

2014 Project Ranking Criteria For Projects Included in the Greater Monterey County IRWM Plan

*(Project Ranking Criteria approved by Regional Water Management Group September 21, 2011,
with amendments through January 10, 2014)*

The State Department of Water Resources requires that Regional Water Management Groups prioritize the projects included within their Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plans as part of the Proposition 84 IRWM Grant Program requirements. This is not an easy process, and different IRWM regions throughout the state have come up with different systems for prioritizing their projects. The idea is to develop a project ranking system that is objective and fair, and that can be systematically applied to all projects with the end result being an objectively ranked numerical listing of projects.

All implementation projects included in the Greater Monterey County IRWM Plan will be ranked relative to one another through this project ranking system. Concept proposals will not be ranked (and will not be eligible for grant funding). It is important to keep in mind that *the final ranked project list will not necessarily dictate which projects get submitted for funding through the IRWM Grant Program or through other funding sources* but is merely a tool to help the Regional Water Management Group and the State evaluate the many projects within our region. At the top of that list will be the projects that 1) best meet the region's goals and objectives, and that 2) best meet the objectives of the State's IRWM Grant Program. Those are the projects that will be most competitive for State IRWM grant funds.

The project ranking process takes into consideration the following factors:

1. *Objectives:* How well a project addresses the Greater Monterey County IRWM Region's goals/objectives
2. *Integration:* How well a project incorporates "integration"
3. *Project Need:* Recognition of special or urgent need
4. *Overall Strength of Project:* Strength of project in terms of its technical feasibility, project costs, and work plan
5. *DACs/Environmental Justice:* How well a project addresses a critical need of a disadvantaged community (DAC) and/or environmental justice concerns

Each of these factors is weighted. The following table shows the relative weighting of each of the five factors, and the maximum number of points that a project can achieve for the various criteria within each category (with 100 being the total maximum number of points possible):

Table 1. Project Ranking - Summary of Points

Category	Criteria	Maximum Potential Points
Objectives = 40%	Regional objectives (in the IRWM Plan)	40
Integration = 20%	Strength of benefits, and whether there are <i>multiple</i> benefits	10
	Resource management strategies	2
	Partnerships	4
	Regionalism	4
Project Need = 10%	Special/urgent need	10
Overall Strength of Project = 20%	Technical feasibility	8
	Project costs/financing	6
	Work Plan	6
DACs/EJ = 10%	Addresses critical need of DAC and/or environmental justice	10
TOTAL		100

The table below describes the scoring methodology in more detail:

Table 2. How Projects are Scored

Category	Explanation of Scoring
Objectives	There are 7 goals and 57 regional objectives in the IRWM Plan. Projects are scored on a scale of 0-5 based on how many and how well the regional objectives are addressed, with 285 points being the maximum possible. Then, projects are ranked “on a curve”: projects are assigned points relative to each other, so that the project with the most objectives addressed gets the full amount of points possible (40), and a project with half those objectives gets half those points (20). ¹ Points are awarded for the relative number of objectives addressed.
Integration	Integration includes the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Benefits (max 10 points) - Resource Management Strategies (max 2 points) - Partnerships (max 4 points) - Regionalism (max 4 points) Points are awarded (on a sliding scale) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Project Benefits</u>: A project can receive up to 10 extra points to the extent that it demonstrates water supply, water quality, flood reduction, and/or other benefits. No points if only “minimal” benefits are demonstrated. - <u>Resource Management Strategies</u>: A project can receive up to 2 extra points for using a diverse mix of strategies, or for using a resource management strategy that most other projects do not (i.e., contributing to the diversification of the region’s water management portfolio). No points for using just one strategy. - <u>Partnerships</u>: A project can receive up to 4 extra points if it demonstrates multiple partnerships, based on diversity and number of partners. No points if

¹ Here’s the formula: Take the highest raw score for objectives and divide that number by 40 (e.g., for 2011 projects, the highest score for objectives for any one project was 127. That divided by 40 is 3.175. Then divide each project’s raw objectives score by 3.175).

	<p>there are no partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regionalism: A project can receive up to 4 extra points if it demonstrates regional (vs. local) benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 point: Benefits 8-digit HUC or smaller area - 2 points: Benefits 3-digit hydrologic unit code (HUC) area - 3 points: Benefits entire IRWM Plan region - 4 points: Benefits extend beyond the IRWM Plan region
Project Need	A project can receive up to 10 extra points (on a sliding scale) if there is a recognized special or urgent need. These are used as “bonus” points; i.e., projects with “average” need receive no points.
Overall Strength of Project	<p>This category recognizes the overall strength of a project in terms of its technical feasibility, project costs/financing, and work plan. The maximum potential score in this category is 20, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical feasibility (0-8 points) - Project costs/financing (0-6 points) - Work plan (0-6 points)
DACs/ Environmental Justice	A project can receive up to 10 extra points if it addresses a <i>critical</i> water resource need of a disadvantaged community, or if a project addresses an environmental justice concern.

All implementation projects in the IRWM Plan are ranked according to this process. The result is a ranked Project List, which is then approved by the Regional Water Management Group and officially incorporated into the IRWM Plan. The latest ranked Project List is posted on the Greater Monterey County IRWM website: <http://www.greatermontereyirwmp.org/projects/proposed/>

SELECTING PROJECTS FOR IRWM GRANT FUNDS

Whenever an IRWM grant solicitation is announced, the Regional Water Management Group must decide which projects to put forward to the California Department of Water Resources on behalf of the Greater Monterey County region. Only a limited number of projects can be submitted in any one round. To make this decision, the Regional Water Management Group will begin with the ranked Project List and select:

- Only those projects that are ready to proceed.
- Only those projects whose project proponents have adopted, or have committed to adopting, the IRWM Plan (the Proposition 84/1E IRWM Program Guidelines stipulate that each project proponent named in an IRWM Grant application must adopt the IRWM Plan).
- Only those projects for which project proponents are able to provide certainty of landowner support.

Several additional factors are then taken into consideration to help develop a competitive application package for State IRWM grant funds. Factors include: project costs relative to the amount of funding available, economic costs and benefits (based on a preliminary economic analysis), how well the projects address IRWM Program preferences, and how well projects can be integrated to address regional needs and provide the most benefit to the region. The desired outcome is an application package comprised of several projects that, together, will help implement the objectives of the Plan, will provide multiple and regional benefits for the Greater Monterey County IRWM region, and that will be most competitive on a State level for IRWM (and other) grant funds.