Imperial IRWMP
Project Ranking Results Summary
July 13, 2012

Available Funding
Proposition 84 provided a pool of $1 billion to fund IRWM projects. $100 million was set aside for interregional projects, and the remaining $900 million is apportioned among the IRWM Funding Regions according to the Proposition 84 requirements. Total funding allocated for the Colorado River Region is $36 million. Of this amount, $14 million was awarded in the first round of grant funding, leaving a potential $22 million to be awarded in the second and third rounds. Up to $5.24 million will be awarded in the second round, and the remaining $17 million could be awarded in the third round.

Minimum required local cost share is 25 percent, though this minimum can be waived for disadvantaged communities. The number of projects that might be funded will depend on the quality of the applications throughout the Funding Area (i.e. from Mojave, Coachella, and Borrego), the maximum award (there was a $10 million cap in the first round), and the local cost share. Assuming that the Imperial Region could capture all available Round 2 funding, projects totaling $5.24 million could be funded with no local cost share (i.e. DAC projects), or up to $52.4 million assuming a 90 percent local cost share.[1]

Project Rankings
The final project rankings are reported in Table 1. The top 20 rated projects in this table have an aggregate estimated cost of $387 million. The two most expensive projects represent 64 percent of this total.

Project proponents were asked to submit information addressing the adopted evaluation criteria (performance measures). Two independent reviewers evaluated the submitted information against the criteria, and their evaluations were then compared, discussed, reconciled if they differed significantly, and then averaged. The Project Submittal Form is included herein as attachment K-1. The IRWMP Goals and Performance Measures are included as attachment K-2.

Projects were rated in four broad categories:
- How well projects met the Imperial IRWMP Goals
- Strategic considerations
- The degree to which statewide priorities are addressed
- Readiness to proceed

IRWMP Goals and their respective number of Performance Measures are as follows:
- Water Supply Goal (8 performance measures)
- Water Quality Goal (6)
- Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal (2)
- Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal (1)

[1] Comparable totals for Round 3 would be $17M and $170M, respectively for 0 and 90 percent local cost share.

Table 1- Final Project Ranking

Rank	Project Title	IRWMP Goals					Strategic Considerations	Readiness to Proceed	Statewide Priorities	Total Score	Project Cost
		Water Supply	Water Quality	Environmental	Flood	Subtotal					
Maximum Possible Points		*51*	*24*	*8*	*4*	*87*	*33*	*63*	*22*	*205.0*	
1	Keystone Water Reclamation Facility	18	10	3.5	2	33.5	12	35	19	99.5	$65,000,000
2	Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)	39.5	12	0	2	53.5	12.5	12	18	96.0	$147,440,000
3	East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)	36.5	13.5	0	2	52	10	12	19	93.0	$101,000,000
4	Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently-Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea Water Quality and Regional Air Quality	15	9	8	2	34	11.5	32.5	14.5	92.5	$5,620,000
5	City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project	19.5	9.5	0	2	31	20	26.5	14	91.5	$12,500,000
6	City of Brawley Water Meter Project	20.5	4	0	2	26.5	9	36	7	78.5	$4,000,000
7	City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project	24	10.5	0	2	36.5	12	22	7	77.5	$4,000,000
8	Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project	5.5	7.5	3	3	19	9.5	35.5	10.5	74.5	$6,149,000
9	Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture :	8.5	7	3	2	20.5	12.5	21.5	13.5	68.0	$350,000
10	Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363	9	7.5	0	4	20.5	7.5	32.5	6	66.5	$1,916,794
11	HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment	18	10	0	2	30	9	16	11	66.0	$12,500,000
12	New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project	7.5	8	7	2	24.5	5	18.5	15.5	63.5	$600,000
12	Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project	8	10	1.5	2	21.5	4.5	28.5	9	63.5	$4,100,000
14	Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG	8	9	0	2	19	4.5	32	7.5	63.0	$10,000,000
15	Holtville Water Distribution System Project	7	9.5	0	2	18.5	8.5	25.5	8.5	61.0	$3,040,000
15	Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project	10	8.5	1	4	23.5	4.5	19	14	61.0	$7,095,000
17	Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility District	6	10	0	2	18	8.5	21	7	54.5	$1,400,000
18	Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project	5	12	0	2	19	3	24	6	52.0	$540,000
19	Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project	4.5	3.5	1.5	3	12.5	3	26	6	47.5	$60,000
20	Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project	4.5	7	0	2	13.5	3	20	7	43.5	$84,000

Strategic Considerations (4 performance measures) include public acceptance, cost effectiveness, and economic development.

Statewide Priorities (8 performance measures) include such things as whether multiple benefits are provided, whether there are multiple beneficiaries, and the project's impact on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

Readiness to Proceed (6 performance measures) includes an assessment of how quickly the project could be implemented, whether environmental compliance and permitting have been completed, and whether the project has defined funding sources. Readiness to proceed was rated twice; once by the independent reviewers, and once by the Projects Working Group. The same five criteria were used; however, the independent reviewers used Performance Measure weighting scheme and a total of 38 possible points, and the Projects Working Group used an evenly weighted scheme with each Performance Measure worth 5 points or a total 25 possible points. The two readiness criteria were added together. Not all projects were rated by the Projects Working Group; those not rated received an effective score of zero.

The relative weight assigned to these categories is summarized in Table 2. Approximately 40 percent of project's score comes from how well it addresses the Imperial IRWMP Goals, and 30 percent of the score is related to its readiness to proceed.

Table 2 - Summary of Evaluation Criteria and Weighting

	Number of Criteria	Possible Points	Percent of Total Score
Imperial IRWMP Goal			
Water Supply Goal	8	51	25%
Water Quality Goal	6	24	12%
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	2	8	4%
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	1	4	2%
Strategic Considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation	4	33	16%
Readiness to Proceed			
Independent reviewers	5	38	19%
Project Working Group review		25	12%
Statewide Priorities	8	22	11%
Total	34	205	100%

Those wishing to review the detailed rating assigned to individual projects are referred to the following spreadsheet files posted on the Imperial IRMWP website (www.imperialirwmp.org):

1 – Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation.xls	Ratings by independent review team
2 – Imperial IRWMP PWG Readiness to Proceed.xls	Readiness to proceed ratings by PWG

A guide to these spreadsheets is appended below as Attachment A.

Attachment A
Guide to Project Rating Spreadsheets

The rating and ranking process for the Imperial IRWMP projects is described below. How project scores were calculated is described from start to finish, starting with Project Score Sheets and ending with the Final Ranking Table.

Project Score Sheets
The first file (1 - Imperial IRWMP Preliminary Project Evaluation.xls) contains all project score sheets and project score summaries and totals.

If you select tab '1' you will see the full review sheet, including question weights and calculations. This is representative of all project score sheets in this file. Reviewer score sheets were originally password protected and those columns hidden so reviewers could not see totals or weights to prevent any bias.

Preliminary Calculations
The first file (1 - Imperial IRWMP Preliminary Project Evaluation.xls) contains a tab titled 'Summary Calcs'. This tab summarizes information from each project tab and averages the reviewer scores.

Averaged scores are then summed categorically (e.g. Project 1 Water Quality Goal score is 10 of 24). These categorical values are then used to calculate the total project scores.

The 'SummCalcs_Transpose' tab summarizes the ratings and provides the project title and a category breakdown. This table contains only the results to protect original calculations and equations. This version of this table does not include the Readiness to Proceed scoring exercise performed by the Projects Work Group on April 20, 2012. The projects that received the highest ranking during this preliminary step were made available for PWG review.

Project Work Group Review—April 20, 2012
The second file (2 - Imperial IRWMP PWG Readiness to Proceed.xls) contains the calculations and final project ranking based on the Preliminary Evaluation plus the PWG Review.

The tab titled 'PWG Review Scores' shows the list of reviewers and their total scores for each project based on each project's Readiness to Proceed score ('ScoresheettoPrint' tab). These values were included into the "Summary Calcs" table.

Red highlighted column titles are columns added to include the PWG score.

Note this table includes four groundwater projects (East Mesa GW Storage Project, Painted Canyon GW Storage Project, Ave. 62 Thomas Levy Recharge Site, and Ave. 72 Martinez Canyon GW Storage Project) that are not ranked. These projects require a Groundwater Management Plan for State funding and were removed from the final ranking table.

The tab 'Final Project Ranking' shows the rated projects ordered by their scores. This table is reproduced as Table 1 above. The IID Systems Conservation Improvement Project was removed at the request of IID.

K-1 Imperial IRWMP Project Submittal Form

Imperial IRWMP

Project Information Form

http://www.imperialirwmp.org/

PURPOSE

The Project Information Form is to be used by project sponsors to submit proposed projects to the Imperial Water Forum to be considered for inclusion in the Imperial Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). Submitted Projects should help the Imperial Region meet the Imperial IRWMP's goals and objectives. Projects that may seek funding from Proposition 84 or Proposition 1E must be included in the Imperial IRWMP to qualify for grant funding.

INTRODUCTION

To submit a project to the Imperial Water Forum for inclusion into the Imperial IRWMP, please complete this form and submit it to ImperialIRWMP@geiconsultants.com. It is recommended that you print a copy of this form for reference as you complete the document. Project sponsors may find it helpful to first prepare the responses using word processing software, then cutting and pasting final responses into this form.

1. Each proposed project requires a separate form.

2. If the fields of the form are not highlighted, please click on the "Highlight Fields" button on the upper right hand corner of the form. This will highlight all fields to be filled out. *Please note, fields outlined in red are required to submit the form.* You can either click on the field to enter data or use the Tab button to tab through the form.

3. To fill out a text field (i.e., a paragraph descriptor or address information), click the cursor in the field and type the necessary information. Some text is highlighted in **red**; these indicate questions that have further instruction. Place the cursor over the question and a box will pop up with further instruction. The help information is also listed at the back of this form.

4. To select items in the drop down menus, click on the arrow to the right of the field and select an item.

5. To select a box or circle item, click on the box or circle to select it.

6. Please verify all information is correct and the form is as complete as possible prior to sending.

7. To save the form go to File > Save As and save the document to your working directory.

8. Once you have completed the form please click on the "Submit" button in the upper right hand corner of the form. Adobe will attempt to send the file immediately using the default e-mail system on your computer. If one is not set up to send e-mails automatically, please send the saved form as an attachment. If Adobe has used your default e-mail successfully, the sent submittal will be in your "Outbox" or "Sent" folder. You will receive a Notice of Receipt from the Imperial IRWMP e-mail. Please note this may take a few days to process.

9. You may also attach other project documentation to the e-mail if desired.

If you have any problems filling out or sending this form, please e-mail ImperialIRWMP@geiconsultants.com.

DWR Documentation

California Department of Water Resources IRWMP Planning Solicitation Package

California Department of Water Resources IRWMP Guidelines Prop 50/84/1E

To Download Adobe Reader

http://get.adobe.com/reader/

Imperial IRWMP

Project Information Form

http://www.imperialirwmp.org/

Today's Date

Part 1-Basic Project Information, Relation to Imperial IRWMP's Goals and Benefits

1. Project Title *(Required)*

2. Participating Agencies

3. Agency/Organization *(Required)*

4. Person to Contact *(Required)*

5. Title

6. E-Mail Address *(Required)*

7. Mailing Address *(Required)*

8. Phone Number *(Required)*

9. Project Location

10. Summary of Project Description *(Required)*

11. Primary Project Type

- ◯ Water Supply
- ◯ Water Quality
- ◯ Environmental Protection and Enhancement
- ◯ Flood Protection & Stormwater Management
- ◯ Regional Policy Goals
- Other

12. Are you seeking co-sponsors within the Imperial Region for the project or would you be willing to partner with others on a project?

◯ Yes ◯ No

13. Does the project contribute to meeting specific Imperial IRWMP's Objectives? ◯ Yes ◯ No

See Imperial's Goals and Objectives http://www.imperialirwmp.org/20100824%20WF%20GoalsObjectives_rev_16June2011.pdf

13a. If yes, please explain and discuss the specific objective or objectives and how the project contributes.

14. Purpose and Need

Imperial IRWMP

Project Information Form

http://www.imperialirwmp.org/

Local Planning Document Consistency

15. Is the project consistent with the City or County General Plan, State or Federal land use plan, City UWMP, Water Quality Control Plan, Water Management or Flood Plan, or an existing capital facility plan? If yes, please explain and list. Please provide a specific title and citation of the related plan, describing how the project would support plan implementation. ◯ Yes ◯ No ◯ Not Sure

Project Benefits

Please describe the anticipated benefits of the project as specifically as possible, providing quantitative or qualitative information whenever possible.

16. Does the project have any expected measurable water supply yield benefits? If yes, explain

◯ Yes ◯ No

17. Does the project have any expected flood protection or storm water management benefits? If yes, explain

◯ Yes ◯ No

18. Does the project have any expected demand management benefits? If yes, explain

◯ Yes ◯ No

19. Does the project have any expected ecosystem restoration and management benefits? If yes, explain

◯ Yes ◯ No

20. Does the project have any expected recreation and public access benefits? If yes, explain

◯ Yes ◯ No

21. Does the project have any expected power cost savings and production benefits? If yes, explain

◯ Yes ◯ No

22. Does the project promote economic development? If yes, explain

◯ Yes ◯ No

23. Describe what you believe are any other benefits of the project.

Imperial IRWMP

Project Information Form

http://www.imperialirwmp.org/

Part 2- Project Status, Needs, and Readiness to Proceed

Regardless of the project's readiness to proceed, the Imperial Water Forum intends to: a) document stakeholder needs and prepare for subsequent rounds of funding or future state funding opportunities; b) identify potential partners and project integration opportunities; and c) match proposed projects with funding sources for design and implementation money.

Project Schedule Information

24. Project Planning: Please select where the project is in the planning and project development process.

25. Project Schedule: (Check the condition that applies)

Commencement:

- ◯ Already Started
- ◯ Expected to commence within 1 year
- ◯ Expected to commence 1 to 3 years from now
- ◯ Expected to commence 3 to 6 years from now
- ◯ Expected to commence greater than 6 years from now

Completion:

- ◯ Could be completed within 1 year
- ◯ Could be completed 1 to 3 years from now
- ◯ Could be completed 3 to 6 years from now
- ◯ Could be completed greater than 6 years from now

Project Funding

26. Funding Needs: Please briefly describe where you need funding to further plan, design and construct your project.

27. Do you have total cost or project cost estimates? *(Please select Yes or No)*

The Total Estimated Cost (TEC) is the total cost of the [illegible] Total planned local funding is the

a. Total Estimated Cost (TEC).

b. Total of planned local funding (cost match).

c. Total of other non-state or federal funding.

d. Total project costs currently unfunded.

28. Do you plan on seeking funding for your projects from Proposition 84 for water resources projects, or from Proposition 1E for Flood and Stormwater projects? If no, you may skip to question 31. ◯ Yes ◯ No

29. Has local project funding and financing been secured? ◯ Yes ◯ No

30. Is there a plan and schedule to finalize the project funding and financing? ◯ Yes ◯ No

Project Technical Information

Please note that project sponsors may be asked to provide copies of technical documents. This could include feasibility and planning studies, design documents, economic analysis, rate studies or other supporting reports. Lack of technical information should not preclude submittal of a project, and may identify needs and define future actions.

31. Do you have project technical reports and documentation? ◯ Yes ◯ No	If yes, please list. If no, please describe planned work	

Project Environmental Information

Please note that project sponsors may be asked to provide copies of the environmental documents, or permit and compliance information. Lack of environmental clearance should not preclude submittal of a project, and may identify needs and define future actions.

32. Is the environmental documentation for the project complete? ◯ Yes ◯ No	If yes, please list	
33. Do you have a plan and schedule to complete the environmental review? ◯ Yes ◯ No	If yes, please list	
34. Does the project have the necessary permits and regulatory agency approvals? ◯ Yes ◯ No	If yes, please list	
35. Do you have a plan and schedule to complete the permitting process? ◯ Yes ◯ No	If yes, please list	

36. *CDWR Resource Management Strategies Applied*

Please check all resource management strategies the project employs to meet the Imperial IRWMP goals and objectives, or help meet State eligibility criteria.

Increase Water Supply

- ☐ Groundwater Development, Banking, and Storage
- ☐ Desalination
- ☐ Recycled Municipal Water
- ☐ Conveyance Improvement
- ☐ Small Local Storage

Reduce Water Demand

- ☐ Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
- ☐ Urban Water Use Efficiency
- ☐ Industrial Process Water Efficiency

Improve Water Quality

- ☐ Drinking Water Treatment and Distribution
- ☐ Groundwater/Aquifer Remediation
- ☐ Matching Quality to Use
- ☐ Pollution Prevention
- ☐ Salt and Salinity Management

Practice Resources Stewardship

- ☐ Land Use Planning Management
- ☐ Economic Incentives (Loans, Grants, and Water Pricing)
- ☐ Agricultural Lands Stewardship
- ☐ Ecosystem Restoration
- ☐ Recharge Area Protection
- ☐ Water-Dependent Recreation
- ☐ Water exchange, reclamation, and retirement

Improve Flood Management

- ☐ Flood Risk Management
- ☐ Urban Runoff Management, Capture, Storage, Clean-up, or Treatment
- ☐ Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood management programs.

37. *State Program Preferences*

Please check which of the state preferences the project would support. PRC § 75026.(b) and CWC §10544 state that preference will be given to project proposals that:

- ☐ Include regional projects or programs (*CWC §10544).*
- ☐ Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within the Imperial Region and Colorado River Hydrologic Region.
- ☐ Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions.
- ☐ Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region.
- ☐ Support the effective integration of water management with land use planning.
- ☐ For eligible storm water and flood management funding, projects which provide multiple benefits, including, but not limited to, water quality improvements, ecosystem benefits, reduction of in stream erosion and sedimentation, and groundwater recharge.

38. ***Address Statewide Priorities***

Please mark which of the specific Statewide Priorities for the IRWMP Grant Program the project would help meet.

- ☐ Drought Preparedness.
- ☐ Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently.
- ☐ Climate Change Response Action, including support adaptation to climate change, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce energy consumption, use clean energy sources to move and treat water.
- ☐ Projects that practice, promote, improve, and expand environmental stewardship to protect and enhance the environment.
- ☐ Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality.
- ☐ Ensure equitable distribution of benefits, increase participation, develop multi-benefit projects, and/or address the safe drinking water and wastewater needs of small and disadvantaged communities.

39.

Additional Information:

If there are any other comments or details you would like to provide regarding the project please include them here.

Explanations

2. Please list all partners or cosponsors; any agency that has agreed to cosponsor or participate in the project. For example, confirmed partners include Imperial County, City of Calexico. Potential partners include the City of El Centro, City of Imperial, and IID.

10. Please provide a one paragraph description of the project.

14. Please provide a detailed description of the purpose and need for the project. Include discussion of the project's goals and objectives and of the critical impacts that will occur if the project is not implemented. This section should describe the purpose and need for the proposed project, including the problems or conflicts that are being addressed and the potential consequences or negative impacts of inaction. Please describe if the project is intended to support compliance with a specific regulatory requirement.

16. Where possible, please describe supply benefits in quantitative terms. For example, the project yield (acre feet), volume of water treated (MGD), population served, acres of land irrigated, etc. Include qualitative descriptions as needed. For example, the project will provide an alternative supply of water to be used in place of a current Colorado River water use, thus expanding the available supplies, or the projects will put poor quality water to beneficial use and create economic benefits without requiring additional Colorado River water.

17. Where possible, please describe flood control and storm water benefits in quantitative terms. For example, the project will help reduce flooding on 100 acres of residential development, prevent flooding and closure of 1.5 miles city streets during 50 year events, and avoid $500,000 in estimated property damages. Include qualitative descriptions where appropriate, for example: the project will build regional retention basins that help the city support residential and commercial development by reducing the loss of developable acres that would otherwise be committed to on-site stormwater retention ponds.

18. Where possible, please describe demand management or water conservation benefits in quantitative terms, for example: the project will provide a substitute for Colorado River water use by providing 2500 acre feet of recycled wastewater for irrigation purposes; line 1 mile of canals preventing conveyance loss; 2500 water meters will be installed. Include qualitative descriptions where appropriate. For example, the project will save water through installation of water measurement devices and implement a two year leak detection and pipeline repair program in the City.

19. Where possible, please describe ecosystems restoration benefits in quantitative terms. For example, the project will provide 100 acres of brackish marsh habitat and support 5 species of migratory water fowl. Include qualitative descriptions where appropriate. For example: the project will create open water habitat and incidental recreational benefits for bird watching.

20. Where possible, please describe recreation and public access benefits in quantitative terms. For example, the project will increase accessible open space by creating 100 acres of wetlands that include a 20 car parking lot and handicap accessible bird viewing areas. Include qualitative descriptions where appropriate. For example, the project will help the County by combined stormwater retention ponds and soccer fields.

21. Where possible, please document power saving benefits in quantitative terms. For example, the project will increase the efficiency of the current plant operations and save 15% of the power required by the current plant to treat the same volume of water. Include qualitative descriptions where appropriate. For example, the project will include solar panels to meet some of the demands, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

22. Does the project provide any measurable economic benefits to the Imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, job creation and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and/or the Cities here possible, please document power saving benefits in quantitative terms. For example, the project will increase the efficiency of the current plant operations and save 15% of the power required by the current plant to treat the same volume of water. Include qualitative descriptions where appropriate. For example, the project will include solar panels to meet some of the demands, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

27. The Total Estimated Cost (TEC) is the total cost of the project. Total planned local funding is the planned local funding. This can include direct expenditures (e.g.; land acquisition, design or environmental review services) or other in-kind expenses (e.g.; staff time). Total federal or other non-state funding includes all other planned sources of funding (e.g.; private sector partners), which could be used to meet local match funding requirements. Total unfunded costs are those which would be candidate for grand funding or represent the amount needed to plan, design and construct the project.

K-2 Imperial IRWMP Project Reviewer Score Sheet (Ranking Criteria)

Project Reviewed:
Project Number:
Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria

Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
IRWMP Goals			
Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and sustainable supply to meet current and future demands		
1. Effect to agricultural users of water.	***Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?***		
	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.		
	1. Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.		
	0. Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		
2. Improve Water Supply.	***Does the project provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply that contributes to the regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, or industrial demands by 2025?***		
	5. >50,000 acre feet.		
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.		
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.		
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.		
	1. 0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		
3. Protect Surface Water Rights, maintain Colorado River yields.	***Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through development of groundwater storage of underruns?***		
	2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.		
	1. The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.		
	0. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.		
4. Conserves Colorado River Supplies.	***Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?***		
	2. Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.		
	1. Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.		
	0. Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.		
5. Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River Water.	***Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?***		
	1. Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.		
	0. The project would not create a source of supply that could be used by a current user as a substitute for Colorado River supply and subsequent reapportionment.		
6. Integrate Resource Management Strategies.	***Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?***		
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.		
	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.		
	0. Less than three RMS.		
7. Plan Consistency.	***Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan, UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?***		
	2. Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.		
	1. Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.		
	0. Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		
8. Groundwater Rights.	***Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?***		
	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft.		
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft.		
	0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.		
1. Match Water Quality to use.	***Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?***		
	2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.		
	1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.		
	0. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.		
2. Support DACs- Wastewater.	***Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements; create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend Colorado River supplies?***		
	2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		
	1. Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		
	0. Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	***Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?***		

Project Reviewed:
Project Number:
Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria

Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.		
	1. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.		
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	***Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?***		
	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.		
	1. Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		
	0. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		
5. Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)	***Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?***		
	2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.		
	1. Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.		
	0. Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		
6. Preserve or Improve	***Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?***		
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing water quality.		
	1. Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.		
	0. Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.		
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.		
1. Environmental Enhancements	***Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?***		
	2. Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.		
	1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.		
	0. Project does not increase or improve habitat.		
2. Integrated Design Elements	***Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?***		
	1. Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.		
	0. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.		
Percent/Possible Points			
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.		
Percent of IRWMP Goal=			
1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events	***Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?***		
	2. Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.		
	1. Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.		
	0. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.		
Strategic Considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation			
1. Public Acceptance/Public	***Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?***		
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		
	1. Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		
	0. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		
2. Cost Effectiveness	***Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?***		
	4. < $150/af.		
	3. $151 to $300/af.		
	2. $301 - $450/af.		
	1. >450/af.		
3. Equitable cost sharing	***Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?***		
	2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.		
	1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.		
	0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.		
4. Promote Economic Development	***Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?***		
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.		
	1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.		
	0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.		
Readiness to Proceed Category			

Project Reviewed:
Project Number:
Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria

Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
1. Timeliness	***Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?***		
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.		
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.		
	2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.		
	1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.		
2. Technical Feasibility of Project	***Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?***		
	3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.		
	2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.		
	1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.		
	0. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.		
3. Environmental Compliance	***Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?***		
	2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.		
	1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete environmental documentation.		
	0. There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		
4. Permitting	***Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?***		
	2. The permits have been obtained or are in the process.		
	1. The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.		
	0. The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		
5. Funding	***Are the project funding sources well defined?***		
	2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations.		
	1. Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.		
	0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria			
1. Provides multiple benefits	***Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?***		
	1= Yes		
	0= No		
2. Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	***Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?***		
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.		
	1. Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.		
	0. Projects involves one stakeholder.		
3. Provides regional benefits	***Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?***		
	1= Yes		
	0= No		
4. State Program Preferences	***Does the project support meet the state preferences?***		
	1= Yes		
	0= No		
5. Statewide Priorities	***Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?***		
	1= Yes		
	0= No		
6. Climate Change Adaption	***Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change?***		
	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.		
	0. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.		
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project	***Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?***		
	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.		
	0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.		
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	***Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?***		
	1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.		
	0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.		