Appendix F – Project Lists and Implementation List Development

Appendix F contains the full projects lists and details on the development of the implementation list.

F.1 Full Project List

See attachment for the full project list.

F.2 Implementation List Development

This attachment includes the 2019 IRWM Implementation List evaluation sheets. See **Section 6** for more details about the Implementation List.

APPENDIX F.2 – IMPLEMENTATION LIST DEVELOPMENT

This appendix accompanies **Section 6.** Details about the eligibility, processes and scope of the Implementation List can be found in **Section 6.**

The following attachments are included:

1. 2018 IRWM Project Evaluation Sheet 1 – Rubric. This file is the overview of the scoring criteria and the basic parameters for scoring a project.
2. 2018 IRWM Project Evaluation Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets. This spreadsheet is for tallying the scores for each criterion and allows for streamlined scoring of Criteria A (Contributing to Objectives), Criteria B (Resource Management Strategies) and Criteria I (Climate Change Adaptation).
3. 2018 IRWM Project Evaluation Sheet 3 – Form. This document is for demonstrating the project's position/status with each criterion.

Submitted projects and their individual scores can be accessed at www.slocountywater.org/irwm. Directly at: https://slocountywater.org/site/Frequent%20Downloads/Integrated%20Regional%20Water%20Management%20Plan/Meetings/pdf/2018%20IRWM%20Project%20Scoring%20-%20Submitted%20Scoring%20documents.pdf

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 1 Rubric

Note: The central idea behind the Scoring Guidelines is "percent-complete". If a project doesn't fit these Guidelines, evaluate it for the subject Criteria based on completeness.

Criteria	Scoring Guidelines	Points	
		Subtotal	Total
A. How a project contributes to the IRWM Plan Objectives *(Scored via separate worksheet)*	- Projects that contribute to 5 or fewer objectives, 1 point - Projects that contribute to 6-10 objectives, 2 points. - Projects that contribute to 11-15 objectives, 3 points. - Projects that contribute to 16-20 objectives, 4 points. - Projects that contribute to 21 or more, 5 points. *Note: Include any direct, indirect or qualitative contribution.*	5	**25**
	- For a project that documents of how it <u>directly</u> contributes to objectives: - Evidence of contributing to 5 or less objectives: 4 pts. - Evidence of contributing to 6-10 objectives: 8 points. - Evidence of contributing to 11-15 objectives: 12 points. - Evidence of contributing to 16-20 objectives:16 points. - Evidence of contributing to 21 or more objectives are given 20 points.	20	
B. How the project is related to resource management strategies *(Scored via separate worksheet)*	- Project that includes 1-3 RMSs from the SLO IRWM Plan are given 3 points. - Project that includes 4-9 RMSs from the SLO IRWM Plan are given 6 points. - Project that includes 10 or more RMSs from the SLO IRWM Plan are given 10 points.	-	**10**
C. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation	- If the project demonstrates the ability to integrate with other projects or be modified to encourage regional planning and produce multiple benefits, it is given 5 points. No partial points are given for this criterion.	-	**5**
D. Technical feasibility of the project	- If project plans/designs have been completed and if there is evidence to indicate it will have a successful outcome (i.e. achieve the claimed benefits of the project), the project is given all 10 points. - If project plans/designs have not been completed and evaluated for feasibility, the subsequent guidelines are followed: - For completed technical feasibility studies, the project is given 2 points. - For the completion of background studies and reconnaissance (before design), it is given 2 points. - For completed designs or technical project plans, the project is given 3 points. - For completed report(s) that document a successful outcome of the project, the project is given 3 points.	10	**10**

E. Project status / Readiness to Proceed	- If fully prepared for implementation (i.e. CEQA complete or exempt, Easements executed, etc.), project earns 10 pts. - If a project is not ready for implementation, the subsequent guidelines are followed: - For a project that has identified it's permitting needs and a timeline to completion, 2 points are given. - A portion of the remaining 8 points will be given based on the percent-complete of the project's permitting needs and timeline.	-	**10**
F. Project costs and financing	- Project Costs. If project costs are known to best extent possible and documented, the full 5 points will be given. A full 5 points will be awarded for projects with contractor bids and an engineer's estimate. If there is only an estimate without bids, 3 points will be awarded.	5	**10**
	- Financing. A project will receive the full 5 points if it can document 80% financing or more. If partially financed, points will be given according to the percent financed, rounded up to the nearest whole number. (i.e. 62% financed rounds to 4 pts).	5	
G. Economic feasibility (O&M)	- Is the O&M cost of the completed, operational project accounted for? An analysis or report of these anticipated O&M costs, and how any additional financial needs are being covered is required to receive 10 points. No increase in O&M costs, with proof, will receive 10 points.	-	**10**
H. Environmental justice considerations	- If the project specifically addresses critical water issues of a disadvantaged community (DAC), it is given 4 points.	4	**10**
	- If the project specifically addresses critical water issues of Native American Tribal communities, it is given 3 points.	3	
	- If the project specifically addresses Environmental Justice concerns (i.e. pollution, industrial contamination), then the project is given 3 points.	3	
I. Climate Change Adaption *(Scored via separate worksheet)*	- For each climate change vulnerability addressed, the project is given points based on a weighting of the vulnerability's priority.	4	**6**
	- If changes in runoff and recharge are addressed in the project planning, then the project is given 1 point. - If sea level rise impacts, specifically to water supply, are addressed in project planning, the project is given 1 point.	2	
J. Climate Change Mitigation (GHG Emission Reduction)	- If the selected project reduces GHG emissions compared to other project alternatives, and can provide documentation of this analysis, it is given 1 point.	1	**3**
	- If the project qualitatively reduces energy consumption, especially energy embedded in water, it is given 1 point.	1	
	- When evaluating the project-related GHG emissions on a 20-year planning horizon, projects that reduce GHG emissions are given 1 point.	1	
K. Reduce reliance on the Delta	- If the project reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, it is given 1 point.	-	**1**
	Total Possible Score	**100**	

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

2018 IRWM Project Evaluation - Sheet 2

Summary and Worksheets

Project Sponsor: <enter name of organization> **DATE:** <enter date>

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															
<enter project1 name>	0	0	0									0			**0**
<enter project2 name>	0	0	0									0			**0**
<enter project3 name>	0	0	0									0			**0**
<enter project4 name>	0	0	0									0			**0**
<enter project5 name>	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.		**<enter project1 name>**		**<enter project2 name>**	
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				
	Diverse supply (recycled, desalination)				
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				
	Further local basin management objectives				
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking				
	Protect and improve GW quality				

San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Region

Objectives Scorecard

		<enter project1 name>		<enter project2 name>	
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				
	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	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		**0**	**0**	**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.	<enter project1 name>	<enter project2 name>	<enter project3 name>	<enter project4 name>	<enter project5 name>
Resource Management Strategy (RMS)					
Agricultural water use efficiency					
Conjunctive management and groundwater storage					
Conveyance – Regional/Local					
Desalination					
Drinking water treatment & distribution					
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					
Watershed management					
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	0	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)
	0	**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.		<enter project1 name>	<enter project2 name>	<enter project3 name>	<enter project4 name>	<enter project5 name>
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					
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	<enter project1 name>	<enter project2 name>	<enter project3 name>	<enter project4 name>	<enter project5 name>
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	0	0	0	0	0
Normalized Score (4 points max) *(Total Score / Points Possible) * 4*	4	0	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**	**0**	**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:

Project Sponsor Agency/Organization:

Contact Person:

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 _____ 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.

(insert brief description)

D. Technical feasibility of the project (Design) _____ 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".

(insert brief description)

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.

(insert brief description)

F. Project costs and financing _____ 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.

(insert brief description)

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?) _____ 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.

(insert brief description)

H. DAC, Tribal and Environmental Justice considerations _____ 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) _____ 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 _____ 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)