



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

Date: November 5, 2025
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: SLO City/County Library Community Room
995 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA

Please note, this meeting will be in-person only.

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

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

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, Supervising Water Resources Engineer
DATE: November 5, 2025
SUBJECT: Item #3: Prop 1, Round 2 Application Recommendation

Recommendation

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

Discussion

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

1. Review of Grant & Selection Process

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

1. September 3, 2025. Reviewed draft Call for Projects at an RWMG meeting.
2. September 8 – 29, 2025. Call for Projects open (22 days).
3. October 1 – 3, 2025. Eligibility Screening by staff.
4. October 10, 2025. Project Showcase @ RWMG Meeting. Applicants presented projects to members and public stakeholders. Additionally, an RWMG Working Group was formed.
5. October 24, 2025. RWMG Working Group met to finalize scores and prepare an amendment recommendation.
6. November 5, 2025. RWMG Meeting, 10am – 12pm. Members to vote on the projects and funding recommendation by the Working Group for the DWR application.
7. December 3, 2025. WRAC Meeting, 1:30pm – 3:30pm. Per our program MOU.
8. December 16, 2025. Board of Supervisors. Staff to seek BOS authorization to submit amendment request to DWR.

Scoring:

As presented at the Sept. 3rd, 2025 regular RWMG meeting, the scoring metrics used were selected directly from DWR to evaluate submitted projects, with additional screening related to project timing. The selected metrics key in on the merits of the projects, rather than how well an application is put together. For example, our region evaluated projects for multiple benefits, but not if the work plan, budget and schedule completely matched. A detailed work plan, budget and schedule were not required submittals for our local process. The final scoring metrics from the State are attached.

Four (4) local agencies submitted projects for consideration to be included in the amendment. Submitted Project Information Forms (PIF), presentations, and reference materials are available at www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm, click the “P1R2 Call for Projects (2025)” link on the left.

2. RWMG Working Group Meeting Recap

The RWMG Working Group, as established at the 10/10/25 joint RWMG meeting, met on October 24th from 2:00pm to 3:30pm. The meeting was open to the public and an agenda for that meeting is attached.

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

After a brief break, the meeting reconvened to select projects for funding. The Working Group agreed to recommend the top 2 scoring projects – Heritage Ranch CSD and the City of San Luis Obispo.

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

3. Selected Projects and Funding

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

- Leverage non-state funds (Guidelines pg. 6)
- Implement projects with greater watershed coverage (Guidelines pg. 6)
- Provide multiple benefits (Guidelines pg. 7)

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

- Drought Preparedness
- Climate Resilience

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

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Project Score	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	Type of Funding
Heritage Ranch CSD	Disinfection Byproduct Reduction Project	8	\$492,930	\$ 492,930	General
City of San Luis Obispo	Groundwater Cleanup Project	8	\$1,000,000	\$ 507,070	General
Total			\$ 1,492,930	\$ 1,000,000	

4. Staff Recommendation

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

Staff recommends the RWMG consider recommending the RWMG Working Group-selected projects and funding to the Board of Supervisors for amendment into our Prop 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant Agreement.

Attachments

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

Table 4: Scoring Criteria⁴

-	Proposal Level Evaluation		-	-	-	-
	Questions		Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
1	If the IRWM region has been identified as an area where contaminants listed in AB 1249 exist, does the proposal contain project(s) that address the contaminant(s)?		Provide specific explanation of how the project(s) addresses existing AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point) If the requirements of AB 1249 do not apply to the applicant’s IRWM region(s), full points awarded.	10541 (e)(14)	GGranTS Application	1
					Maximum Score:	1
	Project Level Evaluation					
	Questions		Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?		Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	79707 (b)	Attachment 3	1
3	Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified?		Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR. • The Work Plan appears to be sufficiently complete, with all deliverables identified, and reasonable given the intent of the project. (3 points) • 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) • The Work Plan is sparsely filled out, with minimal information and/or minimal deliverables listed. (1 point)		Attachment 2	3
4	Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, justified, and consistent with each other? Considerations include: Are the tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget consistent? Are the costs presented in the Budget backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? Is the Schedule reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan?		Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR, including: Tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) Costs presented in the Budget are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) A Schedule that is reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan, which indicates the project will likely be completed by the end date listed in Attachment 6. (1 point)		Attachment 2,3, and 4	3

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

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



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

RWMG Working Group – Prop 1, Round 2 Grant, Project 3 Replacement

Date: October 25, 2025
Time: 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Location: Ludwick Community Center
864 Santa Rosa St, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Members of Working Group:

Ron Munds, Los Osos CSD
Kelly Dodds, San Miguel CSD
Peter Brown, Oceano CSD
Brendan Clark, County of San Luis Obispo, Facilitator (non-voting)
Joey Steil, County of San Luis Obispo, Note-taker / Time-keeper (non-voting)

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1) Introduction, Purpose, opening remarks (Brendan) | 5-10 Minutes |
| 2) Public Comment for items not on the agenda | |
| 3) Finalize Project Scores (All) | 30 Minutes |
| a) Project-by-Project, Alphabetically | |
| b) Compile a ranked list | |
| 4) Break | 5-10 Minutes |
| 5) Project Selection Process (Brendan) | 5-10 Minutes |
| a) DWR Guidelines and Priorities | |
| 6) Select Projects for Application (All) | 15 Minutes |
| 7) Funding for Selected Projects (All) | 15 Minutes |
| 8) Summary, Next Steps, Etc. (Brendan) | 5 Minutes |
| 9) Adjourn | |

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



Scoring Metrics for the P1R2 Call for Projects

The "Screening Criteria" section is intended to filter projects that are not able or not likely to meet the narrow reimbursement schedule of this funding opportunity. For the source of "DWR Scoring" and "Prop 1 / Readiness Scoring", please see the Prop 1, Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant Guidelines, Project Solicitation Package (PSP) and associated attachments. The "Other Factors" are derived from the 2019 IRWM Plan, Sections 1, 2, 4 and 6.

All files are available at: (click "2025 P1R2 Call for Projects" on the left pane)

www.slocounty.ca.gov/irwm

Screening Criteria	y/n?	Comment
Construction completed by 12/31/2026?		If "no", the project is ineligible.
CEQA & NEPA?		Multiple "no" responses may affect the project's ability to be considered
Access and Permits?		
Funding Secured?		

DWR Scoring	Points	Comment
AB 1249 Contaminant(s)	1	Per Project Solicitation Package, see pages 30-31 of Draft PSP
Leveraged funds	1	
Claimed Benefit logical and reasonable?	1	
Does project benefit more than one region?	1	
AB 1249 & Small DAC?	1	
Employ new or innovative technology?	1	
Or, is project a decision support tool?		
Total	6	

Prop 1 / Readiness Scoring	Points	Comment
Other funding secured (i.e. grants, loans, etc.)	1	Per PSP Attachment 7
Multiple quantifiable benefits	1	
CEQA Complete? (pts awarded if N/A)	1	
NEPA Complete? (pts awarded if N/A)	1	
Access Complete? (pts awarded if N/A)	1	
Permits Complete? (pts awarded if N/A)	1	
Total	6	

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

Note: per DWR, because the City of Morro Bay, Oceano CSD, San Miguel CSD and the SLO County Flood Control and Water Conservation District have projects remaining in the Prop. 1, Round 2 Agreement, if these entities want to submit a project, or increased benefits for a funded project, these projects will be considered only if the general call for projects cannot meet the screening and eligibility requirements.

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Eligible? (y/n)	DAC? (y/n)	Score (12 max)	Request	Recommended Award
Heritage Ranch CSD	DBP Reduction Project	Y	No	8	\$492,930	\$ 492,930
City of San Luis Obispo	Groundwater Cleanup Project	Y	No	8	\$1,000,000	\$ 507,070
Nipomo CSD	Eureka Well Project	Y	No	6	\$1,000,000	\$ -
City of Pismo Beach	Well 23 Replacement	Y	No	4	\$1,000,000	\$ -

Other factors for Recommendations

(Approved by RWMG, derived from IRWM Plan Sections 1, 2, 4 and 6)

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

Project Sponsor
City of Pismo Beach

Project Name:
Well 23 Replacement

Screening Criteria

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Yes/no
	Construction Completed by 12/31/2026	If "no", the project is ineligible	C.4	Yes
	CEQA & NEPA Complete?	Multiple "no" responses may affect the project's ability to be considered	n/a	No
	Access and Permits?		D.11	No
	Funding Secured?		C.1-2	yes

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

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

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria

(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities) Points awarded if N/A

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

Project Sponsor

City of San Luis Obispo

Project Name:

Groundwater Cleanup Project

Screening Criteria

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Yes/no
	Construction Completed by 12/31/2026	If "no", the project is ineligible	C.4	yes
	CEQA & NEPA Complete?	Multiple "no" responses may affect the project's ability to be considered	n/a	yes
	Access and Permits?		D.11	yes and no
	Funding Secured?		C.1-2	yes

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

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

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria

(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities) *Points awarded if N/A*

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

Project Sponsor
Heritage Ranch CSD

Project Name:
DBP Reduction Project

Screening Criteria

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Yes/no
	Construction Completed by 12/31/2026	If "no", the project is ineligible	C.4	yes
	CEQA & NEPA Complete?	Multiple "no" responses may affect the project's ability to be considered	n/a	yes
	Access and Permits?		D.11	yes and no(?)
	Funding Secured?		C.1-2	yes

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

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

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities) *Points awarded if N/A*

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

Project Sponsor
Nipomo CSD

Project Name:
Eureka Well Project

Screening Criteria

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Yes/no
	Construction Completed by 12/31/2026	If "no", the project is ineligible	C.4	yes
	CEQA & NEPA Complete?	Multiple "no" responses may affect the project's ability to be considered	n/a	yes
	Access and Permits?		D.11	yes and no
	Funding Secured?		C.1-2	yes

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

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

Competitive Process & Project Readiness Criteria
(PSP Attachment 7 & RWMG Priorities) *Points awarded if N/A*

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



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

Working Group Meeting

October 24, 2025

Motion Statement: Recommend the following project scores:
4 for the City of Pismo Beach, Well 23 Replacement
8 for City of San Luis Obispo, Groundwater Cleanup Project
8 for Heritage Ranch CSD, DBP Reduction Project
6 for Nipomo CSD, Eureka Well Project

Motion: Los Osos CSD

Second Motion: San Miguel CSD

Comments:

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Los Osos CSD	X			
Oceano CSD	X			
San Miguel CSD	X			
TOTAL	3	-	-	-

Motion Statement: Recommend the following projects and funding to the full RWMG to consider recommending to the Board of Supervisors for to Replace Project 3 in the Prop. 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant:
City of Pismo Beach – Well 23 Replacement - \$0
City of San Luis Obispo – Groundwater Cleanup Project - \$507,070
Heritage Ranch CSD – DBP Reduction Project - \$492,930
Nipomo CSD – Eureka Well Project - \$0

Motion: Oceano CSD

Second Motion: Los Osos CSD

Comments:

RWMG Working Group Member	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Los Osos CSD	X			
Oceano CSD	X			
San Miguel CSD	X			
TOTAL	3	-	-	-