



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

Date: August 1, 2018
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: SLO City/County Library Community Room,
995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

- 1) Introduction/Public Comment
- 2) Stormwater Resources Plan Update
- 3) IRWM 2018 Plan Update
 - a) Updated Plan Adoption Schedule
- 4) Prop 1, Round 1 Grant Concepts and Updates
 - a) Current Schedule from DWR
 - b) New Timeline, Application and Program from DWR
- 5) Project Review Process
 - a) Full Project List Update – via SurveyMonkey
 - i) <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SLO-IRWM-Project-Form>
 - b) Results of the RWMG Working Group
 - c) Implementation List Scoring
- 6) Workshop for Project Lists
 - a) This is free/open time to review and update the Full Project List and begin the Implementation Scoring process. Expect to have at least an hour for these tasks.

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 <http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm>

NEXT RWMG MEETING:

Wednesday **September 5, 2018** at 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
SLO City/County Library Community Room, 995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo CA

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

TO: IRWM Regional Water Management Group
FROM: Brendan Clark, Water Resources Engineer
DATE: July 25th, 2018
SUBJECT: Item #3: IRWM Program and 2018 Plan Updates

Recommendations

1. Receive updated RWMG Meeting Schedule

Discussion

See Item 3, Attachment 1 for the current RWMG meeting calendar. Staff expects to have monthly meetings through the end of 2018.

The Plan update continues to be worked on by staff. The current Project Review and Scoring efforts are the critical path currently for completion of the draft plan. Staff anticipates having the draft plan complete for review by the RWMG by November 2018.

Attachments

- 3-1: 2018 RWMG Schedule



San Luis Obispo County Region
 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)
slocountywater.org/irwm

2018 RWMG SCHEDULE

IRWM Plan Adoption and Prop 1 Grant Application

The following meetings, workshops, and actions are scheduled to achieve adoption of the 2018 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan for San Luis Obispo (SLO) County.

For notices via e-mail, please sign up for the IRWM Stakeholder Mailing List online at <http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm>

Date	Activity	Location	Key Actions
2018			
August 1	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>IRWM Plan and Prop 1 Grant Updates</i>
September 5	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>IRWM Plan and Prop 1 Grant Updates</i>
Fall	PSP Review and Response Planning, Grant-Specific Call for Projects, etc.		
October 3	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>IRWM Plan and Prop 1 Grant Updates</i>
November 7	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>Prop 1 Grant Updates</i>
December 5	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>Prop 1 Grant Updates</i>
January 2, 2019	No RWMG Meeting		
February 6	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>Prop 1 Grant Updates</i>
Early 2019	IRWM Plan Adoption by RWMG Members due		
Mid 2019	Round 1 Grant Applications Due to DWR.		

RWMG = Regional Water Management Group
 WRAC = Water Resources Advisory Committee
 SLO City/County Library Community Room is located at 995 Palm Street in San Luis Obispo, CA
 County of SLO Board of Supervisors Chambers is located at 1055 Monterey Street in San Luis Obispo, CA
 University of California Coop. Ex. Auditorium is located at 2156 Sierra Way, Suite C, in San Luis Obispo, CA

TO: IRWM Regional Water Management Group
 FROM: Brendan Clark, Water Resources Engineer
 DATE: July 25th, 2018
 SUBJECT: Item #4: Prop 1, Round 1 Grant Update

Recommendations

1. Receive updated Prop 1, Round 1 schedule and concepts from DWR.

Discussion

Schedule of Grant Proposal Solicitation Process (PSP)

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) has continued to update the schedule for the upcoming Prop 1, Round 1 grant:

Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grants¹	
Proposal Solicitation Process and Schedule	
Milestone or Activity	Tentative Schedule²
Coordination with Regional Stakeholders RE: Development of Implementation Grant Program Concepts	May 2017 – August 2018
DWR Releases Draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for Public Comment Period (minimum 45-days)	September 2018
Three Public Meetings (Northern, Central, and Southern California locations TBD)	October 2018
Draft PSP Public Comment Period Closes	October 2018
DWR Releases Final PSP	Late Fall 2018
Round 1 Grant Applications Due to DWR ³	First application anticipated April 2019
Round 1 Grant Awards	2019

<https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs/Proposition-1>

Application Process

DWR is proposing a complete overhaul to the application process. Rather than having each project sponsor create their own application, DWR will be issuing a standardized, fillable form for project sponsors to populate. The second big change is that as part of the application process, prior to submitting the final form, each project sponsor will present their project to

DWR and other State agencies. These presentations take place at the Funding Area level. So, over a one to two-day period, the 6 regions in our funding area would present our proposed projects to DWR for feedback regarding the project. Essentially, we will know with a level of confidence if the selected projects would be supported by DWR, prior to submitting the final application.

Here is the conceptual timeline (with very tentative dates in parenthesis):

- Final PSP released (Dec 2018)
- RWMG selects projects to apply for grant (Feb 2019)
- Project sponsors prepare initial form responses (March 2019)
- Project sponsors present to DWR at the Funding Area presentation (April 2019)
- Submit final application to DWR (July 2019)
- Preliminary Awards from DWR (Sept 2019)
- Final Awards (Oct 2019)
- Grant Agreement Execution (Spring 2020)

Funding Available for Round 1

The total funding available to our Region is summarized below, based on the concepts provided by DWR and the MOA between the Central Coast Funding Area IRWM regions. DWR anticipates awarding 50% of the available Implementation funds, as well as up to 30% of the DAC-specific Implementation funds. DWR’s intention of holding back 70% of the DAC-specific funds for future rounds is for the planning work related to the Needs Assessments and DAC-Involvement Grant projects to be completed prior to awarding the majority of Implementation funds. Of course, the funds set aside for DAC Implementation is only a minimum.

	Total Prop 1 Funds (per MOA)	Available for Round 1 (per DWR)	Available for Round 1
DAC Involvement (2017)	\$ 938,570	n/a	n/a
DAC Implementation (future)	\$ 774,099	30%	\$ 232,229
Planning Grant (2017)	\$ 204,183	n/a	n/a
Implementation Grants (future)	\$ 6,047,060	50%	\$ 3,023,530
Total for SLO Region (Per MOA)	\$ 7,963,912		\$ 3,255,759

Local Cost Share (State has generally said these will be in the PSP):

- 50% of total proposal cost being covered non-State funds.
- Costs incurred after January 1st, 2015 can be used for local cost share
- Requirement can be waived or partially reduced for projects that directly benefits DACs.

Reimbursement Eligibility (Subject to change. We will know more when the Draft PSP releases):

- The State has initially proposed the “funding award date” as the eligibility date for reimbursement.
- For the Central Coast Funding Area, this roughly points to September 2019.

TO: IRWM Regional Water Management Group
FROM: Brendan Clark, Water Resources Engineer
DATE: July 25th, 2018
SUBJECT: Item #5: Project Review Process

Recommendations

1. Review and update the Full Project List.
2. Receive update from the RWMG Working Group for Implementation List Scoring.
3. Consider approval the Implementation List Scoring Rubric, Worksheet and Form.

Discussion

Item 5a - Full project list.

The last full project list update was in May, 2017. The compiled list of projects is attached as Item 5a, Attachment 1. The list is organized alphabetically by project sponsor. Please note there are two "NCMA Agencies" projects that will eventually need a lead agency.

Please review the attached full project list and **provide any updates by August 10th**.

To add a project to the list, please fill out this form on SurveyMonkey. It should take about 10 minutes. <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SLO-IRWM-Project-Form> **Please complete this task by August 10th**.

Corrections, updates and new projects will be added to the list for review and acceptance by the RWMG to the 2018 IRWM Plan at the September 5th RWMG Meeting.

Item 5b - RWMG Working Group for Implementation List Scoring

Recommendation: Approval of the updated Rubric and Project Scoring forms.

The RWMG working group was formed at the April 4th, 2018 RWMG meeting to update the Implementation Scoring process (i.e. Rubric). The group included Willy Cunha (Shandon-San Juan Water District), Linda Chipping (Coastal San Luis RCD), Mario Iglesias (Nipomo CSD), Renee Osborne (San Simeon CSD and Los Osos CSD), and Brendan Clark (SLO County Public Works, IRWM Program Manager). We met 3 times as a group.

The results of these meetings are the attached files:

- A "Read Me" / Summary document
- Sheet 1 – Rubric
- Sheet 2 - Worksheets (excel)
- Sheet 3 - Form (word)

The most significant changes to the scoring process from the draft presented at the 4/4 RWMG meeting are:

1. *Reduced total points from 135 to 100.*

The Working Group agreed that 100 is much more relatable and tangible than 135, 150 or any other number.

2. *Re-allocated percentage of points for meeting objectives, readiness and State priorities.*

The 2014 IRWM Project Review Process weighed meeting objectives at 80% of the total available points. The Working Group felt, given this list is intended to have a 5-year horizon, readiness to proceed had to be more highly valued. The updated percentage weighting is now:

- Meeting Plan Objectives - 40%
- Readiness to Proceed - 40%
- State Priorities - 20%

3. *Weighed demonstrable contribution to objectives more heavily than any objective indirectly (or directly) contributed to.*

Earlier drafts had points more skewed to total objectives contributed to, whether qualitatively or quantitatively, directly or indirectly. The Working Group flipped this to reward projects more points for objectives that are contributed to directly, quantitatively, and as part of the expressed purpose of the project.

4. *Reduced the weight of Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation.*

The Working Group identified a significant overlap of the Objectives and RMS scoring criteria with that of the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation scoring criteria. For example, both Water Supply and Ecosystem & Watershed Goals each contain objectives to combat the effects of climate change. Meeting these objectives alone could raise a project's score 5%. At its draft state, the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation scoring criteria accounted for 15% of the scoring available. The Working Group pared this down to 9%.

Item 5c - Implementation List Scoring

The Working Group estimates completing the scoring for a project will take 2-hours. The worksheet and the form are intended to be completed side-by-side.

Review the "Read Me" file and instructions on each form carefully. The Worksheet, for example, is automated. To score a project's contribution to objectives, simply enter an 'x' in the field and the score will be tabulated. This same functionality applies to RMS's implemented and tallying climate change vulnerabilities addressed by the project as well.

Use the form (sheet 3) to respond specifically to where the project lands regarding the design, permitting, financing, operating costs and climate change mitigation criteria.

Attachments

- 5a-1: Draft 2018 Full Project List
- 5c-1: 2018 IRWM Project Scoring – Readme
- 5c-2: 2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 1 – Rubric
- 5c-3: 2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 2 – Summary and Worksheets
- 5c-4: 2018 IRWM Project Scoring Sheet 3 – Project Form

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit- cation		
Avila Beach CSD								
Avila Beach Wastewater System Upgrade								
California Department of Corrections								
Chorro Reservoir Rehabilitation		x	x	x	x		Planning	
CMC Wastewater System Upgrade								
California Army National Guard								
Camp San Luis Obispo Chorro Creek Habitat Management Program	Local watershed agencies		x		x	x	Planning	
Cambria CSD								
WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements		x	x	x		\$3,000,000	Design	
Cayucos Sanitaton District								
Cayucos Sustainable Water Project	3 local water purveyors; Whale Rock Commission	x	x	x	x	\$35,000,000	Ready for implementation	
Central Coast Infrastructure Investment Forum								
Morro Valley Water Reliability Plan	Coastal San Luis RCD; SLO Farm Bureau; California Avocado Commission; Cal Poly; County of SLO; RWQCB; California Coastal Commission	x	x	x	x	\$100,000	Concept	

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit- cation		
Central Coast Salmon Enhancement								
Meadow Creek Restoration Plan	State Parks; Coastal San Luis RCD; County of SLO	x	x		x	x	\$250,000 - 500,000	Ready for implementation
Pismo Creek Watershed Program	City of Pismo Beach; Coastal San Luis RCD; CCSE; State Parks	x					\$1,000,000 - 5,000,000	Ready for implementation
See Canyon Habitat Enhancement	City of SLO	x	x		x	x	\$325,000	Conceptual
See Canyon Watershed Management Plan								
SLO Communities Water Enhancement Program		x	x	x	x	x	\$250,000 - 500,000	Ready for implementation
Steelhead 4(d) Program								
City of Atascadero								
Atascadero Creek Watershed Management Plan	Upper Salinas Las Tablas RCD	x	x	x	x	x	\$250,000 - 500,000	Concept
City of Morro Bay								
Morro Bay-Cayucos Sanitation District Salt and Nutrient Management Plan		x	x	x		x	<\$250,000	Ready for implementation
Chorro Valley Wells Nitrate Removal Project		x		x			\$250,000 - 500,000	Concept
Morro Bay Desalination Facility Upgrade								
Morro Bay Harborwalk	MBNEP; County of SLO	x	x		x		\$1,690,365	Design

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit- cation		
City of Paso Robles								
21st Street Reservoir Reconstruction		x	x			x	>\$5,000,000	Design
Phase 2 – Lake Nacimiento Potable Water Treatment Plant	Nacimiento Water Project	x	x	x		x	>\$5,000,000	Planning
Recycled Water Treatment and Distribution System – Phase 1	Cooperative agreements between agricultural and golf interests	x	x	x		x	>\$5,000,000	Planning
Recycled Water Treatment and Distribution System – Phases 2_3	Cooperative agreements between agricultural and golf interests	x	x	x		x	>\$5,000,000	Planning
Paso Robles Reclamation and Recharge Program								
City of Pismo Beach								
Pismo Beach Wastewater System Upgrade		x	x	x	x	x	\$4,700,000	Design
Regional Groundwater Sustainability Project (RGSP)	SSLOCSD	x	x	x	x	x	\$95,000,000	Design
Regional Recycled Water System	SSLOCSD	x	x	x		x	\$1,000,000 - 5,000,000	Design

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit- cation		
City of San Luis Obispo								
Nacimiento Water Project Energy Recovery Turbine	City of SLO; PG&E; SLO Flood Control District	x	x			x	\$1,895,000	Planning
Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion		x				x	\$400,000	Ready for implementation
Meadow Park Stormwater Capture and Use Project	Cal Poly; LID Initiative; RWQCB	x	x	x		x	\$2,000,000	Concept
One Water SLO	Cal Poly; The Nature Conservancy; Water Environment & Research Foundation; PG&E; Waste Connections; Morro Coast Audubon Society; Water Education Foundation; Cuesta College; National Audubon Society; SLO Chamber of Commerce; Arts Obispo; CCSE; SWRCB; Others.	x	x	x		x	\$8,000,000	Design
Mid-Higuera Bypass	SLO Flood Control District Zone 9;	x	x			x	\$4,600,000	Design
Water Reclamation Facility Upgrade								
Creston Water Purveying Entity								
Creston State Water Project Turnout	DWR; CCWA; Brenda Mesa; SLO Flood Control and Water Conservation District; local State Water subcontractors; water purveyors	x		x		x	\$50,000,000	Planning

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communitation		
Coastal San Luis RCD								
Edna Valley Groundwater Basin Recharge and Steelhead Trout Habitat Enhancement	Edna Valley Growers MWC; Central Coast Salmon Enhancement	x	x	x			\$1,500,000	Design
Conservation Planning for Coastal Watersheds	Natural Resource Conservation Science	x	x	x	x	x	\$500,000	Planning
Rancher to Rancher Program	US-LT RCD, NRCS, UC Cooperative Extension, and Cattleman/woman	x	x	x	x	x	<\$250,000	Ready for implementation
Stormwater Rewards Rebate Program		x	x	x	x	x	\$300,000	Ready for implementation
Urban Landscape Water Management and Conservation Program		x	x			x	<\$250,000	Planning
Arroyo Grande Creek Floodplain and Riparian Enhancement Feasibility	Central Coast Salmon Enhancement	x	x			x	unknown	Conceptual
Agricultural Water Management and Conservation Program	Coastal San Luis RCD, NRCS, US-LT RCD, UC Cooperative Extension	x	x	x		x	\$250,000-500,000	Planning
Countywide Watershed Planning Phase II	Upper Salinas Las Tablas RCD; County of SLO; local conservation groups	x	x	x	x	x	<\$250,000	Planning
Feasibility Study for Recycled Water for Agricultural Use	Upper Salinas Las Tablas RCD	x		x		x	<\$250,000	Concept
Livestock & Land Program	Upper Salinas Las Tablas RCD	x		x		x	\$175,000-200,000	Planning
Alternatives Analysis and BMP Implementation Plan for the Oso Flaco Watershed	Cachuma RCD, RWQCB; State Parks	x	x	x	x	x	\$150,000	Concept

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit- cation		
County of San Luis Obispo								
County Service Area 7A – Oak Shores – Interception Sewer System Replacement	Monterey County Parks; Oak Shores Community Association	x	x				\$6,000,000	Concept
San Miguel Flood Control Program		x			x		\$4,142,000	Planning
County Service Area 10 – Clearwell Tank Roof Replacement		x				x	\$160,000	Concept
Los Osos Landfill Remediation – Pump and Treat	RWQCB, SLO APCD, California Department of Resources and Recycling	x		x			\$901,000	Planning
Flood Control District								
Flood Control Zone 3 – Lopez WTP Sludge Bed 1 & 2 Upgrades	Flood Control Zone Advisory Committee; Lopez WTP users	x	x				\$325,000	Planning
Lopez Water Project Habitat Conservation Plan	National Marine Fisheries Service and California Fish & Wildlife	x	x			x	\$1,000,000-5,000,000	Ready for implementation
Federal Flood Insurance Program Compliance Study								Concept
Salinas Pipeline-Nacimiento Pipeline Emergency Intertie and Pipeline Extension Project	Nacimiento Water Project, City of SLO, CA Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	x	x	x	x	x	\$4,050,000	Design
Arroyo Grande Creek Channel Waterway Management Program	CCSE		x		x		\$7,342,000	Ready for implementation
CSA 16 New Storage Tank		x		x			\$1,379,000	Concept
CSA 16 Waterline - Replace Centre Street		x					\$1,223,000	Planning
CSA 16 Waterline - Upsize 1st Street		x					\$660,000	Concept
CSA 16 Waterline - Loop N. 2nd to N. 3rd Street		x					\$233,000	Concept
Toad Creek Waterway Management Program	TCSD; Templeton Area Advisory Group		x		x		<\$250,00	Concept

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit-cation		
Greenspace - The Cambria Land Trust								
SLO County Drought Protection & Climate Change Preparedness Pilot Project	CCSE, Cambria CSD, County of SLO, Coastal San Luis RCD, and private landowners	x	x	x	x	x	<\$250,000	Planning
Heritage Ranch CSD								
Vertical Well Project for HRCSD		x	x		x		\$250,000-500,000	Planning
Land Conservancy of SLO								
Attiyeh Ranch Conservation Easement		x	x	x	x		\$84,723,900	Ready for implementation
Los Osos Basin Management Committee								
Los Osos Creek Groundwater Replenishment and Recharge Program	MBNEP	x	x	x			\$6,200,000	Planning
Los Osos CSD								
8th Street Upper Aquifer Well and Nitrate Removal Facility	ISJ Working Group: Los Osos CSD, SLO County; Golden State Water company; S&T MWC	x	x	x			\$935,000	Design
Los Osos Water System Improvements	Golden State Water Company; S&T Mutual Water Company; County of SLO	x	x	x			\$935,000	Ready for implementation
3rd Street Chromium Removal		x						Concept

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit-cation		
Morro Bay National Estuary Program								
Chorro Creek Ecological Reserve Floodplain Restoration Project	Trust for Public Land; Wildlife Conservation Board; US Fish and Wildlife Service; CA Department of Transportation; State Coastal Conservancy; CA Department of Fish and Wildlife; Sierra Club - Santa Lucia Chapter	x	x	x	x		\$1,500,000	Ready for implementation
Los Padres CCC Center – Stormwater LID Treatment Project	National Guard	x	x	x	x	x	\$1,663,192	Design
Water Conservation Partnerships in Chorro Valley	Trout Unlimited; California Conservation Corps; NOAA; CA Department of Fish and Wildlife	x	x	x	x	x	\$1,000,000 - 5,000,000	Planning
Baywood Park 2nd Street Stormwater Management	Cal Poly; County of SLO; Los Osos CSD; Los Osos Basin Management Committee; Low Impact Development Initiative	x	x	x	x	x	\$1,500,000	Conceptual
NCMA Agencies								
Lopez Pipeline Improvements	SLO Flood Control District; SLO Flood Control District Zone 3 Technical Advisory Committee; Oceano CSD; City of Arroyo Grande; City of Grover Beach; City of Pismo Beach; CSA 12	x	x	x	x	x	\$3,400,000	Planning
Lopez Lake Spillway Raise Project		x	x	x	x	x	\$15,000,000	Planning

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit-cation		
Nipomo CSD								
Nipomo CSD Supplemental Water Project - Final Phase	MKN	x		x			\$5,400,000	Ready for implementation
Nacimiento Regional Water Management Advisory Committee								
Interlake Tunnel Project	County of SLO; Monterey County Water Resources Agency; Monterey County Parks and Recreation Department	x	x	x			\$595,000	Planning
Jerrett Reservoir	Monterey County	x					\$71,000,000	Concept
Oceano CSD								
Beach Street Alley Waterline Replacement		x	x	x			\$225,000	Design
Conjunctive Use and Groundwater Banking Evaluation	Santa Maria Groundwater Basin stakeholders	x		x			<\$250,000	Concept
Oceano CSD Water System Improvements		x					\$2,500,000	Planning
Oceano Groundwater Recharge Plan		x	x	x	x		\$50,000 - 100,000	Planning
S&T Mutual Water Company								
S&T Mutual Water Co - Golden State Water Co Intertie	Golden State Water Company	x		x			<\$250,000	Concept
San Miguel CSD								
San Miguel CSD Water System Improvements		x	x				\$950,000	Ready for implementation
New Well Water Supply		x	x	x			\$500,000 - 1,000,000	Design
Toilet Retrofit Incentive Program		x	x	x				Design

Sorted by Project Proponent

Project	Project Partners	Relevant IRWM Goals					Cost	Status
		Water Supply	Ecosystem and Watershed	GW Mgmt	Flood Mgmt	Water Mgmt & Communit- cation		
San Miguelito MWC								
San Miguelito Wastewater System Upgrade								
Lower San Luis Obispo Creek Fish Passage Improvement and Seawater Intrusion Barrier Planning Study		x	x	x			Concept	
Avila Valley Regional Recycled Water Program	Avila Beach CSD	x	x	x	x	x	\$25,000,000	Concept
San Simeon CSD								
Potable Water System Distribution Reliability - Water Loop		x					\$614,931	Ready for implementation
Recycled Water System Expansion West		x	x	x			\$1,795,200	Ready for implementation
Water Storage Reservoir								Design
Upper Salinas Las Tablas RCD								
Toad Creek Flood Control, Restoration and Basin Recharge	US-LT RCD; SLO Flood Control; Templeton CSD; CA Fish & Wildlife	x	x	x	x	x	\$500,000-1,000,000	Ready for implementation
Basin-wide Water Quality Sampling								Concept
Salinas River Management Plan		x	x	x	x	x	\$250,000	Concept
Paso Robles Creek Sediment Sampling & Assessment	City of Paso Robles; RWQCB	x	x					Planning
Santa Rosa Creek Recharge Basins	USFS; BLM	x	x	x			<\$250,000	Planning
Santa Rosa Creek Floodplain/ Wetland Restoration	CDFW; WCB; NOAA; NCRS	x	x	x			\$500,000-1,000,000	unknown
Expanded Key Percolation Zone Study		x	x	x	x	x	\$52,760	unknown
On-Farm Water Management Improvements	Central Coast Vineyard Team; Center for Irrigation Technology Fresno; others	x	x	x		x	\$350,000	Ready for implementation



2018 IRWM Project Evaluation Read Me

Summary

Each IRWM Plan update includes a list of projects which, for that Plan's cycle (~5 years), represent the projects that best implement the objectives of the Plan. This list is called the "IRWM Implementation List". It is a subset of the "Full Project List".

The scoring criteria were set by the Department of Water Resources' 2016 IRWM Program guidelines, and are summarized in the April 4th RWMG Meeting Staff report, starting on page 26. https://www.slocountywater.org/site/Frequent%20Downloads/Integrated%20Regional%20Water%20Management%20Plan/Meetings/pdf/20180404_IRWM%20RWMG%20Agenda.pdf

There are three files related to the scoring:

1. [2018 IRWM Project Evaluation Sheet 1 – Rubric \(PDF\)](#). 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 \(Excel\)](#). 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 \(Word\)](#). This document is for demonstrating the project's position/status with each criterion.

Instructions:

Project sponsors are to *self-score* their projects with the provided documentation. Upon completion, the Program Manager will review the scoring and provide feedback to the project sponsor. Scores from the RWMG will be compiled and presented to the RWMG for review and integration into the 2018 IRWM Plan at the September 5th RWMG Meeting.

Sheet 2 (worksheet) and Sheet 3 (Form) are intended to be open side-by-side. Sheet 1 (Rubric) is a reference.

The expectation and intention of these forms is to take around 2 to 3 hours to complete, per project.

Please contact the IRWM Program Manager, Brendan Clark, with any questions. (805) 788-2316 or bclark@co.slo.ca.us



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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. <p><i>Note: Include any direct, indirect or qualitative contribution.</i></p>	5	25
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For a project that documents of how it <u>directly</u> contributes to objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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
<i>Total Possible Score</i>			100



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.

Category (see Rubric and Form)	Plan Objectives (40 points)			Readiness to Proceed (40 points)			Environmental Justice (10 points)			Climate Change & Delta (10 points)			Total Project Score		
	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 E j concern	Climate Change Adaptation	Climate Change Mitigation	Reduced dependence 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
															0



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 separately 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				
Groundwater	Climate change in ecosystems				
	Understand GW issues and conditions				
	Support local GW management				
	Further local basin management objectives				
	CASGEM Program				
	Groundwater recharge/banking				
	Protect and improve GW quality				



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
<i>Maximum is 37</i>		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)
<i>See "Scoring Rubric" for Point Allocation</i>		0	0	0	0



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
<i>Maximum is 25</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>1-3 RMS = 3 points 4-9 RMS = 6 points 10+ RMS = 10 points</i>	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



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 Vulnerabilities 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					



Climate Change Adaption Scorecard

		<enter project1 name>	<enter project2 name>	<enter project3 name>	<enter project4 name>	<enter project5 name>
Climate Change Vulnerabilities With Prioritization (continued)	Possible Points					
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					
<i>Climate Change Vulnerabilities Subtotal (86 total)</i>	86	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Normalized Score (4 points max) (Total Score / Points Possible) * 4</i>	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					
<i>Climate Change Impacts Subtotal</i>	2	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Total CC Adaptation Score</i>	6	0	0	0	0	0



**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.

Provide *brief* description for each response of the status of the project and justification for the score.

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.

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".

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.

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.

Part II. Project Financing (5 Points possible).

How is the project being funded? Provide a brief description of the funding sources and percent complete of the funding for the project. 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.

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.

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

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?

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)

_____ 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.

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.

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.

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.