



San Luis Obispo County Region  
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)  
Regional Water Management Group (RWMG)

Date: September 7, 2022  
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM  
Location: SLO County New Government Center  
Room 161/162 (adjacent to BOS Chambers)  
1055 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, CA

This meeting will also be broadcast via Zoom:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86052036463?pwd=cGt6endWQTIHRTlkdXB3V2orVE1PQT09>

Call-in information: 1 (669) 900 6833, Meeting ID: 860 5203 6463, Passcode: 388512

Please note, voting members must be physically present in order to count toward the quorum and cast a vote

- 1) Introduction, Public Comment and Member Updates
- 2) General Program and Funding Updates
- 3) Consider recommending the RWMG Working Group-selected projects and funding to the Board of Supervisors for an application for the Prop 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant.
  - a) Review of Selection Process
  - b) RWMG Working Group Meeting Recap
  - c) Selected Projects and Funding

NOTICE: All IRWM notices will be emailed only by the online mailing list service. Please sign-up for the IRWM Stakeholder mailing list online at [www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm](http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm)

For more information, please contact  
Brendan Clark, County of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department  
bclark@co.slo.ca.us  
(805) 788-2316  
[www.slocountywater.org/irwm](http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm)

TO: IRWM Regional Water Management Group  
 FROM: Brendan Clark, Supervising Water Resources Engineer  
 DATE: September 2, 2022  
 SUBJECT: Item #3: Prop 1, Round 2 Application Recommendation

**Recommendation**

Consider recommending the RWMG Working Group-selected projects and funding to the Board of Supervisors for an application to DWR for the Prop 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant.

**Discussion**

1. Review of Grant & Selection Process
2. RWMG Working Group Meeting Recap
3. Selected Projects and Funding
4. Staff Recommendation

1. Review of Grant & Selection Process

The schedule for our local solicitation was/is as follows:

1. *April 7<sup>th</sup> – 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022.* Call for projects is open (21 days).
2. *May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022, Project Showcase @ Joint WRAC/RWMG Meeting.* Applicants presented projects to members and public stakeholders.
3. *May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2022.* DWR Releases Final Guidelines and PSP
4. *September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022.* RWMG Working Group met to recommend scoring, selection and funding of the submitted projects to the full RWMG to consider.
5. *September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022 @ RWMG Meeting, 10am – 12pm.* RWMG to consider recommending a suite of projects to the BOS for the DWR application.
6. *October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022 @ WRAC Meeting, 1:30pm.* WRAC will consider support for the application.
7. *November 8 or December 6, 2022 @ Board of Supervisors.* Board will consider authorizing the Public Works Department to submit the application (per MOU).
8. *February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023.* Application due to DWR.

The following table summarizes the total funding for Proposition 1 IRWM for the San Luis Obispo County Region. Round 2 funding available is highlighted in yellow.

**Table 1 - Prop 1 IRWM Funding for San Luis Obispo County Region**

	Total Prop 1 Funds	DAC Implementation	General Implementation
Planning Grant (2016)	\$ 204,183	n/a	n/a
DAC Involvement (2017)	\$ 938,570	n/a	n/a
Round 1 Implementation Grant (2019)	\$ 2,782,130	\$ 274,500	\$ 2,507,630
Round 2 Implementation Grant (2022)	\$ 3,782,129	\$ 499,599	\$ 3,282,530
<b>Total for SLO Region (Per CCFA MOA)</b>	<b>\$ 7,707,012</b>	<b>\$ 774,099</b>	<b>\$ 5,790,160</b>

## Scoring:

As presented at the 4/6/22 and 5/4/22 regular RWMG meetings, the scoring metrics used were selected directly from DWR to evaluate submitted projects. The selected metrics key in on the merits of the projects, rather than how well an application is put together. For example, our region evaluated projects for multiple benefits, but not if the work plan, budget and schedule completely matched. A detailed work plan, budget and schedule were not required submittals for our local process. The final scoring metrics from the State are attached.

Six (6) local agencies submitted projects for consideration of Round 2 funding. Submitted Project Information Forms (PIF), presentations, and all relevant reference materials are available at [www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm](http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm), click the "P1R2 Call for Projects" link on the left.

### 2. RWMG Working Group Meeting Recap

The RWMG Working Group, as established at the 5/4/22 joint WRAC/RWMG meeting, met on September 1<sup>st</sup> from 10:00am to 12:00pm. The meeting was open to the public and a Zoom broadcast was provided; an agenda for that meeting is attached.

The Working Group went project-by-project, point-by-point to assign points based on the submitted answers and subsequent clarifications provided by project proponents present (in-person or online). This process took approximately 1 hour. At the conclusion of this effort, a finalized scoring for each eligible, submitted project was determined and a ranked list was prepared. The complete list of project scoring summaries are attached.

After a brief break, the meeting reconvened to select projects for funding. The Working Group felt the top 3 scoring projects should be included in the application. The next three projects were evaluated by readiness – funding, permitting, legal access, etc. The Working Group recognized that Central Coast Blue met the intentions of IRWM and had a clear path to implementation (leveraged funding, CEQA+, right-of-way access). Then the Working Group discussed the projects in San Miguel and San Simeon. San Miguel's suite of projects included a \$300,000 stand-alone pipeline project that the Working Group recognized has a clear path to implementation. The Working Group considered the other San Miguel projects (pump, tank, etc.) and the San Simeon Project to have a less clear path to implementation and did not recommend funding for those.

As shown in the attached voting record, these projects were selected 3-0 by the group with a motion by Nipomo CSD and a second by Los Osos CSD.

### 3. Selected Projects and Funding

As indicated in the recommended projects' submitted materials, this recommended suite of projects provides a clear response to many DWR priorities for the Prop 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant:

- Leverage non-state funds (Guidelines pg. 6)
- Employ New or Innovative Technology or Practices, including Decision Support Tools (Guidelines pg. 6)
- Implement projects with greater watershed coverage (Guidelines pg. 6)
- Provide multiple benefits (Guidelines pg. 7)

And, a number of Statewide Priorities (Guidelines pgs. 7-8) including:

- Encourage regional approaches among water users sharing watersheds
- Drought Preparedness

- Climate Resilience
- Strengthen partnerships

The following table details the recommended projects, scoring, requested funding, recommended funding and the type of funding.

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Project Score	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	Type of Funding	Notes
City of Morro Bay	Indirect Potable Reuse	10	\$2,612,914	\$ 1,200,000	General	No past awards
City of Pismo Beach	Central Coast Blue, Phase 1	8	\$2,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	General	No past awards
Oceano CSD	Water Resource Reliability Projects	10	\$245,000 to \$1,160,530	\$ 600,000	DAC & General	1 prior implementation award
San Luis Obispo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Master Water Report & Information System	10	\$550,000	\$ 549,755	General	Multiple prior planning awards Can be impl. right away
San Miguel CSD	Water Reliability Projects	6	\$4,497,000	\$ 300,000	DAC & General	No prior impl. awards; Pipeline project (\$300,000) can be impl. in 1-2 yrs
San Luis Obispo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Grant admin	n/a	3.5% of total	\$ 132,374	General	Required for running the grant
<b>Total</b>			\$ 12,370,444	\$ 3,782,129		

#### 4. Staff Recommendation

In reviewing the selected projects, it appears this suite of projects meets the requirements of the Prop. 1, Round 2 grant solicitation, focuses on projects with the highest chance successful implementation in the grant timeline and captures multiple geographic areas of the County.

Staff recommends the RWMG consider recommending the RWMG Working Group-selected projects and funding to the Board of Supervisors for an application to DWR for the Prop 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant.

#### Attachments

1. DWR Scoring Metrics,.
2. RWMG Working Group Meeting Agenda
3. Project Scores and ranks by RWMG Working Group
4. RWMG Working Group Voting Record

**Table 4: Scoring Criteria<sup>4</sup>**

	<b>Proposal Level Evaluation</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:</b>	<b>Leg Citation</b>	<b>Form/Question No.</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>
<b>1</b>		If the IRWM region has been identified as an area where contaminants listed in AB 1249 exist, does the proposal contain project(s) that address the contaminant(s)?	Provide specific explanation of how the project(s) addresses existing AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point) If the requirements of AB 1249 do not apply to the applicant's IRWM region(s), full points awarded.	10541 (e)(14)	GRanTS Application	1
					<b>Maximum Score:</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Project Level Evaluation</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:</b>	<b>Leg Citation</b>	<b>Form/Question No.</b>	<b>Maximum Points Available</b>
<b>2</b>		Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	79707 (b)	Attachment 3	1
<b>3</b>		Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified?	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The Work Plan appears to be sufficiently complete, with all deliverables identified, and reasonable given the intent of the project. (3 points)</li><li>The Work Plan is generally complete and/or deliverables generally listed, but it appears pertinent information is missing or gaps in the scope of work are identified. (2 points)</li><li>The Work Plan is sparsely filled out, with minimal information and/or minimal deliverables listed. (1 point)</li></ul>		Attachment 2	3
<b>4</b>	Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, justified, and consistent with each other? Considerations include: Are the tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget consistent? Are the costs presented in the Budget backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? Is the Schedule reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan?		Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR, including: Tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) Costs presented in the Budget are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) A Schedule that is reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan, which indicates the project will likely be completed by the end date listed in Attachment 6. (1 point)		Attachment 2,3, and 4	3

<sup>4</sup> These scoring criteria will not be used for applications from Cooperative Funding Areas and are consistent with the requirements included in Attachment 7.  
Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package

5	<p>Is the primary benefit* claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan?</p> <p>*For Decision Support Tools, non-physical (qualitative) benefits will be considered. For example, if a decision support tool will contribute to the design or operation of an implementation project, planned or potential quantitative benefits will also be considered.</p>	<p>A properly completed quantification of at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project. For physical (quantitative) benefit(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.)? (1 point)</li> <li>Is the benefit description and quantitative measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? Does the claimed benefit use industry standard units of measure (as described in D.2)? (1 point)</li> </ul> <p>For non-physical benefit(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.)? (1 point)</li> <li>Is the benefit description and measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? (1 point)</li> </ul>	N/A	GRanTS Application	2
6	<p>Does the project provide physical benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?</p>	<p>A sufficient description of the benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area. The description must include an explanation of the benefits to various IRWM regions and/or Funding Areas. (1 point)</p>	79742(a)	GRanTS Application	1
7	<p>If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small, disadvantaged community?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide specific explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2022 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point)</li> <li>Full points awarded if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements.</li> </ul>	10545	GRanTS Application	1
8	<p>Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?</p>	<p>A reasonable explanation of how a project employs new or innovative technology or practices, including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc.</li> <li>Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g., Smart Meters, new apps, etc.)</li> <li>New applications of existing technologies</li> <li>Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects</li> </ul>	79707(e)	GRanTS Application	1
-	-	-	-	<b>Maximum Score:</b>	<b>13</b>



San Luis Obispo County Region  
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)  
Regional Water Management Group (RWMG)  
RWMG Working Group – Prop 1, Round 2 Grant

Date: September 1, 2022  
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM  
Location: SLO City/County Library Conference Room  
995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA

A broadcast of this meeting will be available via Zoom. Voting members of the RWMG Working Group must be present. <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85175237712?pwd=RW1JV3pHak56SXpSUjlNd2d3bm15dz09>

Dial by your location: +1 669 900 6833; Meeting ID: 851 7523 7712; Passcode: 142458

Members of Working Group:

Ron Munds, Los Osos CSD  
Nick Teague, City of San Luis Obispo  
Mario Iglesias, Nipomo CSD  
Willy Cuhna, Shandon-San Juan Water District  
Brendan Clark, County of San Luis Obispo, Facilitator (non-voting)  
Joey Steil, County of San Luis Obispo, Note-taker / Time-keeper (non-voting)

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 1) Introduction, Purpose, opening remarks (Brendan) | 5-10 Minutes |
| 2) Public Comment for items not on the agenda       |              |
| 3) Finalize Project Scores (All)                    | 45 Minutes   |
| a) Project-by-Project, Alphabetically               |              |
| b) Compile a ranked list                            |              |
| 4) Break  | 5-10 Minutes |
| 5) Project Selection Process (Brendan)              | 5-10 Minutes |
| a) DWR Guidelines and Priorities                    |              |
| 6) Select Projects for Application (All)            | 20 Minutes   |
| 7) Funding for Selected Projects (All)              | 20 Minutes   |
| 8) Summary, Next Steps, Etc. (Brendan)              | 5 Minutes    |
| 9) Adjourn @ 12pm                                   |              |

For more information, please contact  
Brendan Clark, County of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department  
bclark@co.slo.ca.us  
(805) 788-2316  
[www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm](http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm)

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Eligible? (y/n)	DAC? (y/n)	Score (12 max)	Request	Recommended Award	Notes
City of Morro Bay	Indirect Potable Reuse	Y	No	10	\$2,612,914	\$ 1,200,000	No past awards
City of Pismo Beach	Central Coast Blue, Phase 1	Y	No	8	\$2,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	No past awards
Oceano CSD	Water Resource Reliability Projects	Y	Y	10	\$245,000 to \$1,160,530	\$ 600,000	1 prior implementation award
San Luis Obispo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Master Water Report Information System	Y	No	10	\$550,000	\$ 549,755	Multiple prior planning awards Can be implemented right away
San Miguel CSD	Water Reliability Projects	Y	Y	6	\$4,497,000	\$ 300,000	No prior Implementation awards; Pipeline project (\$300,000) can be implemented in 1-2 yrs. Other SMCS D projects have readiness questions
San Luis Obispo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Grant admin	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.5% of total	\$ 132,374	Required for running the grant
San Simeon CSD	Reservoir Expansion Project - Phase 1 Distribution System	Y	Y	8	\$1,550,000	\$ -	multiple prior implementation awards multiple readiness questions (funding, legal access, etc.)
\$12,370,444						\$ 3,782,129	

Other factors for Recommendations

Other Factors	Comments
Highest Readiness Scoring Geographical Equity Previous Awards	Prioritize projects farther along in Permits, CEQA, Funding, and access. Maximize areas of the County (North, South, Coastal, etc.) with grant funding Take into account previous awards under the IRWM Program

Funding Category	Funding Target
General Impl. Projects Maximum	\$ 3,150,156
DAC Project Minimum	\$ 499,599
Grant Admin (3.5%)	\$ 132,374
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,782,129</b>

**Project Sponsor**

City of Morro Bay

**Project Name:**

Indirect Potable Reuse

Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Scoring Criteria  
(derived from Table 4, page 33)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the project address contaminant(s) listed in AD 1249? (Nitrate, Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Hexavalent Chromium)	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point)	D.5	1	1
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
3	Is the primary benefit claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the PIF	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. For physical benefits, does the narrative include references to supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point).	D.1	1	1
4	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
5	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. (1 point)	D.5c	1	0
6	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	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, technology and partnerships etc. - Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g. Smart Meters, new apps, etc.) - New applications of existing technologies - Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects. (1 point)	D.7	1	1
PSP Scoring Subtotal:				6	5

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria  
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
2	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) quantifiable benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
3	Is CEQA Complete for the project (i.e. Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by lead agency and filed with State)	• Documentation for CEQA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	E.1	1	1
4	Is NEPA Complete for the project?	• Documentation for NEPA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	n/a	1	1
5	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project?	• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the project area. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.11	1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have required permits complete (i.e. Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Encroachment Permits, Air Pollution Control Board, etc.)	• Project Sponsor has completed and obtained permits for construction. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.2	1	0
Competitive Process and Readiness Subtotal:				6	5
<b>Grant Total:</b>				12	10

**Project Sponsor**

Cities of Pismo Beach, Arroyo Grande, and Grover Beach

**Project Name:**

Central Coast Blue, Phase 1

Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Scoring Criteria  
(derived from Table 4, page 33)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the project address contaminant(s) listed in AD 1249? (Nitrate, Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Hexavalent Chromium)	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point)	D.5	1	1
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
3	Is the primary benefit claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the PIF	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. For physical benefits, does the narrative include references to supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point).	D.1	1	1
4	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
5	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. (1 point)	D.5c	1	0
6	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	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, technology and partnerships etc. - Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g. Smart Meters, new apps, etc.) - New applications of existing technologies - Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects. (1 point)	D.7	1	1
PSP Scoring Subtotal:				6	5

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria  
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
2	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) quantifiable benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
3	Is CEQA Complete for the project (i.e. Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by lead agency and filed with State)	• Documentation for CEQA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	E.1	1	1
4	Is NEPA Complete for the project?	• Documentation for NEPA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	n/a	1	0
5	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project?	• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the project area. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.11	1	0
6	Does the project sponsor have required permits complete (i.e. Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Encroachment Permits, Air Pollution Control Board, etc.)	• Project Sponsor has completed and obtained permits for construction. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.2	1	0
Competitive Process and Readiness Subtotal:				6	3
<b>Grant Total:</b>				12	8

**Project Sponsor**

Oceano CSD

**Project Name:**

Water Resource Reliability Projects

Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Scoring Criteria  
(derived from Table 4, page 33)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the project address contaminant(s) listed in AD 1249? (Nitrate, Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Hexavalent Chromium)	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point)	D.5	1	0
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
3	Is the primary benefit claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the PIF	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. For physical benefits, does the narrative include references to supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point).	D.1	1	1
4	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
5	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. (1 point)	D.5c	1	1
6	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	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, technology and partnerships etc. - Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g. Smart Meters, new apps, etc.) - New applications of existing technologies - Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
PSP Scoring Subtotal:				6	4

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria  
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
2	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) quantifiable benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
3	Is CEQA Complete for the project (i.e. Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by lead agency and filed with State)	• Documentation for CEQA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	E.1	1	1
4	Is NEPA Complete for the project?	• Documentation for NEPA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	n/a	1	1
5	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property to implement the project?	• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the project area. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.11	1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have required permits complete (i.e. Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Encroachment Permits, Air Pollution Control Board, etc.)	• Project Sponsor has completed and obtained permits for construction. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.2	1	1
Competitive Process and Readiness Subtotal:				6	6
<b>Grant Total:</b>				12	10

**Project Sponsor**

SLO County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

**Project Name:**

Master Water Report and Information System

Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Scoring Criteria  
(derived from Table 4, page 33)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the project address contaminant(s) listed in AD 1249? (Nitrate, Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Hexavalent Chromium)	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point)	D.5	1	0
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
3	Is the primary benefit claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the PIF	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. For physical benefits, does the narrative include references to supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point).	D.1	1	1
4	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
5	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. (1 point)	D.5c	1	0
6	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	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, technology and partnerships etc. - Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g. Smart Meters, new apps, etc.) - New applications of existing technologies - Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects. (1 point)	D.7	1	1
PSP Scoring Subtotal:				6	4

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria  
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
2	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) quantifiable benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
3	Is CEQA Complete for the project (i.e. Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by lead agency and filed with State)	• Documentation for CEQA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	E.1	1	1
4	Is NEPA Complete for the project?	• Documentation for NEPA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	n/a	1	1
5	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project?	• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the project area. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.11	1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have required permits complete (i.e. Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Encroachment Permits, Air Pollution Control Board, etc.)	• Project Sponsor has completed and obtained permits for construction. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.2	1	1
Competitive Process and Readiness Subtotal:				6	6
<b>Grant Total:</b>				12	10

**Project Sponsor**

San Miguel CSD

**Project Name:**

Water Reliability Projects

Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Scoring Criteria  
(derived from Table 4, page 33)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the project address contaminant(s) listed in AD 1249? (Nitrate, Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Hexavalent Chromium)	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point)	D.5	1	0
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	0
3	Is the primary benefit claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the PIF	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. For physical benefits, does the narrative include references to supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point).	D.1	1	1
4	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
5	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. (1 point)	D.5c	1	1
6	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	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, technology and partnerships etc. - Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g. Smart Meters, new apps, etc.) - New applications of existing technologies - Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
PSP Scoring Subtotal:				6	3

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria  
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	0
2	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) quantifiable benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
3	Is CEQA Complete for the project (i.e. Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by lead agency and filed with State)	• Documentation for CEQA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	E.1	1	0
4	Is NEPA Complete for the project?	• Documentation for NEPA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	n/a	1	1
5	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project?	• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the project area. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.11	1	0
6	Does the project sponsor have required permits complete (i.e. Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Encroachment Permits, Air Pollution Control Board, etc.)	• Project Sponsor has completed and obtained permits for construction. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.2	1	1
Competitive Process and Readiness Subtotal:				6	3
<b>Grant Total:</b>				12	6

**Project Sponsor**

San Simeon CSD

**Project Name:**

Reservoir Expansion Project

Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Scoring Criteria  
(derived from Table 4, page 33)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the project address contaminant(s) listed in AD 1249? (Nitrate, Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Hexavalent Chromium)	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point)	D.5	1	0
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
3	Is the primary benefit claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the PIF	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. For physical benefits, does the narrative include references to supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point).	D.1	1	1
4	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
5	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. (1 point)	D.5c	1	1
6	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	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, technology and partnerships etc. - Technologies that were developed and/or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g. Smart Meters, new apps, etc.) - New applications of existing technologies - Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
PSP Scoring Subtotal:				6	4

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria  
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities)

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	C.2	1	1
2	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) quantifiable benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
3	Is CEQA Complete for the project (i.e. Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by lead agency and filed with State)	• Documentation for CEQA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	E.1	1	1
4	Is NEPA Complete for the project?	• Documentation for NEPA completion provided. (1 point) * Points awarded if N/A	n/a	1	1
5	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project?	• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the project area. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.11	1	0
6	Does the project sponsor have required permits complete (i.e. Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Encroachment Permits, Air Pollution Control Board, etc.)	• Project Sponsor has completed and obtained permits for construction. (1 point) • Points awarded if N/A	D.2	1	0
Competitive Process and Readiness Subtotal:				6	4
<b>Grant Total:</b>				12	8



**San Luis Obispo County Integrated Regional Water Management  
Regional Water Management Group (RWMG)**

**Working Group Meeting**

*September 1, 2022*

**Motion Statement:** Recommend a project score of 10 for the City of Morro Bay, Indirect Potable Reuse Project

**Motion:** Nipomo CSD

**Second Motion:** Los Osos CSD

**Comments:**

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Shandon-San Juan Water District				X
San Miguelito MWC				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>

**Motion Statement:** Recommend a project score of 8 for Central Coast Blue, submitted by the Cities of Pismo Beach, Arroyo Grande and Grover Beach

**Motion:** City of San Luis Obispo

**Second Motion:** Nipomo CSD

**Comments:**

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Shandon-San Juan Water District				X
San Miguelito MWC				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>

**Motion Statement:** Recommend a project score of 10 for Oceano Community Services District, Water Resource Reliability Projects Phase 2

**Motion:** Los Osos CSD  
**Second Motion:** City of San Luis Obispo  
**Comments:**

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Shandon-San Juan Water District				X
San Miguelito MWC				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>

**Motion Statement:** Recommend a project score of 10 for the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Master Water Report Update and Information System Project

**Motion:** Nipomo CSD  
**Second Motion:** City of San Luis Obispo  
**Comments:**

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Shandon-San Juan Water District				X
San Miguelito MWC				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>

**Motion Statement:** Recommend a project score of 6 for San Miguel Community Services District, Water Reliability Projects

**Motion:** City of San Luis Obispo  
**Second Motion:** Nipomo CSD  
**Comments:**

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Shandon-San Juan Water District				X
San Miguelito MWC				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>

**Motion Statement:** Recommend a project score of 8 for San Simeon Community Services District, Reservoir Expansion Project

**Motion:** Los Osos CSD

**Second Motion:** City of San Luis Obispo

**Comments:**

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Shandon-San Juan Water District				X
San Miguelito MWC				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>

**Motion Statement:** Recommend the following projects and funding to the full RWMG to consider recommending to the Board of Supervisors for the SLO County Region Prop. 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant Application:

City of Morro Bay – Indirect Potable Reuse – \$1,200,000

City of Pismo Beach – Central Coast Blue – \$1,000,000

Oceano CSD – Reliability Projects - \$600,000

Flood Control District – Master Water Report Update – \$549,755

San Miguel CSD – Pipeline replacements - \$300,000

Flood Control District – Grant Admin – 132,374

**Motion:** Nipomo CSD

**Second Motion:** City of San Luis Obispo

**Comments:**

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Shandon-San Juan Water District				X
San Miguelito MWC				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>