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

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

9/8/2025

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? Or, is project a decision support tool?	1	
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.

P1R2 Project 3 Replacement Process
Project Scoring Recommendation Summary

10/24/2025

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Eligible? (y/n)	DAC? (y/n)	Score (12 max)	Request	Recommended Award
City of Pismo Beach	Well 23 Replacement	Y	No	**0**	**$1,000,000**	
City of San Luis Obispo	Groundwater Cleanup Project	Y	No	**0**	**$1,000,000**	
Heritage Ranch CSD	DBP Reduction Project	Y	No	**0**	**$492,930**	
Nipomo CSD	Eureka Well Project	Y	No	**0**	**$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:
<agency name>

Project Name:
<project name>

Screening Criteria

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

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

	Criteria	Guidance	PIF Question	Points available	Project Score
1	Does the project address contaminant(s) listed in AD 1249? (Nitrate, Arsenic, Perchlorate, and Hexavalent Chromium)	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point)	**D.5**	1	**0**
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	• Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point)	**C.2**	1	**0**
3	Is the primary benefit claimed logical and reasional per the information in the PIF	• A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. For physcal benefits, does the narrative include references tosupporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point).	**D.1**	1	**0**
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 disad. 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 accessbile 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	**0**

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	**0**
2	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) quantifiable benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 5 of DWR's scoring? (1 point)	**D.2**	1	**0**
3	Is CEQA Complete for the project (i.e. Mitigated Engative Declartion 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	**0**
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), Encroahcment Permits, Air Polution Control Board, etc.)	• Project Sponsor has completed and obtained permits for construction. (1 point)	**D.2**	1	**0**
			Competitive Process and Readiness Subtotal:	6	**0**
			Grant Total:	12	**0**

TO: **Regional Water Management Group**

FROM: **Brendan Clark, Supervising Water Resources Engineer**

DATE: **October 24, 2025**

SUBJECT: **Item 3: Submitted Projects**

Attachments:

1. City of Pismo Beach: Well 23 Replacement Project
2. City of San Luis Obispo: Groundwater Cleanup Project
3. Heritage Ranch CSD: Disinfection Byproducts (DBP) Reduction Project
4. Nipomo CSD: Eureka Well Project

All files are available online at: https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/departments/public-works/forms-documents/committees-programs/integrated-regional-water-management-(irwm)/documents-p1r2-call-for-projects/2025-submitted-projects