


Meeting #7




May 16, 2007

Ground Rules

- Turn off cell phones or put on vibrate
- Limit side conversations
- Wear a regional hat or tell us if you can't
- Put your stake in the ground and be willing to move it
- Encourage even participation
- No monologues
- Use microphones
- Allow at least two people speak before re-speaking
- Tap on table to show agreement or to indicate support of a statement
- We know we have flaws, tell us how to make things better

2

Where Are We Now?



3

RMC

Revised Prioritization Process

4

RMC

Agenda

- RAC Comments
- Straw Man Prioritization Proposal
- Discussion and Decisions

5

RMC

Comments Received from the RAC

- Additional criteria should be considered at the Plan level
- Process should reduce the pool of projects further
- Process is too complicated/confusing and should be simplified

6

RMC

Comments Received from the RAC

- Add Strategies:
 - Environmental strategies from Prop 50
 - Ecosystem protection
- Include Criteria:
 - Multiple watersheds
 - Degree of benefit (acres restored, amount of supply, etc)
 - Inclusion in an existing plan
 - Sustainability
 - Creating new water supply

7

RMC

Major Changes to Plan Prioritization Respond to Overarching Comments

- Added scoring criteria & strategies
 - Environmental strategies from Prop 50 (Plan Scoring)
 - Ecosystem protection (Plan Scoring)
 - Multiple watersheds (Plan Scoring)
 - Degree of benefit (Plan Screening and Scoring, Qualitative Evaluation)
 - Inclusion in an existing plan (Plan Scoring)
 - Sustainability (Qualitative Evaluation)
 - Creates new supply
- Ranked projects and designated top 33rd percentile as “Top Tier”
- Simplified by establishing clear, transparent criteria

8

RMC


Agenda

- RAC Comments
- Straw Man Prioritization Proposal
- Discussion and Decisions

9

RMC

Straw Man Proposal



10

RMC

Plan Prioritization Includes both Screening and Scoring Criteria

- Screening Criteria
 - IRWM Plan Objectives
 - IRWM Plan Targets
 - Prior Phases Submitted
 - Insurmountable Constraints
- Scoring Criteria
 - Multiple Objectives
 - Multiple Hydrologic Units
 - Multiple Strategies
 - Identified in Existing Plan
 - Multiple Entities Involved
 - Linked to Other Projects
 - Benefits DACs
 - Addresses Environmental Justice Concerns
 - Creates new water supply

11

RMC


Plan Screening Criteria are Assessed on a Pass-Fail Basis

- Addresses Plan Objectives
 - Fail = omitted from Plan
- Addresses at least one plan target
 - Fail = Tier 2 project
- No prior phases submitted
 - Fail = Tier 2 project
- No insurmountable constraints
 - Applicant authorized to implement
 - No known insurmountable legal or regulatory constraints
 - Fail = Tier 2 project

12

RMC


Plan level: Projects are Screened, then Ranked into Tiers



13

RMG

Overview of Straw Man Scoring




14

RMG

Applying Scoring Criteria

- Addresses Multiple Objectives
 - 12 = Addresses 4+ Objectives
 - 9 = Addresses 3 Objectives
 - 6 = Addresses 2 Objectives
 - 3 = Addresses 1 Objectives
- Integrates Multiple Strategies
 - 12 = Addresses 8+ Strategies
 - 9 = Addresses 6-7 Strategies
 - 6 = Addresses 4-5 Strategies
 - 3 = Addresses 2-3 Strategies
- Spans Multiple Hydrologic Units
 - 8 = Addresses 11 Hydrologic Units
 - 6 = Addresses 7-10 Hydrologic Units
 - 4 = Addresses 3-6 Hydrologic Units
 - 2 = Addresses 2 Hydrologic Units



15

RMC

Applying Scoring Criteria

- Identified in Existing Plan
 - 8 = Yes
 - 0 = No
- Involves More than One Entity
 - 4 = Yes
 - 0 = No
- Linked to Other Projects
 - 4 = Yes
 - 0 = No
- Directly Benefits Disadvantaged Communities
 - 4 = Yes
 - 0 = No
- Addresses Environmental Justice Concerns
 - 4 = Yes
 - 0 = No
- Creates New Supply
 - 4 = Yes
 - 0 = No



16

RMC

Preliminary Results from Straw Man Plan Prioritization

- Refer to preliminary prioritized project list handout

17

RMC

Discussion Objectives

- Do you understand the process?
 - If not, then what is unclear and how can it be adjusted?
- Are there bad projects in Tier 1 and better projects in Tier 2?
 - What is good or bad about the project(s)?
- Are we using the right criteria?
 - If not, then what are we missing?
- Are we using the right weighting?
 - If not, then what should we be using?

18

RMC

Agenda

- RAC Comments
- Straw Man Prioritization Proposal
- Discussion and Decisions

19


RMC

Approach to Funding Application Prioritization

20

RMC

Tier 1 Projects in Plan are Considered for Grant Funding Applications



Funding Prioritization Also Includes both Screening and Scoring Criteria

- **Screening Criteria**
 - Requested Consideration for Funding
 - Minimum Funding Match
 - Readiness to Proceed
 - Environmental documentation complete by June 2008
 - Documentation of feasibility
 - Funding Eligibility
 - Groundwater Management Compliance
 - Implementation Component Compliance
- **Scoring Criteria**
 - Program Preferences
 - Funding Match
 - Environmental Justice or Benefit to DAC

22

RMG

RAC or RAC Workgroup will Develop the Application Package by Considering Qualitative Criteria

- Contribution to quantifiable targets/degree of benefit
 - Assists in meeting the region's measurable long-term targets
- Cost-effectiveness
 - Provides more benefit for less cost
- Down- or upcurrent benefits or disbenefits
 - Yields additional down- or upcurrent benefits or disbenefits
- Increasing benefits over time
 - Allows other projects to move forward
- Advances the planning process
 - Involves monitoring, addresses deficiencies in the region, fills data gaps, etc
- Time sensitivity/urgency
 - Immediate need for project

23

RAC or RAC Workgroup will Develop the Application Package by Considering Qualitative Criteria

- Geographic distribution
 - Distribution of projects across the region
- Funding request
 - Amount requested
- Balance across types of projects
 - Variety of strategies employed
- Balance across objectives
 - Variety of objectives addressed

24