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
Where Are We Now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Draft IRMWP Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Draft IRWMP Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 50 Step 1 Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 50 Step 2 Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Prop 50 Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Prioritization Process
Agenda

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

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
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

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
Agenda

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

Straw Man Proposal

Plan Screening — Pass
Plan Scoring & Ranking — Top 33rd Percentile
IRWMP Tier 1 Project List — Pass
Application Screening — Top 30 Projects
RAC/ RAC Workgroup Development

Fails to Meet Any Objective
Dropped from IRWMP

Fails other screen
Bottom 67th Percentile
IRWMP Tier 2 Project List

Fail
Projects Ranked >30
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

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
Plan level: Projects are Screened, then Ranked into Tiers

Plan Screening Objectives
- Targets
- Insumountable Issues
- Prior Phases

Plan Screening Targets
- PASS
- FAIL

Not In Plan

Tier 2

Plan Scoring & Ranking
- TOP
- 33rd %ile

Tier 1

Plan Screening Targets
- PASS
- FAIL

FAIL

PASS Tier 1

PASS Tier 2

Bottom 67th %ile

Overview of Straw Man Scoring

Multiple Objectives 19%
Multiple Hydrologic Units 13%
Multiple Strategies 20%
Identified in Existing Plan 13%
More than One Entity 7%
Disadvantaged Communities 7%
Environmental Justice 7%
Creates New Supply 7%
Linked to Other Projects 7%
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

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

Highest Score
Preliminary Results from Straw Man Plan Prioritization

• Refer to preliminary prioritized project list handout

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?
Agenda

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

Approach to Funding Application Prioritization
Tier 1 Projects in Plan are Considered for Grant Funding Applications

Funding Application Screening Criteria
- Requested Consideration
- Funding Match
- Ready to Proceed
- Groundwater Management Compliance
- Implementation Project

Funding Application Scoring & Ranking Criteria
- Program Preferences
- Funding Match
- Environmental Justice or Benefit to DAC

RAC/RAC Workgroup Targets
- Cost-effectiveness
- Downstream benefits
- Increasing benefits over time
- Advances the planning process
- Time sensitivity/urgency
- Geographic distribution
- Amount requested
- Balance across types of projects
- Balance across objectives

Excluded from Funding Application – Remain Tier 1

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
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

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