are anticipated to be the dominant strategies utilized in the Santa Rosa Creek watershed as they will lead to the greatest measurable enhancements in dry season flow (see Question 15 for scientific basis).

Recharge projects are estimated to contribute 45-75 acre feet (translating into approximately 90% of total measurable instream flow enhancements). Proposed projects will result in instream flow enhancements either through the direct release of water into mainstem Santa Rosa Creek and/or percolation of water from recharge basins via the ground and discharge into mainstem Santa Rosa Creek during the dry season. To achieve the latter, recharge basins will be located and designed using a surface-groundwater model that will predict the timing and location that recharged water will reach the mainstem. Existing baseline and future monitoring efforts will allow for a complete evaluation of recharge and surface-groundwater predictions. This approach will provide a demonstration to Central Coast agricultural landowners both within and outside of the Santa Rosa Creek watershed a new way to sustainably manage their water while improving local native steelhead habitat and runs.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

The project does not directly address an environmental justice issues, although it indirectly benefits environmental justice issues through improve water reliability and water quality. (0 points)

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) 3 out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Riparian and wetland plants will be used in conjunction with recharge basins to improve water quality and provide habitat for wildlife. As a result, using USDA's COMET-Planner, an estimate of 1 tonnes of CO_2 per acre per year will be sequestered in soil organic carbon.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

The projects are passive, in that they do not require any energy inputs in order to operate. Gravity and hydraulic pressure are used as the driving mechanisms to recharge groundwater. Qualitatively, higher groundwater levels require less power to pump from compared to pumping from lower levels.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

Several of the project areas will be planted with riparian and wetland plant species, which sequester carbon. Based on input from the USDA COMET Planner, the proposed project is estimated to reduce GHG emissions by 1 tonnes of CO_2 per acre per year.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta 0 out of 1 point.

If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

The proposed project is not associated with the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta water supply.

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: USLTRCD

Contact Person: Devin Best

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5___ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

This is a feasibility project of which the direct focal point is determining the potential of future projects in the area.

Central Coast Salmon Enhancement, in partnership with USLTRCD, received WCB Prop 1 grant funds to develop the Santa Rosa Creek Streamflow Enhancement project which will provide enhanced streamflow through voluntary projects on private land (agricultural properties) in the Santa Rosa Creek watershed. The cumulative benefits of both efforts will greatly increase habitat quality and quantity by providing more contiguous flows during critical steelhead lifestages and functional habitat in a high priority section of stream.

USLTRCD is also in the process of implementing several habitat restoration projects on private lands where sediment is infiltrating the stream and the riparian corridor is dysfunctional. These projects would greatly benefit from the projects mentioned above by improving the hydrograph such as timing and duration of flows during peak storm events.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___5___ out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

The focal points of this feasibility project have been identified. Willing landowners have been sought out as opposed to attempting to develop the study for the entire reach. Significant efforts have been made to cultivate a relationship on trust which will in turn aid in the future development of working relationships with currently less progressive landowners.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ___10____ out of 10 points.

See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

The proposed project is planning project and therefore is a statutory exempt from CEQA (Section 15262). Phase II (implementation) of the project may also qualify for categorical exemptions for Small Habitat Restoration Projects (Section 15333) depending on the size, scope, and proximity to sensitive species. Phase II will also require Clean Water Act 404 and 401, CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement, and SLO County Grading permit. The USLTRCD has a programmatic permit with Army Corps of Engineers and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board for implementing NRCS conservation practices, known as Partners In Restoration. Again, depending upon the size and scope of the designs, Phase II projects may qualify.

There will be no delay. Willing participants have already been sought out and once funded, this program can begin with crucial data collection. Partial data collection is already underway through spawner surveys and juvenile snorkel surveys of the reach with the assistance of the Americorps Watershed Stewardship Program (WSP) Members assigned to the US-LTRCD.

F. Project costs and financing ___6___ out of 10 points.

Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

Project budget has been detailed in a grant application to the WCB Climate Adaptation and Resilience Program.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:

0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points
40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

There is no funding secured at this time, USLTRCD is contributing $6,400 of WSP time toward the project. Funding for WSP comes from several sources including CDFW Fisheries Restoration Grant Program, AmeriCorps, California Conservation Corps, and individual placement sites. USLTRCD expects to have two members at $20/hr for a total of 160 hours invested in assisting Stillwater Sciences in data collection including stream habitat typing, riparian surveys, flow monitoring, topographic surveys, and landowner coordination. Landowners will also be contributing their time and, eventually, donating their land to habitat restoration. It is difficult to estimate the cost rate of agricultural producers as their salaries are based on current market values of commodities they produce. However, conservatively one could estimate agricultural producers mean annual salary of $80,302 per year or $38.62 per hour[1]. We estimate approximately 20 hours of time for each landowner to provide input and review design concepts equally $1,544. However, because it is unknown what the average annual salary of each participating landowner, we are not including this in the in-kind contribution at this time. Additionally, land values vary widely from parcel to parcel. Landowners will be donating their land and based on best available information, an acre of land in Cambria is estimated at $155,000 per acre. Phase II (implementation) will consider this as in-kind once the total acreages of floodplain restoration are known.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ____10___ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

Economic analysis has been completed to provide a budget to the WCB Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Grant application. Application was submitted in August of 2018 and the budget was provided with up-to-date subcontractor labor included.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations ____0___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits
This project does not directly benefit a DAC. The proposed project does not fall within a disadvantaged community as defined by the CA Air Resource Board. Most communities in San Luis Obispo County,

[1] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2017. Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2017 11-9013 Farmers, Ranchers, and Other Agricultural Managers. Available at: https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes119013.htm

excluding a few areas such as parts of Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo, or Oceano, do not qualify as either a disadvantaged or low-income community.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?
This project relates directly to water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration, and fish migration. Functional, hydrologically connected floodplains also provide a suite of other ecological benefits such as habitat complexity, vegetative communities, biodiversity, nutrient cycling, sediment transport/retention, and food sources for aquatic organisms. It is the goal of this proposal to assess and evaluate the potential feasible alternatives to restore ecological function on floodplains and wetlands in Santa Rosa Creek.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

The project does not directly address an environmental justice issues, although it indirectly benefits environmental justice issues through improve water reliability and water quality.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __1___ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.) If yes, it is given 1 point.

The alteration to the landscape from various land use practices such as agriculture, forestry, and urban development have drastically degraded the fundamental watershed functions that can absorb stochastic events (e.g. fires, floods, droughts). Santa Rosa Creek has had many large-scale modifications to the watershed resulting in increased turbidity, habitat fragmentation, increased flashiness in the hydrograph, and reduce species diversity and abundance. As conditions continue to exacerbate over time, other watershed functions have diminished as a result. There are few observed floodplain terraces connected to the active channel in many reaches of Santa Rosa Creek – mostly confined channels with abandoned floodplains. Connectivity to floodplains reduces flood risk to downstream properties, increases habitat availability for aquatic species, and improves water supply and quality. Expected outcomes from impacts to climate change result in greater frequency and intensity of flooding, reduced optimal streamflow to support sensitive aquatic species, and increased pollutant loading from anthropogenic sources.

To address, and prevent further watershed decline from climate change impacts, the Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain Feasibility Study will develop floodplain and wetland restoration designs that are both adaptable and resilient to environmental factors. Floodplains and wetlands are dynamic systems which

link upslope watershed processes to riverine functions - capable of being both resilient and adaptable to minor changes over time.

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This planning study does not reduce energy consumption in water. 0pts.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This planning study does not itself reduce GHG emissions. 0pts.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ___0____ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

This project will have no effect on the reliance of the delta.

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation
Sheet 3 – Form

Instructions:

This Form accompanies and supplements the "2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets"

Project Sponsors shall evaluate a single project with this Form as guided in the "Project Evaluation Rubric". This Form is to be filled out on a per project basis. Please ensure the Project Name and Sponsor information matches with what is on the Summary worksheet.

Note for non-infrastructure projects: The Rubric and guidance for this scoring is geared toward traditional infrastructure projects. In general, evaluate your "project" for "readiness" and "understanding". Think high-level. Please contact Brendan Clark (805-788-2316) with any questions.

Project Name: SLO County Key Percolation Zone Study

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization: US-LTRCD

Contact Person: Devin Best

A. Contribution to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
B. Utilization of IRWM Resource Management Strategies (RMS) *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation ___5____ out of 5 points.
For all 5 points, insert a description if the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects and agencies or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits. No partial points are given for this criterion.

Groundwater recharge is a high priority for conservation of limited water resources in San Luis Obispo County. Identifying key areas to percolate groundwater will enable stakeholders interested in groundwater management and water supply recovery to effectively and appropriately develop groundwater recharge projects that a mutually beneficial at a watershed scale. The primary goal of the Key Percolation Zone Study is to provide resource managers and other stakeholders the ability to recharge groundwater basins. Identifying the extent and amount of potential recharge will be necessary to improve groundwater management. The project will increase public awareness by providing maps of high percolation zones that cross property boundaries, leading to more holistic management of water resources and aligning management goals. Currently, landowners in Santa Rosa Creek and Cambria Community Service District, via USLTRCD, are collaborating on projects to improve water management for municipal, irrigated agriculture, and ecosystem function. The project will hold stakeholder meetings to draw more support and collaboration
from the public, resource professionals, and other water resource managers.

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) ___10____ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the design complete? If not complete, describe the status of the design and a percent complete.

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's feasibility to achieve the desired benefits and score it accordingly. For example, has a pilot project been completed, observed and documented? If so, a program would score highly for "Technical Feasibility".

The proposed scope of work will build directly upon the recently completed pilot study of percolation potential in two groundwater basins: Santa Rosa Valley near Cambria and San Luis Obispo Valley near San Luis Obispo (Stillwater Sciences 20151). The pilot study of repeatable approach to producing spatially explicit baseline information of intrinsic percolation (or groundwater recharge) potential in the two basins. The analysis depended entirely upon available spatial information and past studies. The study findings will aid subsequent evaluations and prioritization of site-scale opportunities for enhancing groundwater recharge. All groundwater basins present in the county will be the focus of this effort. The county hosts 21 basins as identified by the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR), including the two pilot-study basins. The geographic scope will be expanded beyond the groundwater basin boundaries as to include the entire surface-water catchments contributing to these groundwater basins, but not extending outside the county boundaries.
The project work will be partitioned into five tasks, all building to produce a suite of deliverables that will identify and prioritize areas of relatively high groundwater-recharge potential within the groundwater basins. We will work closely with RCD staff to refine the study goals and objectives, analytical approaches and results, and opportunity prioritization.

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed (Permitting, etc.) ___10____ out of 10 points.
See Rubric. Is the project CEQA complete or exempt? If CEQA is not yet complete, what is the timeline and how complete is it? When will the Final EIR/MND/NOE/Etc. be approved by your governing body?

For non-infrastructure projects (i.e. programs), describe the project's readiness to proceed and score it accordingly. No delay of implementation of the program would be 10pts. Less than 1year, 8pts. 1-2 years, 5 points. 2-4 years, 2 points, unknown timeline – 0pts.

No delay of implementation. The project is based on current GIS data with limited ground trothing. There will be no permitting necessary to carry out the tasks.

F. Project costs and financing ____5___ out of 10 points.
Part I. Project Costs (5 points possible).
Are project costs known? If a cost estimate has been prepared, submit it along with the form to the IRWM Program Manager.
3 points are given if an engineer's estimate (or equivalent) has been prepared.
5 points are given if contractor bids have been received or project costs are understood/known via a pilot project or other method. Be prepared to provide documentation.

An estimated budget and schedule has been provided by Stillwater Sciences.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).
How is the project being funded? Points are awarded for percent complete of secured & documented financing:
0% financed, 0 points
1% - 19%, 1 point
20% - 39%, 2 points

40% - 59%, 3 points
60% - 79%, 4 points
80% or more, full 5 points.

There is currently no funding available for this project to move forward.

G. Economic Feasibility (Is project cost effective? O&M Costs planned?) ____10___ out of 10 points.
If an economic analysis of the project has been completed within the past 5 years and indicates the project is financially feasible, the project is given 10 points. Project sponsor shall provide documentation of the completed analysis to receive points.

The budget for this project is based on the smaller scale version completed by Stillwater Sciences. That version was successful in developing key percolation zone analysis. The plan was extrapolated for the remainder of the county.

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations _0___ out of 10 points.
Part I. DAC (4 points)
Does the project directly benefit a critical water issue of a DAC? DAC's in our Region include the communities of San Miguel, San Simeon, Oceano and the Cities of San Luis Obispo and Grover Beach.
0 points for does not directly benefits
4 points for directly benefits

Does not directly benefit DACs. Needs to be direct. 0pts.

Part II. Native American Critical Water Issues (3 points)
Does the project directly address water quality in surface waters, habitat restoration and/or fish migration?

This study itself does not address critical native American water issues. 0pts.

Part III. Environmental Justice (3 points)
Does the project directly address Environmental Justice issues, i.e. access to quality water, water pollution generation reduction, etc.? Guidelines state "Environmental Justice seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burden and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air)".

This project does not directly address any environmental justice issues.

I. Climate Change Adaption *(See Sheet 2 - Worksheet)*
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction) __1___ out of 3 points.
Part I. Project Alternatives Analysis (1 point)
Does the selected project reduce GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis? (It's possible this was included in an EIR or other CQEA compliance efforts.)
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This study does not reduce GHG emissions. 0pts

Part II. Energy Consumption Reduction (1 point)
Does the project qualitatively reduce energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This project will relate to reducing energy consumption through reduced pumping. Key infiltration zones will allow more water to make it back into the sub-surface aquifers, allowing for increased re-charge rates.

Part III. Emission Reduction over 20-year Horizon (1point)
When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, does the project reduce GHG emissions?
If yes, it is given 1 point.

This study does not reduce GHG emissions. 0pts.

K. Reduce reliance on the Delta ____0___ out of 1 point.
If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.

This project will have no effect on the Delta.