

## **Attachment 2: Draft Project Review Template and Criteria Contents**

**Attachment 2A** – Draft Revised Project Template

**Attachment 2B** – Scoring Used in Past Project Submittals and Point Allocation  
by Project Category Tables (Table No. 1 – 4)

**Attachment 2C** – Current Criteria Used for Past Project Evaluation Process

**Attachment 2D** – Excerpt from 2012 Guidelines “Project Review Process”

FOR THE PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW

1. Information highlighted in yellow is also on the existing Tahoe-Sierra Project Template.
2. Information highlighted in magenta has been added as it is on the Project Template but not in the K/J template.
3. Information not highlighted is an addition to the original Tahoe-Sierra Project Form.

## Draft Revised Project Template

Please provide information in the tables below:

**I. Project Proponent Information**

<b>Lead Agency/ Organization</b>	
<b>Name of Primary Contact</b>	
<b>Mailing Address</b>	
<b>E-mail</b>	
<b>Phone (###)###-####</b>	
<b>Other Cooperating Agencies/Organizations/Stakeholders</b>	(SC) – Formal Partners/Regional Plan
<b>Is your agency committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain</b>	

**II. General Project Information**

<b>Project Title</b>	
<b>Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less, including scientific basis and if “Green Technology” is used)</b>	(SC) – Uses alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, and more energy efficient systems. Assessment completed for scientific basis.
<b>Does this project contribute to a larger Project? If so provide description.</b>	(SC) – Formal Partners/Regional Plan
<b>Project Location:</b>	(SC) – Project located within the Region
<b>Latitude:</b>	
<b>Longitude:</b>	
<b>Project Location Description:</b>	

(SC) = Scoring Criteria

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

FOR THE PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW

1. Information highlighted in yellow is also on the existing Tahoe-Sierra Project Template.
2. Information highlighted in magenta has been added as it is on the Project Template but not in the K/J template.
3. Information not highlighted is an addition to the original Tahoe-Sierra Project Form.

<b>Project Status (Check only one)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Conceptual <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input type="checkbox"/> CEQA/NEPA <input type="checkbox"/> Permitting <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> Construction/Implementation <input type="checkbox"/> Study/Other <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance/Monitoring
<b>Political Support – Provide related MOUs, agreements or TACs currently in place.</b>	
<b>Earliest expected start date (mm/dd/yr) (Schedule and Readiness to Proceed)</b>	<b>(SC) – Implement/construction within next two years, three years or greater than three years</b>

**III. Plan Objectives Addressed**

For each of the objectives addressed by the project, provide a one to two sentence description of how the project contributes to attaining the objective. If the project does not address any of the draft IRWM plan objectives, provide a one to two sentence description of how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity of the region.

<b>Objective(s) that the Project will help accomplish:</b>	<b>(SC) – Project relevance to IRWMP number of objectives met.</b>
<b>Explanation of Project linkage to objectives</b>	
<b>How will the project be measured to ensure the objectives are being fulfilled?</b>	

(SC) = Scoring Criteria

## FOR THE PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW

1. Information highlighted in yellow is also on the existing Tahoe-Sierra Project Template.
2. Information highlighted in magenta has been added as it is on the Project Template but not in the K/J template.
3. Information not highlighted is an addition to the original Tahoe-Sierra Project Form.

**IV. Resource Management Strategies**

For each resource management strategy employed by the project, provide a one to two sentence description in the table below of how the project incorporates the strategy. A description of the Resource Management Strategies can be found in Volume 2 of the 2009 California Water Plan here:

<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/cwpu2009/index.cfm>

<b>Reduce Water Demand</b>	
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	
Urban Water Use Efficiency	
<b>Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers</b>	
Conveyance - Delta	
Conveyance - Regional / local	
System Reoperation	
Water Transfers	
<b>Increase Water Supply</b>	
Conjunctive Management & Groundwater	
Desalination	
Precipitation Enhancement	
Recycled Municipal Water	
Surface Storage -- CALFED	
Surface Storage -- Regional / Local	
<b>Improve Water Quality</b>	
Drinking Water Treatment and Distribution	
Groundwater and Aquifer Remediation	
Matching Water Quality to Use	
Pollution Prevention	
Salt and Salinity Management	
Urban Runoff Management	
<b>Practice Resources Stewardship</b>	
Agricultural Lands Stewardship	
Economic Incentives (Loans, Grants, and Water Pricing)	
Ecosystem Restoration	
Forest Management	
Land Use Planning and Management	
Recharge Areas Protection	
Water-dependent Recreation	
Watershed Management	
<b>Improve Flood Management</b>	
Flood Risk Management	

**(SC)** = Scoring Criteria

FOR THE PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW

1. Information highlighted in yellow is also on the existing Tahoe-Sierra Project Template.
2. Information highlighted in magenta has been added as it is on the Project Template but not in the K/J template.
3. Information not highlighted is an addition to the original Tahoe-Sierra Project Form.

**V. Project Impacts and Benefits (SC)- Community Benefit**

Please select all the project benefit categories that apply and provide a brief explanation. If the project benefits do not fit any of the listed categories, please explain in the box below. Suggested benefit descriptions are included in the Project Information Form instructions sheet.

Benefit Categories:		Brief Explanation of Selected Benefits	Quantification (e.g. acre-feet of water supplied, acres of habitat restored)
Increase Water Supply	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Improve Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Groundwater Improvements	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Water Conservation and Reuse	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Watershed Rehabilitation	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Habitat Improvements	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Flood Management	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Other Benefits:

(SC) = Scoring Criteria

FOR THE PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW

1. Information highlighted in yellow is also on the existing Tahoe-Sierra Project Template.
2. Information highlighted in magenta has been added as it is on the Project Template but not in the K/J template.
3. Information not highlighted is an addition to the original Tahoe-Sierra Project Form.

-----  
 Please provide a summary of the expected project benefits and impacts in the table below.

<b>a. Describe any expected impacts of the project</b>	
<b>b. If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to Native American Tribal Community considerations.</b>	
<b>c. If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to Disadvantaged Communities*.</b>	<b>(SC) – Project benefits disadvantaged community</b>
<b>d. If applicable, describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to Environmental Justice ** considerations.</b>	
<b>e. If applicable, describe how the project assists the region in adapting to effects of climate change.</b>	
<b>f. If applicable, describe the generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project.</b>	

\*A Disadvantaged Community is defined as a community with an annual median household (MHI) income that is less than 80 percent of the Statewide annual MHI.

\*\* Environmental Justice is defined as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies.

**(SC)** = Scoring Criteria

FOR THE PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW

1. Information highlighted in yellow is also on the existing Tahoe-Sierra Project Template.
2. Information highlighted in magenta has been added as it is on the Project Template but not in the K/J template.
3. Information not highlighted is an addition to the original Tahoe-Sierra Project Form.

**VI. Project Cost and Financing** - Please provide any estimates of project cost, sources of funding, and operation and maintenance costs as well as the source of the project cost in the table below.

<b>a. Project Costs</b>		
<b>1. Capital (2013 Dollars)</b>		
<b>2. Annual Operations and Maintenance (O&amp;M)</b>		
<b>b. List secured source(s) of funding</b>	<b>Source(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
	(SC) - % of matching funds	
<b>c. List proposed source(s) of funding and certainty of the sources.</b>		
<b>d. For capital projects, explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed.</b>		
<b>e. Basis for project cost</b>		
<b>f. Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?</b>	(SC) – Cost benefit analysis completed	
<b>g. Can a detailed cost estimate be provided upon request?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>h. Please describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded</b>	(SC) – Safety, public health impaired water body, or flood risk.	

**VII. Project Status and Schedule** -Please provide a status of the project, level of completion as well as a description of the activities planned for each project stage.

Project Stage	Description of Activities in Each Project Stage	Planned/Actual Start Date	Planned/Actual Completion Date
<b>a. Conceptual</b>			
<b>b. Planning</b>			
<b>c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA/NEPA)</b>			
<b>d. Permitting</b>			
<b>e. Tribal Consultation</b>			
<b>f. Design</b>			
<b>g. Construction/Implementation</b>			

(SC) = Scoring Criteria

## FOR THE PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW

1. Information highlighted in yellow is also on the existing Tahoe-Sierra Project Template.
2. Information highlighted in magenta has been added as it is on the Project Template but not in the K/J template.
3. Information not highlighted is an addition to the original Tahoe-Sierra Project Form.

**VIII. Project Technical Feasibility**

Please provide any related documents (date, title, author, and page numbers) that describe and confirm the technical feasibility of the project.

<b>a. List water planning documents that specifically identify this project.</b>	<b>(SC) – How project is relevant to other plans.</b>
<b>b. List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plans, Habitat Conservation Plans, etc.)</b>	
<b>c. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project.</b>	
<b>d. If you are an Urban Water Supplier:</b>	
<b>1. Have you completed an Urban Water Management Plan and submitted to DWR?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b>2. Are you in compliance with AB1420?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b>3. Do you comply with the water meter requirements (CWC §525)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b>4. If the answer to any of the questions above is “no”, do you intend to comply prior to receiving Project funding</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b>e. If you are an Agricultural Water Supplier:</b>	
<b>1. Have you completed and submitted an AWMP (due 12/31/12)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b>2. If not, will you complete and submit an AWMP prior to receiving project funding?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b>f. If the project is related to groundwater:</b>	
<b>1. Has a GWMP been completed and submitted for the subject basin?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<b>2. If not will a GWMP be completed within 1 year of the grant submittal date?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

(SC) = Scoring Criteria





**Tahoe-Sierra IRWM Current Project Criteria Point Allocation by  
Project Category (Used for Past Project Evaluation)**

**Table 2. Point Allocation for Water Projects**

Criteria	Point Allocation
Disadvantaged Community	2=Yes, 1=Partial, 0=No
Community Benefit	1 Point for Each - Water Conservation, Water Supply/Reliability, Fire Protection, Consolidation
Cost Benefit Analysis	Determine Cost per person served.Cost/# Served.Include other cost/benefit analysis not captured e.g. energy saving 1 = Have done Cost/Benefit Analysis, 0 = No Cost/Benefit Analysis
Shovel Ready	3=Implement/Construct in 2011, 2=Implement/Construct in 2012/2013, 1=Implement in 2014 or after
Relevance to Plan	3=Meets 3 goals or strategies, 2=Meets 2 goals or strategies, 1=Meets 1 goal or strategy
Other Funds	2=25% match, 1=10% match, 0=no match
Partners	2=Formal partners/Regional Plan Inclusion, 1=Informal partners, 0=no partners
Green Technology	2=Uses many forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, 1=Uses some forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, & some energy efficient systems, 0= Uses nothing

**Table 3. Point Allocation for Stormwater Projects**

Criteria	Point Allocation
Scientific Backing (National or local)	3=Assessment AND equivalent proj, 2=Assessment OR equivalent proj, 1=No assessment or equivalent proj
Cost Investment/ Benefit Analysis	3=Targets defined & comparable to baseline, 2=Targets defined but not comparable to baseline, 1=No targets
Readiness to Proceed	3=Certain Implement begins this year, 2=Good chance to implement this year, definitely implement next year,
Rlvnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	3=Meets 3 goals or strategies, 2=Meets 2 goals or strategies, 1=Meets 1 goals or strategies
Rlvnc to State Water Plan, Other Plans	3=Yes, and also describes how the project is relevant, 2=Yes, but only list, 1=No relevant plans listed
Other Funds	3=25% + match, 2=10 to 25% match, 1=No match
If Not Funded	3=Safety, public health, impaired WB, Flood, or T&E risk , 2=Lose matching funds, 1=Missed opportunity
Partners	3=Formal partners (funding, letter of agreement, letter of intention, MOU, contract, etc.), 2=Informal partners (letters of support, etc.), 1=no partners
Green Tech	3=Uses many forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, hand crews, local sources for labor and/or materials, 2=uses some alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, small amount of hand crew work, some local materials and labor, 1=Uses nothing
Other items of integration to be noted in priority list	3=3 or more: DAC, FP, FC, Drought, Bi-State value, TROA, Fire Suppression, TMDL, 2=2 items 1=1item
Geographical Area	3=no pts, 2=One project in the geographic watershed, 1=Two projects in the geographic watershed
Number of Projects Submitted	3=Only one project submitted, 2=Only two projects submitted, 1=Only three projects submitted

**Table 4. Point Allocation for Restoration Projects**

Criteria	Point Allocation
Community Benefit	1 Point for Each - Water Conservation, Water Supply/Reliability, Fire Protection, Consolidation
Scientific Backing (National or local)	3=Assessment AND equivalent proj, 2=Assessment OR equivalent proj, 1=No assessment or equivalent proj
Cost Investment/ Benefit Analysis	3=Targets defined & comparable to baseline, 2=Targets defined but not comparable to baseline, 1=No targets
Readiness to Proceed	3=Certain Implement begins this year, 2=Good chance to implement this year, definitely implement next year,
Rlvnc to Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	3=Meets 3 goals or strategies, 2=Meets 2 goals or strategies, 1=Meets 1 goals or strategies
Other Funds	2=25% match, 1=10% match, 0=no match
If Not Funded	3=Safety, public health, impaired WB, Flood, or T&E risk , 2=Lose matching funds, 1=Missed opportunity
Partners	3=Formal partners (funding, letter of agreement, letter of intention, MOU, contract, etc.), 2=Informal partners
Green Tech	3=Uses many forms of alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, hand crews, local sources for labor and/or materials, 2=uses some alternative energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, more energy efficient systems, small amount of hand crew work, some local materials and labor, 1=Uses nothing

## **Current Criteria Used for Past Project Evaluation Process: Tahoe Sierra IRWM projects**

1. **Equity (NOT USED):** as much as possible make sure that all participating partners are able to get one project in for submittal. Equity regarding distribution amongst IRWM region should also be considered.
2. **Community Benefit:** Overall, how large a population or areas will the proposed project serve to benefit once implemented? These aspects should be taken into consideration when prioritizing projects. Also is there large opposition or support within community for proposed project? If opposition is strong, we should be asking why. Identify if in a Disadvantaged community.
3. **Scientific Backing:** How much research has been conducted related to proposed project? Does the project have the scientific backing necessary to justify project in application and submittal to funding agencies?
4. **Cost/Benefit Analysis:** What are the specific targets that proposed project will achieve once implemented? Should there be some kind of cost/benefit analysis for project proposals? (i.e. how much benefit will be achieved per \$ cost requested from funding agency) Cost/Benefit may be measured by # of people benefiting, # of acres restored, # of gallons of water conserved, etc.
5. **Readiness to Proceed:** Is the project ready to move forward, or is implementation of project components still a number of years off? Projects ready to move forward by estimated application date should receive priority. Environmental status (CEQA?), phased projects, should all be described. What is the expected timeline and estimated completion date of project? Current projects should be ready to be implemented within a 5 year timeframe.
6. **Relevance to Plan:** Relevance to currently adopted Tahoe Sierra plan and regional goals, objectives and management strategies should be considered. Project prioritization should be considered based on the # of management strategies that the proposed project meets as well as the # of short and long term priorities under each established objective. Given the understanding that future funding guidelines may change, our current plan is what we have to go on.
7. **Other Funds:** Are there other funds available for project implementation? How much of the project is expected to be funded through grant monies? Projects with higher amounts of matching dollar funds may be given a higher priority where funders require it. Identify where other funds are coming from and the total amount of other funds.
8. **Repercussions if Project not Funded:** What will the repercussions be to local community, organization or environment if project is not funded through Prop 84 monies? If the group agrees that this should be a component of the decision making process, this may be a consideration for project prioritization.
9. **Partnering:** Is there a possibility to partner with other participating agencies and potentially combine projects into one proposal submittal? If so, this may be a consideration for prioritization.
10. **Green Technology:** Does the project implement any green technology, energy savings, use alternate energy sources, etc. Describe any of these components.

**11. Disadvantaged Community: (Narrative Needed)**

**12. Relevance to State Water Plan and other Plans: (Narrative Needed)**

**13. Geographical Area: (Narrative Needed)**

**Other criteria required per 2012 Guidelines**

- **How the project is related to resource management strategies**
- **Specific Benefits to critical water issues for Native American tribal communities**
- **Contribution of project in adapting to the effects of climate change**
- **Contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives**

the IRWM planning region; and how both aid in water management in the region. This may mean that watershed health as well as drinking water distribution systems are components of the water system being managed in the IRWM planning effort. IRWM regions must consider how water enters and leaves their IRWM region when defining IRWM boundaries and identifying stakeholders.

### ***PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION INTEGRATION***

IRWM planning decisions can lead to existing or “off the shelf” projects being combined or replaced by new and/or different projects. Part of the advantage of regional planning is addressing similar objectives of local interests with a regional project. Resources of personnel, finance, and equipment to implement multiple smaller efforts may benefit from economy of scale when similar local interests can be met with a regional project. IRWM plans must contain provisions for reviewing project objectives and considering new, expanded, or even different solutions that meet multiple local needs. The planning decisions made in the IRWM Plan must consider integrating the needs of the region and not just the needs of specific entities in the RWMG.

## **Project Review Process**

The intent of the Project Review Process Standard is to ensure the process used for submitting, reviewing, and selecting projects is documented and understandable for regional stakeholders and the public. The standard is intended to produce a list of prioritized implementation projects sufficiently developed and demonstrating appropriate need that can be funded through the IRWM Grant program (PRC §75028 (a)) or other funding opportunities.

While the specific review process is up to each RWMG to develop and document in their IRWM Plan, the process must include three components:

- (1) Procedures for submitting a project to be included in the IRWM Plan
- (2) Procedures for review of projects to implement the IRWM Plan
- (3) Procedure for communicating the list(s) of selected projects

The review process may be a collection of different processes or a single procedure, whichever fits the IRWM region best. Additionally, the review process must include multiple factors. How each factor is applied in the process is up to each RWMG to decide.

It is essential to demonstrate a well thought-out process in the IRWM Plan for decision making and data management roles within the RWMG. Will a subcommittee be responsible for approving the project list? Will each of the projects be reviewed individually for accuracy if they are sorted automatically in a database? Through what mechanism will stakeholders provide input during the submittal, review, selection process to develop the project list? How and when is the list updated and does it require re-adoption of the Plan? The IRWM Plan must clearly document the project review process and demonstrate that the process meets this standard. The projects included in the IRWM Plan are the projects that will implement the Plan and achieve the Plan objectives. The projects should represent priorities of the planning effort and represent a wise investment for State grant funding. Hence, the process should not be designed to only select based on readiness to proceed.

### ***PROCESS COMPONENTS***

#### ***(1) Procedures for submitting a project for inclusion in the IRWM Plan***

The process described in the IRWM Plan must include procedures for submitting projects to be considered for inclusion into the IRWM Plan. Documenting these procedures in the IRWM Plan will allow the RWMG and stakeholders to understand and use the process. Some RWMGs continually accept projects for consideration while others may have specific periods of project submission. Project submittal procedures typically require standardized information so each project submits the necessary information for the review process.

Submittal processes must balance efficiency with accessibility. It is acceptable to use web based submittal tools to aid submission and management of information; however, if there are project proponents that do not have access to such tools, projects of value may be excluded. In such cases, having an alternate submittal process may provide needed access.

Submittal processes must also specify what information is required to be submitted. Typically, we talk about projects as pieces that implement a plan. Should only projects at a certain stage be submitted? Are concepts, ideas, or needs for projects or programs allowed for submission? Remember that the product of the process is actions that will implement the IRWM Plan. Therefore, it may be wise to accept project concepts or ideas, as long as there is a process in place to take these concepts and ideas to fully developed implementation projects.

### **(2) Procedures for review of projects considered for inclusion into the IRWM Plan**

The standard requires that certain review factors be used in the project review process. The review factors listed in this standard speak to important points to consider in the project review process. Review factors are further explained in text below. RWMGs can use the factors in any part of the process they create and they may add various weights to factors within their process to tailor the process to their specific regional needs. **RWMGs are not limited to these review factors but they should use, at a minimum, the factors listed in this standard.**

In developing a project review process, RWMGs are cautioned that the project review process contained in the IRWM Plan **should not** contain any specific grant program related selection criteria. The purpose of identifying projects in the IRWM Plan is to understand the needed action to meet the IRWM Plan objective. Projects should not be prioritized based on any specific grant program. It can be helpful to think of the project selection process as having, at least, two phases:

- ↳ Identify projects that will be necessary to implement the IRWM Plan and
- ↳ Identify projects that may qualify for a specific funding source.

The RWMG **may apply grant criteria** when moving from the overall list of projects in the IRWM Plan to a specific grant proposal.

### **(3) Procedure for communicating the list(s) of selected projects**

The IRWM Plan must also contain the product of the project selection process, the project list(s). The project lists may be quite extensive or change over time. In such cases, it is acceptable for an IRWM Plan to contain a hyperlink or URL to where the list(s) can be viewed. At a minimum, the IRWM Plan needs to demonstrate that the selection process has been conducted and there are identified projects that will implement the IRWM Plan.

### ***REVIEW FACTORS***

The following is a discussion of the factors that a project review process should employ when considering projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan:

#### *A. How the project contributes to the IRWM Plan objectives*

This factor asks RWMG to consider how a project relates to achieving plan objectives. As discussed in the plan standard on objectives, it is important to be able to measure how an objective is being met through projects.

#### *B. How the project is related to resource management strategies*

The IRWM Plan identifies RMS selected for use in the Plan with the goal of diversifying the water management portfolio used to meet plan objectives. Does the proposed project contribute to the diversification of the water management portfolio? If so how? If it does, that should be seen as a positive aspect of the project. If not, the project may still aid in obtaining the plan objectives; however, depending on specific circumstances of the region, a project that contributes to the diversification of the water management portfolio may be more valuable than one that does not.

### *C. Technical feasibility of the project*

The RWMG needs to consider the technical feasibility of the projects. Technical feasibility is related to the knowledge of the project location; knowledge of the water system at the project location; or with the material, methods, or processes proposed to be employed in the project. Is there enough known about the geologic conditions, hydrology, ecology, or other aspect of the system where the project is located? Are there data gaps that require additional studies to develop the project? In examining the methods, materials, or equipment used in the project, are there sufficient technical data to indicate the methods and systems employed in the project will result in a successful outcome? Success of a project is the realization of claimed benefit. For example, if a project is claiming a certain amount of recharge to the aquifer, is there enough known about the hydrogeologic characteristics to support the project claim of the quantity of recharge, and is the proposed method of recharge supported by technical data that indicate those methods will be successful?

### *D. Specific benefits to critical DAC water issues*

The project review process must consider if the project helps to address critical water supply and water quality needs of DACs within the IRWM region. CWC §10540.(c)(7) states that identification and consideration of water-related needs of DACs in the area within the boundaries of a region is among the basic items an IRWM Plan must address. DAC projects may include work that leads to a formal project such as a needs assessment, initial engineering work (design or study) to define a project, or feasibility studies that may lead to a project. Projects that specifically address such needs should be promoted in the project selection process. See Appendix G for additional information regarding DACs.

### *E. Specific benefits to critical water issues for Native American tribal communities*

The project review process must consider if the project helps to address critical water supply and water quality needs of Native American tribal communities within the IRWM region. Such projects may include work that leads to a formal project such as a needs assessment, initial engineering work (design or study) to define a project, or feasibility studies that may lead to a project. Projects that specifically address such needs should be promoted in the project selection process.

### *F. Environmental Justice Considerations*

As IRWM plans contain multiple projects that will affect stakeholders in the region, the project review process needs to include consideration of EJ concerns. EJ seeks to redress inequitable distribution of environmental burdens (i.e. pollution, industrial facilities) and access to environmental goods (i.e. clean water and air, parks, recreation, nutritious foods, etc.). EJ relies on willing awareness of impacts by project proponents and participation in decision making by affected stakeholders. In terms of an IRWM effort, the engagement and participation of stakeholders including DACs in the decision making process can be a proactive step in understanding project impacts that can become EJ concerns. In the project review process, a project that has not been examined for EJ concerns, or a project that is discovered to have EJ concerns, should not be instantly dismissed from consideration. However, addressing the lack of EJ assessment or modifying the project to mitigate EJ concerns may allow the project to move forward.

### *G. Project Costs and Financing*

Project costs need to be considered during the project review process. The basis for the project costs needs to be documented in the IRWM Plan. For example, a sewage treatment plant upgrade is based on a conceptual idea, feasibility study, partial design, etc. If a cost estimate has been prepared for the project, a link to that estimate needs to be included in the IRWM Plan. Discuss the funding sources for the project. Is it with a State grant funded program, through regional assessments, or another funding method?

### *H. Economic Feasibility*

As part of the project review process, the economic feasibility of a project should be considered. DWR's "Draft Economic Analysis Guidebook" (Guidebook), published in January 2008, outlines methods for economic analysis for water resources planning and can be downloaded from the link found in Appendix A.

A preliminary economic analysis must be included as part of the criteria in the project selection process based upon an original assessment of the proposed project or studies conducted within the past five years and updated to most current data available. Either a cost-effectiveness or benefit-cost analysis may be used for the preliminary assessment depending on the nature of the project. Both of these methods are outlined in Chapter 3 of the Guidebook. For example, a cost-effectiveness analysis may be preferable for habitat restoration projects for which it is difficult to assign monetary benefits. The chosen method of analysis must include the types of benefits and types of costs including capital costs, O&M costs, and potential adverse effects to others from the project, described in the Guidebook (See Guidebook pages 14 and 22).

#### *I. Project Status*

In reviewing projects for prioritization in the IRWM Plan, the RWMG should consider the status of the project. Project status is equivalent to readiness to proceed. Readiness to proceed or project status is not necessarily a reason for project exclusion from an IRWM Plan. As the planning horizon for an IRWM Plan is 20-years or more, even a conceptual project should be considered as it may be projected to have benefits that would be worth realizing by developing the project or by leading towards an alternate, integrated, or modified project.

Project status may have to be reconsidered as implementation projects are matched with sources of funding. Funding sources may want projects completed within certain time limits. However, it is also true that some funding sources may cover some developmental phase of a project. RWMGs are encouraged to understand conditions of the specific funding sources they use so they can select programs, projects, or project components most appropriate for a specific funding source.

#### *J. Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan implementation*

One of the advantages of IRWM planning is to use the regional perspective to leverage any efficiency that might be gained by combining or modifying local projects into regional projects. In reviewing projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan, the RWMG must consider a project's merit in light of strategic aspects of plan implementation such as:

- ↪ Purposefully restructuring or integrating projects
- ↪ Purposefully implementing a project as is
- ↪ Purposefully meeting project goals with an alternative project/modified project
- ↪ Plan objective priorities
- ↪ Purposefully implementing regional projects
- ↪ Purposefully implementing projects with multi-benefits

Often times, an IRWM Plan in early development stages may focus on just getting project solicitations implemented and producing a project list. RWMGs are encouraged to go further and take a look at strategic considerations as there may be benefit for multiple stakeholders. This factor acknowledges that there may be benefit in integrating local projects or project goals in developing regional projects. There is also value in examining projects for potential integration efforts and then deciding that a project is best implemented as submitted to achieve plan implementation. DWR expects RWMGs to take advantage of regional planning and integrating projects where possible, and explaining when a single purpose project needs to be implemented in order to best implement an IRWM Plan.

#### *K. Contribution of the project in adapting to the effects of climate change*

In developing the picture of water management issues over the planning horizon, RWMGs must include potential effects of climate change on their region and consider if adaptations to their water management system are necessary. The standard on climate change contains more specific instructions assessing effects of climate change and adaptation to that change.



*L. Contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives*

The IRWM Plan must span at least a 20-year planning horizon. In the State's effort to adapt to climate change and reduce GHG emissions, the RWMG needs to consider a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented. Considerations include energy efficiency and reduction of GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives. See the guidance on Climate Change below, for more discussion on this topic.

## Impacts and Benefits

The intent of this standard is to document potential impacts and benefits of implementation of the IRWM Plan and to clearly communicate those impacts and benefits to stakeholders. The IRWM Plan must contain a screening level discussion of the potential impacts and benefits of plan implementation. The screening level analysis should help any reader of the IRWM Plan begin to understand the potential impacts and benefits of implementing the IRWM Plan. This means the benefit/impact analysis does not have to be extensive or exhaustive.

In the development of an IRWM Plan, it is likely that participants understand the potential benefits to be gained by implementing a regional plan and some of the impacts that may occur. One assumption regarding this standard is that extensive impact and benefit analyses usually occur closer to project implementation than plan development. The list of implementation projects may change as the IRWM planning effort matures; consequently, it may be difficult if not impractical to provide an extensive analysis of impacts and benefits within the IRWM Plan.

The impact and benefit analysis in the IRWM Plan should also serve as a benchmark as the Plan is implemented and Plan performance is evaluated; that is, have the potential benefits been realized or have unanticipated impacts occurred? Since a simplified impact and benefit analysis is included in the IRWM Plan, the Plan must clearly state when more detailed project-specific impact and benefit analyses will occur and that the more detailed analysis will occur prior to any implementation activity.

Many IRWM Plans present and discuss tables of the potential impacts and benefits of Plan implementation. Often times the building blocks of this information are the potential impacts and benefits anticipated from implementing projects. RWMGs may want to organize potential impacts and benefits to emphasize different aspects of their Plan, such as regional benefits, local benefits, by resource management strategy, or objective.

In presenting impacts and benefits information in an IRWM Plan, RWMGs should consider using tables to convey the potential impacts and benefits in an organized, understandable fashion. An example of a table, which shows impacts and benefits specific to the IRWM Plan, is shown below: