

FINAL DRAFT
Upper Santa Clara River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP)
Grant Funding Project Evaluation Process

IRWMP Project Review and Selection Process – 2019 Update

The intent of this update is to document the project evaluation and selection process and scoring content for IRWM funding opportunities. This process is separate from the process used to submit, review, and consider projects for inclusion in the USCR IRWMP. This process, in accordance with the RWMG governance structure, may be updated as necessary to align the process with current funding opportunities, without the need to re-adopt the IRWMP. The 2016 Final IRWM Grant Program Guidelines (pg. 53) specifically notes, “*The RWMG may apply grant criteria when moving from the overall list of projects in the IRWM Plan to a specific grant proposal.*”

Project Ranking and Scoring Criteria

The project review structure is based on an eligibility assessment and point system. Eligibility criteria are presented as Pass/Fail, or NA if Not Applicable. These are criteria that must be passed in order for a project to be eligible for the Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation funding. If a project has a NO for any of these items, scoring of the project will stop, and the project will not be ranked. The RWMG will follow up with the project proponent to see if there is a way to make the project eligible.

Points are awarded, in general, on the extent to which the project is consistent with the 2016 IRWM Proposition 1 Grant Program Guidelines, the 2019 IRWM Proposition 1 Grant Program Guidelines, and how well a project meets the scoring criteria identified in Table 4 (pg. 29) of the 2019 Round 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP).

The project ranking and scoring criteria are shown in Table 1. The project review criteria were developed by the RWMG and reviewed and confirmed by the broader Stakeholder group. Where a criterion is Not Applicable, full points are awarded. The criteria are broken down in more detail below.

TABLE 1
PROJECT RANKING AND REVIEW CRITERIA

Criterion	Possible Points
Pass/Fail Criteria	Project must meet all criteria. Indicate Y/N, or Not Applicable (NA)
IRWMP Objectives (Critical Needs) <i>(Maximum 27 pts possible)</i>	Quantitatively contributes to Objective = 4 pts Qualitatively contributes to Objective = 2 pts Does not Address Objective = 0 pts <i>(Note the Climate Change Objective has a 1-7 point scale [see below])*</i>
IRWMP Priority <i>(Maximum 12 pts possible)</i>	IRWMP High Priority = 12 pts IRWMP Medium Priority = 8 pts IRWMP Low Priority = 4 pts
Readiness to Proceed/Other <i>(Maximum 14 pts possible)</i>	See criteria detail below for points explanation.

Notes: Total amount of points possible = 53.

*Note: Scoring provides one point for each of the 'sub-criteria' listed under the “Take actions within the watershed to adapt to climate change” and “Promote projects and actions that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions” Objectives.

PASS/FAIL CRITERIA

- **Eligible Applicant**

PSP Section IIA and Table 1. 2019 Guidelines Section II.A.

- **Has or Will Adopt the IRWMP**

PSP Table 1 and Exhibit A. 2019 Guidelines Section II.B.

- **Consistent with a Statewide Priority**

PSP Section II.C, Table 1 and Exhibit A.

- **Expected Useful Life of at Least 15 Years**

PSP Section II.C, Table 1 and Exhibit A.

- **CEQA Complete within 12 Months of Funding Award**

PSP Section II.C, Table 1 and Exhibit A.

- **Permits Complete within 12 Months of Funding Award**

PSP Table 1 and Exhibit A.

- **Stormwater and/or Dry Weather Runoff Projects in Stormwater Resources Plan**

PSP Section V.B.3 and Table 1. 2019 Guidelines Section II.B. and II.C.

URBAN WATER SUPPLIER PASS/FAIL

PSP Section V.B.3 and Table 1. 2019 Guidelines Section II.B.

- **Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) Compliance**
- **SB 555 Water Loss Validation Report**
- **CWC 525 Water Metering Requirements**

GROUNDWATER PASS/FAIL

- **Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) Compliance**

PSP Section V.B.3 and Table 1. 2019 Guidelines Section II.B.

- **Approval from Groundwater Sustainability Agency**

PSP Section V.B.3 and Table 1. 2019 Guidelines Section II.B.

IRWMP OBJECTIVES (CRITICAL NEEDS)

Through analysis of the 2014 IRWMP and the 2018 IRWMP Amendment, this criterion evaluates how many of the USCR IRWMP objectives the project contributes to, and how strongly.

For context, the 2014 IRWMP describes Climate Change Vulnerability (we prioritize climate change vulnerability 1-4, 4 being lowest- starting Section 5 and Table 5.1-4), our Plan Objectives (Section 6- equally weighted), and how meeting objectives are measured (Table 6.1-1).

In 2017 and 2018, we amended the 2014 IRWMP to comply with the State's 2016 IRWMP guidelines. Our April 11 2018 Amendment to the IRWMP modifies our 2014 Plan Objectives relating to climate change. It amends Table 6.1-1 of our 2014 IRWMP to reflect additional climate change considerations, and further discusses climate change considerations in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3).

Attached in PDF for reference back to source documents are Chapters 5 and 6 of the 2014 IRWMP, and the full 2018 IRWMP Amendment.

IRWMP Plan Objectives are listed below:

- Reduce Potable Water Demand
- Increase Water Supply
- Improve Water Quality
- Promote Resource Stewardship
- Flooding/Hydromodification
- Take Actions within the Watershed to Adapt to Climate Change
 - Identifies potential effects of climate change on the Region and considers adaptations to water management system
 - Adapts to climate change vulnerabilities
 - Considers change in the amount, timing, intensity, quality and variability of runoff and recharge
 - Considers effects of sea level rise on water supply conditions
- Promote Projects and Actions that Reduce Greenhouse (GHG) Gas Emissions
 - Quantifies GHG emissions
 - Ability to help the IRWM Region reduce GHG emissions
 - Reduces energy consumption (especially embedded energy in water use)

Four (4) points are awarded for a project that quantifiably contributes to an objective (ex., AFY, mg/L, etc.). Two (2) points are awarded for a project that qualitatively contributes to an objective. Zero (0) for a project that does not benefit an objective at all. For the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Objectives, 1 point is given for each sub-objective the project contributes to.

IRWMP PRIORITY

- **IRWMP Prioritization (high, medium, or low)**

The 2016 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines require IRWM Projects to be reviewed in a systematic manner and prioritized (pg. 40). The draft method for prioritizing projects considers

whether a project meets, or contributes to, an IRWMP objective; if it has quantifiable benefits; and if it is deadline driven. The outcome is a 'high', 'medium', or 'low' prioritization.

Twelve (12) points for 'high'; eight (8) points for 'medium'; four (4) points for 'low' prioritization.

USCR IRWMP - IRWM Project List Prioritization Methodology			
		Meets or Contributes Measurably (i.e., X AFY, X tons chloride, X acres habitat restored) to an IRWM Plan Objective	Contributes to an IRWM Plan Objective (measurement not yet quantified)
	Deadline Driven	High Priority=12 points	Medium Priority=8 points
	Not Deadline Driven	Medium Priority=8 points	Low Priority*=4 points
* Low Priority-rated projects could be rated as High or Medium if they are integrated with either a High or Medium priority project.			

READINESS TO PROCEED/OTHER

The USCR IRWMP scoring criteria below are *guided by the State's April 2019 Final Round 1 IRWM Implementation Grant PSP to provide a USCR IRWMP readiness to proceed score. The criteria below do not reflect the State's complete project scoring criteria in the PSP. The criteria below consider the following sections from the final PSP:*

- Section II. Eligibility
 - Section II.A. Eligible Grant Applicants
 - Section II.B. Eligible Project Types
 - Section II.C. Additional Proposal and Project Eligibility Requirements (further defined in Exhibit A)
- Section III. Funding
- Exhibit A - Additional Proposal and Project Eligibility Requirements,
- Table 1: IRWM Implementation Grant Eligibility Checklist, and
- Table 4 Scoring Criteria

- **Contribute to Regional Water Self-Reliance**

Section II. Eligibility

Exhibit A - Additional Proposal and Project Eligibility Requirements,

Table 1: IRWM Implementation Grant Eligibility Checklist

According to the Delta Council, programs and projects that can reduce reliance on the delta, and therefore contribute to self-reliance could include, but are not limited to, improvements in water use efficiency, water recycling, storm water capture and use, advanced water technologies, conjunctive use projects, local and regional water supply and storage projects, and improved regional coordination of local and regional water supply efforts. One (1) point is given if a project meets this definition; 0 points if it does not.

- **AB 1249 Compliance**

Section II. Eligibility

Table 1: IRWM Implementation Grant Eligibility Checklist, and

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q 2)

1 point is given if a project addresses at least one of the following groundwater constituents: arsenic, hexavalent chromium, nitrate or perchlorate; 0 points if it does not. Full points awarded if Not Applicable.

50% Local Cost Share Confirmed

Section III. Funding

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q10)

Two (2) points given if greater than 50% cost share will be provided and can describe the funding source (i.e., FY 18/19 Budget, water rates, etc.); one (1) point is given if a project has the 50% cost share confirmed for the project and can describe the funding source (i.e., FY 18/19 Budget, water rates, etc.); 0 points if it does not. If a DAC waiver is applicable, award full points.

- **Benefits and Costs Defined and Quantified**

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q8)

One (1) points is given if a sufficient and reasonable addressed narrative on cost considerations that provides at least one of the factors: if other projects were evaluated with similar levels of claimed (quantitative or qualitative) benefits as the proposed project; and/or in terms of cost, if justification is provided as to why the project was selected.

Two (2) points given if both of the cost considerations listed above are sufficiently and reasonably addressed.

- **Sufficient Justification/Technical Feasibility Documented**

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q5)

One (1) point given if a logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative is provided. One (1) point given if the narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. One (1) point given if the narrative includes other

information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits.

- **Benefits to a Disadvantaged Community (DAC), Economically Distressed Area (EDA) or Native American Tribe**

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q16)

One (1) point given if the project benefits (75% or greater) to a DAC, EDA or tribe; 0 points if less than 75% or no DAC, EDA or tribe benefit.

- **Legal Access Rights, Easements Obtained**

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q9)

Two (2) given if Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. One (1) point given if Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. Zero (0) points if Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. Full points awarded if Not Applicable.

- **Benefits to other IRWM Regions and/or Funding Area**

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q1)

One (1) point given if the project provides benefits to other IRWM Regions and/or Funding Area; 0 points if the project does not.

- **Employ Innovative Technology**

Table 4 Scoring Criteria (reference Q 15)

One (1) point given if a reasonable explanation of how a project employs new or innovative technology or practices, including, but not limited to: Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches; 0 points if the project does not.