



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

Date: June 5, 2019  
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM  
Location: SLO City/County Library Community Room  
995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA

- 1) Introduction, Public Comment and Member Updates
- 2) 2019 IRWM Plan and Program 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 1 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 <http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm>

**UPCOMING RWMG MEETINGS:**

1. Wednesday **September 4, 2019** at 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM  
SLO City/County Library Community Room, 995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA
2. **Summer/Fall TBA, 2019** – Public Draft Presentation of 2019 IRWM Plan

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)



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

## 2019 RWMG SCHEDULE

### IRWM Plan Adoption and Prop 1 Grant Application

The following meetings, workshops, and actions are scheduled to achieve adoption of the 2019 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan and respond to Proposition 1 IRWM grant opportunities for San Luis Obispo 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
<b>2019</b>			
January 2, 2019	No RWMG Meeting		
February 6	RWMG Meeting	<b>SLO City Council Chambers</b>	<i>Prop 1 Grant Project Selection Process</i>
<b>March 6</b>	No RWMG Meeting		
April 3	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>Grant Updates and Project Showcase</i>
June 5	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>Project Selection for Prop 1 Grant</i>
July 3	No RWMG Meeting scheduled at this time		
August 7	No RWMG Meeting scheduled at this time		
September 4	RWMG Meeting	SLO City/County Library Community Room	<i>TBA</i>
<b>Mid 2019</b>	<b>IRWM Public Draft Presentation</b>		
<b>Late 2019</b>	<b>Round 1 Grant Applications Due to DWR.</b>		

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

SLO City Council Chambers is located at 990 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

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: May 31st, 2019  
SUBJECT: Item #3: Prop 1, Round 1 Application Recommendation

## Recommendation

1. 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 1 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. *March 5<sup>th</sup> - 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019.* Call for projects is open (23 days).
2. *April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019, Project Showcase @ RWMG Meeting, 10am - 12pm.* Applicants presented projects to members and public stakeholders.
3. *April 5<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>, 2019.* Initial project scoring by staff-level team.
4. *April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019.* DWR Releases Final Guidelines and PSP
5. *May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2019.* RWMG Working Group meets to score, select and assign funding to submitted projects.
6. *June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 @ RWMG Meeting, 10am - 12pm.* Members to vote on the projects and funding recommendation by the Working Group for the DWR application.
7. *June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 @ WRAC Meeting, 1:30pm - 3:30pm.* Assuming the RWMG makes a suite-of-projects recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for a grant application, the projects will be presented to the WRAC and WRAC will consider support for the application.

DWR Process for Selecting Projects (dates are pending final DWR approval):

1. **September 10, 2019.** Pre-Workshop Submittal of Project Information Form to DWR
2. **September 23-24, 2019.** Funding Area presentations of projects to DWR, SWRCB, others. Each applicant agency/organization is encouraged to present their project at this event.
3. **December 13, 2019.** Final applications due to DWR.
4. **Feb/March, 2019.** Grant awards announced by DWR
5. **Summer, 2020.** Agreement development and finalization.

## Final PSP Funding Update:

One change made by DWR was to increase the maximum DAC-specific implementation funding from 35% to 50% for the Central Coast Funding Area (CCFA). The funding Prop 1, Round 1 maximum funding is in the table below, which accounts for the MOA between the CCFA regions.

	<b>Total Prop 1 Funds (per MOA)</b>	<b>Available for Round 1 (per DWR)</b>	<b>Available for Round 1</b>	<b>Available for Round 2</b>
DAC Involvement (2017)	\$938,570	n/a	n/a	n/a
DAC Implementation (future)	\$774,099	50%	\$387,050	\$387,049
Planning Grant (2017)	\$204,183	n/a	n/a	n/a
Implementation Grants (future)	\$5,790,160	50%	\$2,895,080	\$2,895,080
<b>Total for SLO Region (Per CCFA MOA)</b>	<b>\$7,707,012</b>		<b>\$3,282,130</b>	<b>\$3,282,129</b>

## Scoring:

As presented at the 2/6/19 and 4/3/19 regular RWMG meetings, the scoring metrics used were selected directly from what DWR will use to evaluate submitted projects. The selected metrics key in on the merits of the project, 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 metrics used for our local process are highlighted in the attached excerpt of the final proposal solicitation package (PSP).

Submitted Project Information Forms (PIF), presentations, and all relevant reference materials are available at [www.slocountywater.org/irwm](http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm) in the "Prop 1, Round 1 - Call for Projects" module.

## 2. RWMG Working Group Meeting Recap

The RWMG Working Group, as established at the 2/6/19 RWMG meeting, met on May 29<sup>th</sup> from 9am to 12:30pm. The agenda for that meeting is attached.

Prior to scoring the projects, the Working Group established guidelines for scoring two of the questions where responses varied and required a level of judgment to score. These questions were related to climate change and innovative technology. In regard to climate change, with the varying styles of answers, the group decided to assign full points to a response that included a clear paragraph response with vulnerabilities identified within the text as well as full points for a list of addressed vulnerabilities. Partial credit was awarded for projects that did not connect to the vulnerabilities or provide a clear paragraph of how the project mitigates, adapts to or addresses climate change. The second question was related to innovative technology. Staff identified that between the various wastewater treatment plant projects, similar tertiary treatment technologies (i.e. MBR, UV) were treated by some as an innovative technology and by others as not. The group consensus was that these tertiary treatment methods were not innovative technologies.

The group then went project-by-project, point-by-point to assign points based on the submitted answers and subsequent clarifications initiated by staff. This process took approximately 2 hours. 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 scores are attached.

After a brief break, the group reconvened to select projects for funding. The group felt the top 5 scoring projects best met the intentions of the grant, provided benefits that matched with the requested funds, and captured a significant portion of the County geographically. As shown in the attached voting record, these projects were selected 6-0 by the group with a motion by Cambria CSD and a second by Los Osos CSD.

Finally, the group evaluated the selected project against the available funding. The group began with assigning full funding to Los Osos CSD and Oceano CSD's projects, because the request was relatively low, and the benefits were clearly in line with DWR's priorities and aligned with the lower request. From there, the funds were split among the remaining top projects based on population, total project cost and project score. As shown in the attached voting record, these funding recommendations were selected 6-0 by the group with a motion by Los Osos CSD and a second by the City of San Luis Obispo.

For specific questions regarding the scoring, please contact the IRWM Program Manager, Brendan Clark.

### 3. Selected Projects and Funding

As indicated by the higher scores, the selected suite of projects provides a clear response to many DWR priorities for the Prop 1, Round 1 Implementation Grant:

- Respond to Climate Change (PSP pg. 6)
- Contribute to Regional Water Self-Reliance (PSP pg. 6)
- Address the most critical needs of the IRWM Region (PSP pg 6)
- Leverage non-state funds (Guidelines pg. 6)
- Implement projects with greater watershed coverage (Guidelines pg. 6)
- Provide multiple benefits (Guidelines pg. 6)
- A number of Statewide Priorities (Guidelines pgs. 7-8) including:
  - Make Conservation a California Way of Life
  - Increase Regional Self-Reliance
  - Protect and Restore Important Ecosystems
  - Manage and Prepare for Dry Periods
  - Improve Groundwater Management
  - Provide Safe Water for All Communities

In addition to these written guidelines, DWR's messaging of their intentions for this round of funding has included meeting these 4 goals:

1. Support the "best of the best of projects".
2. Support projects that meet critical needs of regions, and specifically DACs.
3. Support projects that capture the spirit of IRWM.
4. Maximized benefits for grant funds awarded.

The table on the next page details the selected projects, scoring, requested funding, recommended funding and the type of funding.

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Project Score	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	Type of Funding
City of San Luis Obispo	One Water SLO MBR/UV Component	11	\$ 3,166,014	\$ 1,314,530	General
Nipomo CSD	Supplemental Water Project, Final Phase	11	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 800,000	General
Los Osos CSD	8th Street Well Construction	10	\$ 238,100	\$ 238,100	General
Oceano CSD	Water Resource Reliability Projects #1-2 & #1-9	10	\$ 274,500	\$ 274,500	DAC
San Simeon CSD	Reservoir Expansion Project - Phase 1 Distribution System	10	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 500,000	DAC & General
SLO County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Grant Admin	n/a	\$ 155,000	\$ 155,000	General
<b>Total</b>			\$ 6,233,614	\$ 3,282,130	

4. Staff Recommendation

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 1 Implementation Grant.

Attachments

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

## DWR Scoring from Final PSP

April 2019

**Table 4: Scoring Criteria**

Scoring Criteria - Proposal Level Evaluation (Proposal includes all DAC and General Projects)					
Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
1	Does the proposal support the intent of IRWM? Is coordination and /or collaboration within and between agencies, regions, and/or Funding Areas discussed? Are any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized discussed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal supports the intent of IRWM as discussed in the 2019 Guidelines and the IRWM Planning Act. (1 point)</li> <li>A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal demonstrates coordination and/or collaboration within and between agencies regions, and/or Funding Areas. (1 point)</li> <li>A sufficient description of any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized. (1 point)</li> </ul>	10531; 79741(b)	Proposal Summary/ 8	3
2	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)?	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses 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)	Proposal Summary /PIF/D.5	1
3	Does the proposal include one or more projects that provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. The applicant will receive one (1) point for each project, up to a maximum of two (2) points.	106.3 (AB 685)	PIF/D.6	<del>2</del> 1
<b>Maximum Possible Proposal Score</b>					<b>6</b>
Scoring Criteria – Project Level Evaluation					
Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
<b>Meeting Needs of the Region/Nexus to the IRWM Plan</b>					
4	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	79707(a)	PIF/B.2	1
5	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1? Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.? Does the narrative include other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)</li> <li>The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)</li> <li>The narrative includes other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits. (1 point)</li> </ul>	NA	PIF/D.1	<del>3</del> 2
6	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)</li> <li>A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)</li> </ul>	79741(a); 79742(e)	PIF/B.4	2
<b>Work Plan, Budget, Schedule, and Grant Agreement Readiness</b>					
7	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?	<p>Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR.</p> <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>	NA	Attachment 4	3

**Table 4: Scoring Criteria**

8	<p>Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other?</p> <p>Considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the <u>project description</u> clearly and concisely address all required topics listed in section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project?</li> <li>Are the tasks shown in the <u>Work Plan, Schedule and Budget</u> consistent?</li> <li>Are the costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation?</li> <li>Is the <u>Schedule</u> reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan?</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <u>Project Description</u> that clearly and concisely addresses all required topics listed in Section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project. (1 point)</li> <li>Tasks shown in the <u>Work Plan, Schedule and Budget</u> that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point)</li> <li>Costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point)</li> <li>A <u>Schedule</u> 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)</li> </ul>	NA	PIF/C and Attachments 4-6	4
9	<p>Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	NA	PIF/D.11	2
<b>Project Benefits and Program Preferences</b>					
10	<p>Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)</li> </ul>	79707(b)	Attachment 5	1
11	<p>Is the primary benefit* claimed in Table 3 of the Project Information Form logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan?</p> <p>*For Decision Support Tools, non-physical benefits will be considered.</p>	<p>A properly completed Table 3 for at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project.</p> <p>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 <u>quantitative</u> 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 (qualitative) 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 <u>qualitative</u> measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? (1 point)</li> </ul>	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	2
12	<p>Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?</p>	<p>Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 11? (1 point)</p>	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	1
13	<p>Does the project provide 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)	PIF/D.3	1
14	<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>A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point)</li> <li>Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements.</li> </ul>	10545	PIF/D.5	1
15	<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: Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc. (1 point)</p>	79707(e)	PIF/D.7	1
16	<p>Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?</p>	<p>A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)</p>	NA	PIF/D.8 and/or D.9 and/or D.10 & Attachments 7-9	1
<b>Cost Considerations</b>					

**Table 4: Scoring Criteria**

17	Did the applicant provide a narrative on cost considerations that is fully explained based on information requested in the Project Information Form?	<p>A narrative on cost considerations that provides at least one of the factors listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were other projects evaluated with similar levels of claimed (quantitative or qualitative) benefits as the proposed project?</li> <li>• In terms of cost, is a justification provided as to why the project was selected?</li> </ul> <p>One of the cost considerations listed above is sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (1 point) Both of the cost considerations listed above are sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (2 points)</p>	NA	PIF/D.4	2
<b>Maximum Possible Individual Project Level Score</b>					<b>24</b>
<b>Average DAC Project Score</b>		<b>Average General Project Score</b>			
(Sum of Individual DAC Project Scores/ Number of DAC Projects; rounded to the nearest whole number)		<b>24</b>	(Sum of Individual General Project Scores/ Number of General Projects; rounded to the nearest whole number)		<b>24</b>
<b>DAC Application Score</b>		<b>Maximum Possible Score</b>	<b>General Application Score</b>		<b>Maximum Possible Score</b>
Enter Proposal Score		<b>6</b>	Enter Proposal Score		<b>6</b>
Enter Average DAC Project Score		<b>24</b>	Enter Average General Project Score		<b>24</b>
<b>Bonus Point:</b> At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?		<b>1</b>	<b>Bonus Point:</b> At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?		<b>1</b>
<b>DAC Application Score</b> (Sum Above Three Rows)		<b>31</b>	<b>General Application Score</b> (Sum Above Three Rows)		<b>31</b>

## RWMMG Working Group Agenda



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

#### RWMMG Working Group – Project Scoring & Funding, Prop 1 Grant

Date: May 30, 2019  
Time: 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM  
Location: SLO City/County Library Conference Room  
995 Palm St, San Luis Obispo, CA

Attendees: Brendan Clark, County of San Luis Obispo, Facilitator (non-voting)  
Joey Steil, County of San Luis Obispo, Note-taker / Time-keeper (non-voting)  
Mladen Bandov, SLO County Flood Control & Water Conservation District  
Shirley Gibson, Oceano CSD  
Melissa Bland, Cambria CSD  
Mychal Boerman, City of San Luis Obispo  
Mario Iglesias, Nipomo CSD  
Renee Osborne, Los Osos CSD  
Devin Best, Upper Salinas-Las Tablas RCD

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 1) Introduction, Purpose, opening remarks (Brendan) | 10 Minutes   |
| 2) Finalize Project Scores (All)                    | 75 Minutes   |
| a) Project-by-Project, Alphabetically               |              |
| b) Compile a ranked list                            |              |
| 3) Break  | 5-10 Minutes |
| 4) Project Selection (Brendan)                      | 10 Minutes   |
| a) DWR Guidelines and Priorities                    |              |
| 5) Select Projects for Application (All)            | 30 Minutes   |
| 6) Funding for Selected Projects (All)              | 30 Minutes   |
| 7) Summary, Next Steps, Etc. (Brendan)              | 10 Minutes   |
| 8) 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.slocountywater.org/irwm](http://www.slocountywater.org/irwm)

# RWMG Working Group Voting Record



## San Luis Obispo County Integrated Regional Water Management Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) Working Group Meeting May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**Motion Statement:** SELECT PROJECTS THAT SCORED 10 PTS OR HIGHER FOR GRANT.

**Motion:** MELISSA BLAND (CCSD)

**Second Motion:** RENEE OSBORNE (LOCSO)

**Comments:**

DAC FUNDING DISCUSSION, STAFF REVIEW OF GRANT PRIORITIES, MEMBERS COMMENTED ON BENEFITS

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	X			
Cambria CSD	X			
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Oceano CSD	X			
Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

**Motion Statement:** SELECT FUNDING: CITY OF SLO: \$1,314,530, NCSO: \$200,000, LOS OSOS CSD: \$232,100, OCEANO CSD: \$274,500, SAN SIMON CSD: \$500,000.

**Motion:** RENEE OSBORNE (LOCSO)

**Second Motion:** MYCHAL BOELMAN (CITY OF SLO)

**Comments:**

GROUP DISCUSSION RE: COST/BENEFIT, BALANCE OF DAC/GENERAL & HIGH QUALITY PROJECTS.

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	X			
Cambria CSD	X			
City of San Luis Obispo	X			
Los Osos CSD	X			
Nipomo CSD	X			
Oceano CSD	X			
Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District				X
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>



San Luis Obispo County IRWM  
 RWMG Working Group Final Scoring  
 Prop 1, Round 1 Implementation Grant

5/31/2019

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Eligible? (y/n)	DAC? (y/n)	Score (15 max)	Request
City of San Luis Obispo	One Water SLO MBR/UV Component	Y	Y	11	\$ 3,166,014
Nipomo CSD	Supplemental Water Project, Final Phase	Y		11	\$ 1,000,000
Los Osos CSD	8th Street Well Construction	Y		10	\$ 238,100
Oceano CSD	Water Resource Reliability Projects #1-2 & #1-9	Y	Y	10	\$ 274,500
San Simeon CSD	Reservoir Expansion Project - Phase 1 Distribution System	Y	Y	10	\$ 1,400,000
Cayucos Sanitary District	Cayucos Sustainable Water Project	Y		9	\$ 2,895,080
South SLO County Sanitation District	WWTP Redundancy Project	Y		9	\$ 1,000,000
Cambria CSD	WWTP Nutrient Removal and Efficiency Improvements	Y		8	\$ 1,745,624
Morro Bay National Estuary Program	CCC Center Stormwater Treatment Project	Y		8	\$ 590,000
Avila Beach CSD	Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements Project	Y		6	\$ 1,267,600
County of San Luis Obispo	Mountain Springs Road Sedimentation Control	Y	Y	5	\$ 1,301,310
County of San Luis Obispo	Oceano 13th Street Drainage Project	N	Y	-	\$ 1,000,000
San Simeon CSD	Coastal Hazards Response and Mitigation Plan	N	Y	-	\$ 500,000

Did not request DAC funds

Original request was 1.18M, but no cost share was provided so it has been reduced by 50%

\*Ineligible due to construction timing

\*ineligible due to being a required mitigation

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	0
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	1
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	0
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	0
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	0
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	0

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	0
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	1
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	1
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	0
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	0

15

8

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	0
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	1
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	1
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	0
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	0

	<b>DWR Question</b>	<b>DWR Guidance</b>	<b>PIF Question</b>	<b>Points available</b>	<b>Project Score</b>
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)	<b>D.5</b>	1	<b>1</b>
2	Does the project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	<b>D.6</b>	1	<b>0</b>
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	<b>B.2</b>	1	<b>1</b>
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	<b>D.1</b>	1	<b>1</b>
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	<b>1</b>
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	<b>B.4</b>	1	<b>1</b>
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	<b>1</b>
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	<b>D.10</b>	2	<b>2</b>
7	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)	<b>C.2</b>	1	<b>1</b>
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	<b>D.2</b>	1	<b>1</b>
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	<b>D.3</b>	1	<b>0</b>
10	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)	<b>D.5</b>	1	<b>0</b>
11	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. (1 point)	<b>D.7</b>	1	<b>0</b>
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	<b>D.8 / D.9</b>	1	<b>1</b>

	<b>DWR Question</b>	<b>DWR Guidance</b>	<b>PIF Question</b>	<b>Points available</b>	<b>Project Score</b>
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)	<b>D.5</b>	1	<b>0</b>
2	Does the project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	<b>D.6</b>	1	<b>0</b>
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	<b>B.2</b>	1	<b>1</b>
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	<b>D.1</b>	1	<b>1</b>
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	<b>0</b>
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	<b>B.4</b>	1	<b>1</b>
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	<b>1</b>
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	<b>D.10</b>	2	<b>0</b>
7	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)	<b>C.2</b>	1	<b>0</b>
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	<b>D.2</b>	1	<b>0</b>
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	<b>D.3</b>	1	<b>0</b>
10	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)	<b>D.5</b>	1	<b>0</b>
11	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. (1 point)	<b>D.7</b>	1	<b>0</b>
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	<b>D.8 / D.9</b>	1	<b>1</b>

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	1
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	0
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	1
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	0
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	0

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	0
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	1
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	1
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	0
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	0

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	1
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	1
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	1
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	1
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	0

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	1
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	1
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	1
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	0
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	1

	DWR Question	DWR 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 project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	D.6	1	1
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	B.2	1	1
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	D.1	1	1
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	1
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	B.4	1	1
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	1
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	D.10	2	2
7	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
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	D.2	1	1
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	D.3	1	0
10	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.5	1	0
11	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. (1 point)	D.7	1	0
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	D.8 / D.9	1	1

15

10

	<b>DWR Question</b>	<b>DWR Guidance</b>	<b>PIF Question</b>	<b>Points available</b>	<b>Project Score</b>
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)	<b>D.5</b>	1	<b>0</b>
2	Does the project provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. (1 point)	<b>D.6</b>	1	<b>0</b>
3	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	<b>B.2</b>	1	<b>1</b>
4	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.1?	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point)	<b>D.1</b>	1	<b>1</b>
	Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.?	• The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A)		1	<b>1</b>
5	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point)	<b>B.4</b>	1	<b>1</b>
		• A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)		1	<b>1</b>
6	Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point)</li> <li>• Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points)</li> <li>• Full points awarded if not applicable.</li> </ul>	<b>D.10</b>	2	<b>2</b>
7	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)	<b>C.2</b>	1	<b>1</b>
8	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 11 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	<b>D.2</b>	1	<b>1</b>
9	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	<b>D.3</b>	1	<b>0</b>
10	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)	<b>D.5</b>	1	<b>0</b>
11	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. (1 point)	<b>D.7</b>	1	<b>0</b>
12	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)	<b>D.8 / D.9</b>	1	<b>0</b>