Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project
37
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	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			
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	0		1	
water.	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.     Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.	_			
2 1			Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1		0	
	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.	_			
	to 10,000 acre feet.  1. 0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.				This project responds to the need for a DAC to meet
Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through				CA Dept of Public Health drinking water compliance.
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0		0	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for	-			
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	O. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  Biography  On the project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  On the project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  On the project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  On the project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  On the project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  On the project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  On the project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado  On the project is not, does not include aspects of the project is		Not discussed in the		
Conserves Colorado River	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	0		0	
	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.				
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0		0	
Water.					
	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.				
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	0		0	
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,	1		1	
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?     Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.		-		-
		_			
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
0.00	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Project is listed in the General Plan.		
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	
	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.				
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>				
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	_			
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		Not discussed in the contract of the latest		
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the	L	Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	1		0	
	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.	4			
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.		Project would treat water that has a designated use to come into existing compliance requirements.		Drinking water source would be brought into compliance with latest standards.
Support DACs- Wastewater.	Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;				Established With Intest Standards.
	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend	1		0	
	Colorado River supplies?				
	<ol><li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li></ol>				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;	1			
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.	_	Uncertain if would create an economy of scale.		
	0. Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create		Project claims would remove barrier to economic		<b>This works to see the second of the second </b>
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		boost, however uncertain of veracity of claim at this time.		This project responds to the need for a DAC to meet CA Dept of Public Health drinking water compliance.
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	1		2	Thinking week compliance.
	health, or creating economies of scale?	1			
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	Scale.     Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.	1	Uncertain if would create an economy of scale		
			Uncertain if would create an economy of scale. Project claims would remove barrier to economic boost, however uncertain of veracity of claim at this time.		
0	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	une.	1	
3 2,0	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	_		_	
		-	1	•	1

Project Reviewed:

Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project

37

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Number: Project Reviewer:

1. Project would not provide be rivers.     0. Project could have impacts o     5. Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)      Requirements or implement to	uestion/Performance Measures nefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
Criteria  1. Project would not provide be rivers. 0. Project could have impacts o  5. Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)  Requirements or implement to	uestion/Performance Measures nefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or				
1. Project would not provide be rivers.     0. Project could have impacts o     5. Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)  Requirements or implement to		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
rivers.  D. Project could have impacts of project help the reging light could have impacts of project help the reging light country implement to the project help the reging light country implement to the project help the reging light country implement to the project help the reging light country implement to the project help the reging light country implement to the project could have impacts of the project could have impacts of the project help the reging light country in the project help the region light country in the region light c					
O. Project could have impacts o     Comply with Total Maximum     Daily Loads (TMDLs)      Would the project help the regi     Requirements or implement to	n water quality of drains or rivers				
5. Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)  Would the project help the regi	n water quality of drains or rivers	-			
Daily Loads (TMDLs) Requirements or implement to					
	on comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	1		0	
2 Improves compliance with s	stablished TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.		-		-
2. Improves compliance with e	stabilished fivides and implement stormwater bivirs.				
Improves compliance with es	tablished TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
		-			
U. Does not neip meet establish	ed TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		Project intends to bring the City of Holtville into TTHM and MCL compliance.		
6. Preserve or Improve Would the project preserve or in	mprove quality of groundwater resources?	0	Trim and wee compliance.	1	
Project would improve grour	dwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing				1
water quality.					
	oundwater quality and would not protect existing water				
quality.	oundwater quality or could have potentially significant	-			
impacts to existing water quality			Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
	osystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,	•	· ,		
Enhancement Goal commercial, industrial, and agric			_		_
1. Environmental Enhancements Would the project increase or in	mprove habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0		0	
2.2	halfford and an Ida annual office of a facility of a facil				
2. Project increases or improves impacts.	s habitat and could support mitigation of other project				
	s habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other	1			
project impacts.					
Project does not increase or i	mprove habitat.	<u> </u>	Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
	ronmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements	0		0	
into the design to achieve multi					
	ements to provide multiple benefits.				
I I	lesign elements or provide multiple benefits.	<u> </u>			
Flood Protection and Stormwater Protect life and property from fl					
Management Goal stormwater management strate	gies.				
Reduce impacts from     Would the project help to reduce	e economic damages; and protect life and property from				
stormwater events localized stormwater events an		1		1	
Project would reduce econor	nic damages, protect life and property.				
Projects would not reduce er	onomic damages or protect life and property.				
Project could increase econo	mic 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?		T	_	T
		0		1	
2. High degree of stakeholder s	support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
1 Moderate degree of stakeho	lder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
Imperial Region.	act support and moderate potential for commets within				
Limited or no stakeholder su	pport and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
2. Cost Effectiveness	competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
4. < \$150/af.		_		-	Based on Project Information, project cost not
3. \$151 to \$300/af.					directly associated with per acre-foot yield, however
2. \$301 - \$450/af.					a rough cost of \$15 to\$20 per service connection pe
1. >450/af.			Not discussed on project submittal form.		year, for twenty years is needed to pay for the upgrade.
	benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?		Not discussed on project submittal form.	_	ардивае.
		0		0	
All costs for new water would	be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
		4			
Cost would likely be shared be costs borne by new users.	etween new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the				
	grams distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly				
equal proportions.	grants distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
4. Promote Economic Does the project provide measure	rable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net				
Development economic activity, job creation,	and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	0		1	
2 Greatest notantial for contril	outing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				
Clear documentation.	waring to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				
	ibuting to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue				
generation. Limited documenta		1	Claims to remove a barrier to economic growth,		
	ntributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue		however given current economic conditions		
generation. No solid documents Readiness to Proceed Category	ation.	1	economic growth in this area is questionable.		
	y for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or			_	
program without the need for n	new agreements or additional funding?	4		4	
4. Immediate, < 1 Year.		4			
3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to de		4	Already funded post-		
<ol> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to devel</li> <li>Long-term, &gt;6 Years to devel</li> </ol>		1	Already funded portions of this project are slated to be completed in October of 2012.		
	documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the		22 23 Proceed in October of 2012.	_	
project?		1		2	
<b>■</b> * *	3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility stud	1		]	
and completed engineering desi		4			
	nented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but	1			
incomplete or partial designs.	nented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	1			
I1. The project is not well docur		1			Project is fairly simple and straitforward recording
<ol> <li>The project is not well docur studies and has not been design</li> </ol>				i	Project is fairly simple and straitforward regarding
studies and has not been design		1			design and construction documents necessary for
studies and has not been design	efined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	L			design and construction documents necessary for improvements.
studies and has not been design  O. The project is conceptually de		1		2	
studies and has not been design  0. The project is conceptually de  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have environm  2. Existing studies and complete	efined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  nental documentation and clearance?  ed environmental documents.	1		2	
studies and has not been design  0. The project is conceptually de  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have environn  2. Existing studies and complete	efined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  nental documentation and clearance?	1	Project is exempt from CEQA and NEPA. Unsure if	2	

Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project

37

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		other environmental documents are required.		
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	2		2	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	<ol> <li>The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.</li> </ol>				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		The project does not require any permits.		
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		1	
	2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to				
	maintenance and operations.	_	The funding section of the form doesn't add up.		
	1. Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no	1	There is funding available but not listed on the form.		
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.		The TEC is \$540,000 and the unfunded amount is		
	0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and	i	\$370,000 but the amount of cost match or other		
	operations.		sources of funding is not provided on the form.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C		1	T		T
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	0		0	
	1= Yes		There are no alternative benefits of this project other		
	0= No		than water quality.		
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Proiects involves one stakeholder.		Project involves the City of Holtville.		
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder				
· ·	group?	0		0	
	1= Yes				Project is focused on obtaining compliance for one
	0= No		Only to a single/limited stakeholder group.		DAC's drinking water system.
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
<ol><li>Statewide Priorities</li></ol>	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability	0		0	
	to the effects of climate change?	Ü			
	<ol> <li>Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.</li> </ol>				
	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		1	
	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	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?	0		0	
	<ol> <li>The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.</li> </ol>				
O	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				

Projects were prioritized by their "Commencement" and "Call". The listing is as below. There were no projects that were listed as "Started" provided during the second call and therefore Priority 1 starts with <1 Year.

Priority	Commencement	Call
1	< 1	2nd Call
2	1 - 3	2nd Call
3	3 - 6	2nd Call
4		2nd Call
5	Started	1st Call
6	< 1	1st Call
7	1 - 3	1st Call
8	3 - 6	1st Call
9	> 6	1st Call
10		1st Call

Project Number	Title	Sponsor	Project Type	Project Goals	Project Phase	Start	Finish	Averaged Score
6	New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project	San Diego State University Research Foundation	Habitat Restoration, Invasive Species Control, Conservation	Water Quality	Preliminary Design	< 1	< 1	64
9	City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project	City of Brawley	Reclaim WW	Water Supply, Environmental Protection, Regional Policies/Goals, Water Quality	Preliminary Design	<1	1-3	81
12	City of Brawley Water Meter Project	City of Brawley	Metering, Conservation	Water Supply, Environmental Protection, Regional Policies/GoalsWater Conservation	Preliminary Design	<1	1-3	67
13	Keystone Water Reclamation Facility	City of Imperial	Reclaim WW	Water Supply	Final Design	< 1	1 - 3	88
18	Ave 72, Martinez Canyon Groundwater Storage Project	Imperial Irrigation District	Groundwater Storage	Water Supply	Feasibility	< 1		87
19	Ave. 62, Thomas Levy Recharge Site.	Imperial Irrigation District	Groundwater Storage	Regional Policies/Goals	Feasibility	<1		95
20	East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project	Imperial Irrigation District	Groundwater Storage	Environmental Protection	Feasibility	<1		95
21	Painted Canyon Groundwater Storage Project	Imperial Irrigation District	Groundwater Storage	Water Supply	Feasibility	< 1		45
34	Holtville Water Distribution System Project	City of Holtville	Pipeline Connector (WS), Reliability	Water Quality	Preliminary Design	< 1	1 - 3	61
35	Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project	City of Holtville	WWTP Upgrade	Water Quality	Preliminary Design	<1	1 - 3	64
36	Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project	City of Holtville	Fix wastewater outfall pipeline	Water Quality	Final Design	<1	< 1	64
46	Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently-Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea Water Quality and Regional Air Quality	Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California San Diego (UCSD)	Pilot Project, Algae	Environmental Protection, Regional Policies/Goals, Water Qualityair quality; improved economics for agriculture operators per unit of water irrigated	Project Planning and Feasibility Study	< 1	3 - 6	82
1	HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment	Heber Public Utility District	Reclaim WW	Water Supply	Preliminary Design	1 - 3	1 - 3	66
8	City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project	City of Brawley	Storage, Reliability	Water Supply	Project Planning and Feasibility Study	1 - 3	1 - 3	66
10	Regional Wastewater Treatment and Recycled Water Project	City of Brawley and City of Imperial	Reclaim WW	Water SupplyRegional Policies/Goals, Water Quality	Preliminary Design	1 - 3	3 - 6	
14	IID Systems Conservation and Improvements Projects for IWSP	Imperial Irrigation District	Conservation	Regional Policies/Goals	Construction	1 - 3	3 - 6	104
32	Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG	City of El Centro	Storage, Reliability	Water SupplyRegional Policies/Goals, Water Quality	Preliminary Design	1 - 3	<1	50
41	Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363	Imperial County Public Works	Stormwater	Flood Protection	Project Planning and Feasibility Study	1 - 3	1 - 3	58
2	Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)	Imperial Irrigation District	Desalination	Water Supply	Planning	3 - 6	> 6	96
7	East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)	Imperial Irrigation District	Desalination	Water Quality	Planning	3 - 6	3 - 6	93
15	Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture:	Southern Low Desert Resource Conservation and Development Council	Pilot Project	Regional Policies/GoalsAncillary use of agricultural tailgate water	Ready to Construct		<1	68
37	Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project	City of Holtville	Drinking Water	Water Quality	Project Concept	<1	< 1	52
38	Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project	City of Holtville	Stormwater plan	Flood Protection	Project Concept	< 1	< 1	48
39	Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project	City of Holtville	City Stormwater	Flood Protection	Project Concept	<1	1 - 3	61
40	Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project	City of Holtville	WWT System Upgrade	Water Quality	Project Concept	<1	< 1	
49	Holtville Water Master Plan/Map Update Project	City of Holtville	Develop Plan	Water Quality	Project Concept	<1	< 1	
42	Phased Underrun Storage and Agricultural Wastewater Reclamation Project	Imperial Irrigation District	Groundwater Storage, Water Quality	Water Supply	Project Concept	1 - 3	> 6	
44	Microalgal Cultivation for Improved Yields, Economic Value and Water Use Efficiency on Agricultural lands in the Imperial Valley, CA	Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California San Diego (UCSD)	Pilot Project, Algae	Environmental Protection, Regional Policies/Goals, Water Qualityimproved economics for agriculture operators per unit of water irrigated	Project Concept	1 - 3	>6	
45	Macroalgae Solutions for the Imperial Valley and Salton Sea Region	The Gas Technology Institute (GTI)	Pilot Project, Algae	Water Supply, Environmental Protection, Regional Policies/Goals, Water QualityIncreased value crops per water used	Project Concept	1 - 3	3 - 6	
48	Integrated Microalgae Cultivation Process for Improving Water Quality in Imperial Valley Drainage Canals	Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California San Diego (UCSD)	Pilot Project, Algae	Environmental Protection, Regional Policies/Goals, Water Qualityimproved economics for agriculture operators per unit of water irrigated	Project Concept	1 - 3	> 6	
33	Poe Colonia Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade	County of Imperial	Wastewater Treatment Plant	Wastewater Treatment Plant	Project Concept	3 - 6	3 - 6	
47	Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility District	City of El Centro	Interconnection, Reliability	Water SupplyRegional Policies/Goals, Water Quality	Project Concept	3 - 6		45

## Imperial IRWMP Project Review List--First Call

								-
Project Number	Title	Sponsor	Project Type	Project Goals	Project Phase	Start	Finish	Score
16	I Ramer Lake Conservation Plan for Water Savings	Southern Low Desert Resource Conservation and Development Council	Habitat Restoration, Invasive Species Control, Conservation	Water Supply	Environmental Review	<1	3 - 6	
17	Imperial Valley Biogas Initiative	Southern California Gas Company	Alternate Energy, Algae, Water Quality	Water Supply, Environmental Protection, Regional Policies/Goals, Water QualityRenewable Energy	Project Planning and Feasibility Study	Started	1 - 3	
24	Drainage Upgrade (Broadway St., No. Eighth St., Commercial Ave. from Imperial Ave to sixth street.)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Water Supply	Planning	1 - 3	1-3	
22	Drainage Upgrade (Holt Avenue, Imperial to 12th)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Water Supply	Planning	3 - 6	< 1	
26	Drainage Upgrade (La Brucherie Rd. to 23rd; Barbara Worth Ave. to Orange)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Flood Protection	Planning	3 - 6	3 - 6	
27	Drainage Upgrade (8th St., Woodward to Villa)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Flood Protection	Planning	3 - 6	3 - 6	
28	Drainage Upgrade (Lincoln Ave.; 6th St.)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Flood Protection	Planning	3 - 6	3 - 6	
23	Drainage Upgrade (Development west of Wake Ave and 8th St: Cypress Dr: Farmer Dr: 10th St: 9th St)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Water Supply	Planning	> 6	< 1	
25	Drainage Upgrade (Dogwood Rd., Ross Rd., Heil Ave., Hope Ave. between 1st and Orange)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Water Supply	Planning	> 6	>6	
31	Drainage Upgrade (8th St. from Villa to Central Main Drain)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Flood Protection	Planning	>6	3 - 6	
29	Drainage Upgrade (Oak St. from San Diego to Villa)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Flood Protection	Planning		1 - 3	
30	Drainage Upgrade (Evan Hewes Hwy. Dogwood to Cooley)	City of El Centro	City Stormwater	Flood Protection	Planning		3 - 6	

Project	Max Poss	1	2	6	7	8	9	12	13	14	15	18	19	20	21	32	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	46	47
Water Supply Goal																										
Water Supply Goal Score Subtotal	51	18	39.5	7.5	36.5	24	19.5	20.5	18	39	8.5	40	40	41.5	39.5	8	7	5.5	8	5	4.5	10	4.5	9	15	6
Percent of Goal	100.0%	35.3%	77.5%	14.7%	71.6%	47.1%	38.2%	40.2%	35.3%	76.5%	16.7%	78.4%	78.4%	81.4%	77.5%	15.7%	13.7%	10.8%	15.7%	9.8%	8.8%	19.6%	8.8%	17.6%	29.4%	11.8%
Water Quality Goal																										
Water Quality Goal Score Subtotal	24	10	12	8	13.5	10.5	9.5	4	10	7	7	5	5	5	5	9	9.5	7.5	10	12	3.5	8.5	7	7.5	9	10
Percent of Goal	100.0%	41.7%	50.0%	33.3%	56.3%	43.8%	39.6%	16.7%	41.7%	29.2%	29.2%	20.8%	20.8%	20.8%	20.8%	37.5%	39.6%	31.3%	41.7%	50.0%	14.6%	35.4%	29.2%	31.3%	37.5%	41.7%
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal																										
Environmental Enhancement Goal Score Subtotal	8	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	3.5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.5	0	1.5	1	0	0	8	0
Percent of Goal	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.8%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	18.8%	0.0%	18.8%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal																										
Flood Goal Score Subtotal	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	4	2	2
Percent of Goal	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%
IRWMP Goals Subtotal Score	87	30	53.5	24.5	52	36.5	31	26.5	33.5	48	20.5	47	47	48.5	46.5	19	18.5	19	21.5	19	12.5	23.5	13.5	20.5	34	18
Percent of IRWM Goals	100.0%	34.5%	61.5%	28.2%	59.8%	42.0%	35.6%	30.5%	38.5%	55.2%	23.6%	54.0%	54.0%	55.7%	53.4%	21.8%	21.3%	21.8%	24.7%	21.8%	14.4%	27.0%	15.5%	23.6%	39.1%	20.7%
Strategic Considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation																										
Strategic Considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation Subtotal	33	9	12.5	5	10	12	20	9	12	12	12.5	13.5	18	18	9	4.5	8.5	9.5	4.5	3	3	4.5	3	7.5	11.5	8.5
Percent of Goal	100.0%	27.3%	37.9%	15.2%	30.3%	36.4%	60.6%	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	37.9%	40.9%	54.5%	54.5%	27.3%	13.6%	25.8%	28.8%	13.6%	9.1%	9.1%	13.6%	9.1%	22.7%	34.8%	25.8%
Readiness to Proceed Category																										
Readiness to Proceed Subtotal	38	16	12	18.5	12	10	15.5	24	23	25	21.5	11	14	13	15	19	25.5	24.5	28.5	24	26	19	20	23.5	21.5	11
Percent of Goal	100.0%	42.1%	31.6%	48.7%	31.6%	26.3%	40.8%	63.2%	60.5%	65.8%	56.6%	28.9%	36.8%	34.2%	39.5%	50.0%	67.1%	64.5%	75.0%	63.2%	68.4%	50.0%	52.6%	61.8%	56.6%	28.9%
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria																										
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria Subtotal	22	11	18	15.5	19	7	14	7	19	19	13.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	16.5	7.5	8.5	10.5	9	6	6	14	7	6	14.5	7
Percent of Goal	100.0%	50.0%	81.8%	70.5%	86.4%	31.8%	63.6%	31.8%	86.4%	86.4%	61.4%	70.5%	70.5%	70.5%	75.0%	34.1%	38.6%	47.7%	40.9%	27.3%	27.3%	63.6%	31.8%	27.3%	65.9%	31.8%
Total Project Score	180.0	66.0	96.0	63.5	93.0	65.5	80.5	66.5	87.5	104.0	68.0	87.0	94.5	95.0	87.0	50.0	61.0	63.5	63.5	52.0	47.5	61.0	43.5	57.5	81.5	44.5
Percent of Total Score	100.0%	36.7%	53.3%	35.3%	51.7%	36.4%	44.7%	36.9%	48.6%	57.8%	37.8%	48.3%	52.5%	52.8%	48.3%	27.8%	33.9%	35.3%	35.3%	28.9%	26.4%	33.9%	24.2%	31.9%	45.3%	24.7%

## Imperial IRWMP Project Ranking 4/10/2012

			Water Supply	Water Quality	Environmental	Flood	IRWN	1P Goals	Strategic Co	nsiderations	Read	iness	State	ewide	To	otal
Rank	Project No.	Project Title	Subotal	Subotal	Subotal	Subotal	Subotal	% of Total	Subotal	% of Total	Subotal	% of Total	Subotal	% of Total	Subotal	% of Total
		Maximum Possible Points	51	24	8	4	87	100.0%	33	100.0%	38	100.0%	22	100.0%	180.0	100.0%
1	14	IID Systems Conservation and Improvements Projects for IWSP	39	7	0	2	48	55.2%	12	36.4%	25	65.8%	19	86.4%	104.0	57.8%
2	2	Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)	39.5	12	0	2	53.5	61.5%	12.5	37.9%	12	31.6%	18	81.8%	96.0	53.3%
3	20	East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project	41.5	5	0	2	48.5	55.7%	18	54.5%	13	34.2%	15.5	70.5%	95.0	52.8%
4	19	Ave. 62, Thomas Levy Recharge Site.	40	5	0	2	47	54.0%	18	54.5%	14	36.8%	15.5	70.5%	94.5	52.5%
5	7	East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)	36.5	13.5	0	2	52	59.8%	10	30.3%	12	31.6%	19	86.4%	93.0	51.7%
6	13	Keystone Water Reclamation Facility	18	10	3.5	2	33.5	38.5%	12	36.4%	23	60.5%	19	86.4%	87.5	48.6%
7	18	Ave 72, Martinez Canyon Groundwater Storage Project	40	5	0	2	47	54.0%	13.5	40.9%	11	28.9%	15.5	70.5%	87.0	48.3%
8	21	Painted Canyon Groundwater Storage Project	39.5	5	0	2	46.5	53.4%	9	27.3%	15	39.5%	16.5	75.0%	87.0	48.3%
9	46	Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently- Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea Water Quality and Regional Air Quality	15	9	8	2	34	39.1%	11.5	34.8%	21.5	56.6%	14.5	65.9%	81.5	45.3%
10	9	City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project	19.5	9.5	0	2	31	35.6%	20	60.6%	15.5	40.8%	14	63.6%	80.5	44.7%
11	15	Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture:	8.5	7	3	2	20.5	23.6%	12.5	37.9%	21.5	56.6%	13.5	61.4%	68.0	37.8%
12	12	City of Brawley Water Meter Project	20.5	4	0	2	26.5	30.5%	9	27.3%	24	63.2%	7	31.8%	66.5	36.9%
13	1	HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment	18	10	0	2	30	34.5%	9	27.3%	16	42.1%	11	50.0%	66.0	36.7%
14	8	City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project	24	10.5	0	2	36.5	42.0%	12	36.4%	10	26.3%	7	31.8%	65.5	36.4%
15	6	New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project	7.5	8	7	2	24.5	28.2%	5	15.2%	18.5	48.7%	15.5	70.5%	63.5	35.3%
16	35	Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project	5.5	7.5	3	3	19	21.8%	9.5	28.8%	24.5	64.5%	10.5	47.7%	63.5	35.3%
17	36	Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project	8	10	1.5	2	21.5	24.7%	4.5	13.6%	28.5	75.0%	9	40.9%	63.5	35.3%
18	34	Holtville Water Distribution System Project	7	9.5	0	2	18.5	21.3%	8.5	25.8%	25.5	67.1%	8.5	38.6%	61.0	33.9%
19	39	Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project	10	8.5	1	4	23.5	27.0%	4.5	13.6%	19	50.0%	14	63.6%	61.0	33.9%
20	41	Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363	9	7.5	0	4	20.5	23.6%	7.5	22.7%	23.5	61.8%	6	27.3%	57.5	31.9%
21	37	Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project	5	12	0	2	19	21.8%	3	9.1%	24	63.2%	6	27.3%	52.0	28.9%
22	32	Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG	8	9	0	2	19	21.8%	4.5	13.6%	19	50.0%	7.5	34.1%	50.0	27.8%
23	38	Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project	4.5	3.5	1.5	3	12.5	14.4%	3	9.1%	26	68.4%	6	27.3%	47.5	26.4%
24	47	Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility District	6	10	0	2	18	20.7%	8.5	25.8%	11	28.9%	7	31.8%	44.5	24.7%
25	40	Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project	4.5	7	0	2	13.5	15.5%	3	9.1%	20	52.6%	7	31.8%	43.5	24.2%

## **Project Score**

Project ID	2							
Project Title	Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo	River Source	(50 KAFY)					
Project R	eview Criteria, Distribution of Available Points	Subtotal Goals	% of Goals	Total points	% of Total			
IRWMP Goals				53.5	29.7%			
1. Water S	upply Goal	39.5	77.5%					
2. Water C	Quality Goal	12	50.0%					
3. Environi	mental Protection and Enhancement Goal	0	0.0%					
4. Flood Pr	otection and Stormwater Management Goal	2	50.0%					
Strategic Cons	Strategic Considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation							
Readiness to P	eadiness to Proceed Category							
Other CDWR S	tatewide IRWMP Criteria			18	10.0%			
		Total Pr	roiect Score	96	53.3%			

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Ca	nsdale/S	am Schaeff	er Combo	
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluatio	n and I	Ranking	Criteria	
Criteria	Weight	Possi	ble Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Score
IRWMP Goals					
Water Supply Goal	Diversify th and future			pply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and sustainable supply to meet current	
1. Effect to agricultural users of water.	2	0	4	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	1
			2	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
		,		Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.	
2. Improve Water Supply.	3	1	15	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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1
			5	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.	
		ı	1	1. 0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.	
Protect Surface Water Rights, maintain Colorado River yields.	4	0	8	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0
			2	2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.	4
				<ol> <li>The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.</li> </ol>	
				0. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado	1
Conserves Colorado River	1	I	1	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable	
Supplies.	4	0	8	would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	1
			2	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly	
				demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.	
				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				Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current	
substitution for Colorado River Water.	4	0	4	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	1
			1	1. Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.	
				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.	
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	2	0	6	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	1
ivianagement strategies.	_L	ı	3	2. Integrates five or more RMS.	
				1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.	
				0. Less than three RMS.	1
7. Plan Consistency.	2	0	4	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan, UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	1
	-		2	2. Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.	
				Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.	]
				Limited or no consistency with existing plan.	1
8. Groundwater Rights.	1	0	2	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	1
			2	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	
				prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent	1
				or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.	
				Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	1
				potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.	<u> </u>
Water Quality Goal				ficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWQCB Basin Plan through	
Match Water Quality to use.				, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	
	2	0	4	benefits?	1
			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	1
				not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	-
				economic benefits.	
-				•	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Car	nsdale/So	am Schaeff	fer Combo	
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation	n and I	Ranking	Criteria	
Criteria	Weight	Possil	ble Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Score
Support DACs- Wastewater.	1	0	2	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	2
	_	ŭ	_	Colorado River supplies?	_
			2	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.	
				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.	
Support DACs- Drinking Water				Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	
	4	0	8	health, or creating economies of scale?	0
			2	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.	
				27 7 35 35 3 7 65 10 Meet standardly does not diedee economies of stade.	
				0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.	
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	2	0	4	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1
	•		2	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	1
				rivers.  O. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.	ł
5. Comply with Total Maximum	1	1	1	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	1	0	2	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0
			2	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
			2		
				1. Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.	
6. Preserve or Improve	2	0	4	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	2
			2	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing	
				water quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant	
Environmental Protection and	Protect and	Lonhanc	o aquatic o	impacts to existing water quality. cosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and	
Enhancement Goal	agricultural			cosystems and whome nabitat consistent with municipal, commercial, mustrial, and	
1. Environmental Enhancements	3	0	6	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0
				Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project	
			2	impacts.	
				Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other	
				project impacts.  0. Project does not increase or improve habitat.	
Integrated Design Elements				Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational	
	2	0	2	elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0
			1	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.	
				Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life strategies.	and prop	perty from	flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management	
,					
Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from	4.6%	l		Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	
stormwater events	2	0	4	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	1
	•		2	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.	
				Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.	1
				O Project could increase according demands or result in antential imposets to 197	ł
				Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	
Strategic Considerations for IRWN				Will the project he able to gain public current from the water action and the same	
Public Acceptance/Public	3	0	6	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	1
			2	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	
				Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within	1
				Imperial Region.	
2 2 45% 11		1		0. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	
Cost Effectiveness	3	1	12	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	1
			4	4. < \$150/af.	j

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Car	nsdale/So	am Schaeff							
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluatio	n and I	Ranking	Criteria						
Criteria	Weight	Possil low	ole Score high	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score					
				3. \$151 to \$300/af.						
				2. \$301 - \$450/af.						
				1. >450/af.						
Equitable cost sharing	2	0	6	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0					
			3	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.						
				<ol> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> </ol>						
		1	1	<ol> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> </ol>						
4. Promote Economic Development	3	1	9	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?	1					
			3	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  Clear documentation.  The second seconomic activity and the seconomic activity and the seconomic activity and the seconomic activity and the seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity and the seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity and the seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity are seconomic activity.  The seconomic activity are seconomic acti						
				Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.						
				D. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue						
				generation. No solid documentation.	<u> </u>					
Readiness to Proceed Category				Dogs the project house the chility for Stateholders to get a visible to include a project to the second of the sec						
1. Timeliness	2	1	10	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?	3					
	1		5	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.						
				3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.						
				Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.     Long-term, >6 Years to develop.						
Technical Feasibility of Project	1 .			Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the						
	4	0	12	project?	1					
			3	<ol><li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li></ol>						
				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	2	0	4	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0					
			2	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.     There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete						
				environmental documentation.  O. There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.						
4. Permitting	1	0	2	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1					
			2	2. The permits have been obtained or are in the process.						
				The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.						
	1			The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.						
5. Funding	5	0	10	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1					
			2	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations.						
				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 C	riteria			Table and the second se						
Provides multiple benefits	5	0	5	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0					
			1	recreation, or other benefits? 1= Yes						
			1	1= res 0= No						
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	2	0	4	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0					
		1	2	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.						
				Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.      Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.						
Provides regional benefits	1			0. Projects involves one stakeholder.  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder						
S. Frovides regional beliefits	4	0	4	group?	1					
			1	1= Yes						
A. Chaka Dan Dan f	1		1	Describe analysis to an analysis to a state and for a state an						
State Program Preferences	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1					
			1	1= Yes 0= No						
5. Statewide Priorities	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1					
			1	1= Yes	_					
1			-							

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment
Project Number: 1

Project Reviewer: Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria Possible Score **Question/Performance Measures** Weight Reviewe high 0= No Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the 6. Climate Change Adaption 0 2 2 0 vulnerability to the effects of climate change? 1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the 1 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 Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region? 0 1 1 1 Contribution- Project 1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other 1 0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy. 8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State? 2 0 2 1 Support to Renewable Energy 1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the 1 0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation	n and I	Ranking	Criteria	
Criteria	Weight	Possible Score		Question/Performance Measures	Project
		low	high		Score
IRWMP Goals	D) 15 11				
Water Supply Goal	and future			pply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and sustainable supply to meet current	
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	2	0	4	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2
			2	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.	
2. Improve Water Supply.	3	1	15	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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	3
			5	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,				Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	
maintain Colorado River yields.	4	0	8	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0
			2	2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.	
				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.	4	0	8	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	4
				federal requirements?	
			2	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.      Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.	
				O. 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.	4	0	4	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?	4
vvater.	ı		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.	2	0	6	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2
			3	2. Integrates five or more RMS.	
				1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.	
	1			0. Less than three RMS.	
7. Plan Consistency.	2	0	4	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan, UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	2
			2	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.	
				Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.	
				Limited or no consistency with existing plan.	
8. Groundwater Rights.	1	0	2	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	1
	•	•	2	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.     May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.	
				Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	
				potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.	
Water Quality Goal				lificial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWQCB Basin Plan through , local, and state agencies.	
Match Water Quality to use.	2	0	4	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	2
			2	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and	
				provide economic benefits.	
				Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water     tot otherwise used and provide economic benefits.	
				not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	
				economic benefits.	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number:

Project Number: Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cai	nsdale/So	am Schaef	1 fer Combo	
Imperial IRWMP Project E	_				
Criteria	Weight		ole Score high	Question/Performance Measures	Project Score
2. Support DACs- Wastewater.	1	0	2	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
			2	Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.	
				Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.	
				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	4	0	8	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	0
			2	Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.	
				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.	
1. Effect on Existing Waterways	2	0	4	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	2
			2	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)	1	0	2	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0
,			2	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.	
. Preserve or Improve	2	0	4	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	4
			2	<ol><li>Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing water quality.</li></ol>	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.	
nvironmental Protection and	Protect and			ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and	
L. Environmental Enhancements	3	0	6	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0
			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.	
				Project does not increase or improve habitat.	
. Integrated Design Elements	2	0	2	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0
			1	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.      Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	
lood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life strategies.	and prop	erty from	flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management	
Percent of IRWMP Goal=	4.6%			I	
L. Reduce impacts from stormwater events	2	0	4	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	2
			2	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.	
				Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.	
				Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	
Strategic Considerations for IRWN 1. Public Acceptance/Public	1 Plan Imple 3	mentatio 0	<b>6</b>	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	3
<u> </u>			2	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	-
				Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within	
				Imperial Region.  O. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	
2. Cost Effectiveness	3	1	12	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	3
			4	4. < \$150/af.	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation	n and I	Ranking	Criteria	
Criteria	Weight	Possil low	ole Score high	Question/Performance Measures	Project Score
				3. \$151 to \$300/af.	
				2. \$301 - \$450/af.	
				1. >450/af.	
3. Equitable cost sharing	2	0	6	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0
		1	3	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.	
				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.	
. Promote Economic Jevelopment	3	1	9	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?	3
	1	<u> </u>	3	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.	
eadiness to Proceed Category				In the second of	
Timeliness	2	1	10	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?	6
	1	·	5	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.	
			-	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	
				2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	
	1			1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.	
. Technical Feasibility of Project	4	0	12	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	4
			3	project?  3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies	
			3	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.	
				The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	
. Environmental Compliance	2	0	4	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0
			2	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	
			2	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.	
. Permitting	1	0	2	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1
			2	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.	
				The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.	
				The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	
. Funding	5	0	10	Are the project funding sources well defined?	5
	•	•	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.  O. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and	
				operations.	
other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Cr	iteria				
. Provides multiple benefits	5	0	5	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	0
	_		1	1= Yes	
Involves multiple sesticine **				0= No	
. Involves multiple participants nd stakeholders	2	0	4	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0
	•		2	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.	
				Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	
				Projects involves one stakeholder.	
. Provides regional benefits	4	0	4	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?	4
	1	1	1	1= Yes	
				0= No	
. State Program Preferences	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	2
	<del></del>		1	1= Yes	·
. Statewide Priorities		_		0= No  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	2
- Statewide i Hollities	2	0	2		2
			1	1= Yes	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number: Project Reviewer

roject Reviewer: Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo						
Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation	n and F	Ranking	Criteria		
Criteria	Weight	Possik	ole Score	Question/Performance Measures	Project	
		low	high		Score	
				0= No		
6. Climate Change Adaption	2	0	2	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the	0	
	_	Ů	_	vulnerability to the effects of climate change?		
			1	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	1	0	1	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1	
Contribution- Project	1	"	1		1	
			1	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other		
			1	projects.		
				0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.		
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	1	1	ı	Deserthe agricultural annual a		
	2	0	2	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	2	
Support to Renewable Energy						
			1	<ol> <li>The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.</li> </ol>		
				The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.		

Project Reviewed: Project Number: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewer: Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project E	Evaluation	n and F	Ranking	Criteria	Reviewer One
Criteria	Weight	Possik	ble Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Comments
IRWMP Goals					
Water Supply Goal				upply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and sustainable supply to meet current	
1. Effect to agricultural	and future	uemands	,	Door the available have an offeet to water and lies histories if you will be a control to	
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	2	0	4	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	
···occii			2	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.	-
				Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	-
				Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.	-
2. Improve Water Supply.		т —	1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
z. 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, and/or	
	3	1	15	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural	
		<u> </u>	<u></u>	supplies.	
			5	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.	-
				to 10,000 acre feet;     o to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.	1 2 MCD
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,			1	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	1.2 MGD approximately 1,300 AFY
maintain Colorado River yields.	4	0	8	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	
		-	2	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		1		Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable	
Supplies.	4	0	8	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	
				federal requirements?	
			2	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.	
				Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet	
				requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial	
5. Support for in-lieu uses or		1		use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current	
substitution for Colorado River	4	0	4	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	
Water.					
			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	
C. Laboranto Document				substitute for Colorado River supply and subsequent reapportionment.	
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	2	0	6	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	
management strategies:			3	2. Integrates five or more RMS.	
				1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.	
				Less than three RMS.	
7. Plan Consistency.	2	n	Л	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	
		U		UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	
			2	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.	
				Limited or no consistency with existing plan.	
8. Groundwater Rights.	1	0	2	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	
	1		2	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	
			2	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.	
				May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent	
				or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.	
				0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	May protect ag users by offsetting an industrial
				potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.	demand, which takes a higher priority.
Water Quality Goal			•	ficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWQCB Basin Plan through 5, local, and state agencies.	
Match Water Quality to use.				k, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	
	2	0	4	benefits?	
		·	2	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	
				1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.	
				·	1
				0. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

**Project Number:** 

	Evaluation	Reviewer One			
Criteria Weight Possible Score				Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Comments
2. Support DACs- Wastewater.	1	0	2	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.	
				Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;      Provide required water to extend the Calcada Biver cumply.	
				or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  O. 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	4	0	8	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	
	1		,	health, or creating economies of scale?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of	
			2	scale.	
				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	2	0	4	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	
			2	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	
				Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	
				rivers.  O. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.	
5. Comply with Total Maximum	Т			Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	1	0	2	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	
			2	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.	
5. Preserve or Improve	2	0	4	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	
			2	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing	
	+			water quality.  1. Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water	
	<u> </u>			quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.	
Environmental Protection and				cosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and	
Enhancement Goal 1. Environmental Enhancements	agricultural			Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	
	3	0	6		
	3	0		Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project	
	3	0	2	impacts.	
	3	0		· · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	3	0		impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other	
2. Integrated Design Elements	1	<u>                                     </u>	2	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.  Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational	
2. Integrated Design Elements	2	0	2	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.  Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	
2. Integrated Design Elements	1	<u>                                     </u>	2	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.  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.	
	2	0	2 2 1	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.  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.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater	2	0	2 2 1	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.  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.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater	2 Protect life strategies.	0	2 2 1	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.  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.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from	Protect life strategies.	0	2 2 1	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.  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.  flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	2 Protect life strategies.	0 and prop	2 2 1 perty from	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.  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.  flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from	Protect life strategies.	0 and prop	2 2 1 Deerty from	impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  O. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  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.  O. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  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.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from	Protect life strategies.	0 and prop	2 2 1 perty from	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.  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.  flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from	Protect life strategies.	0 and prop	2 2 1 perty from	impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  O. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  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.  O. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  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.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal  Percent of IRWMP Goal=  1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events	Protect life strategies.	0 and prop	2 1 perty from 4	impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  2. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  2. Poes the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?  2. Integrates multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  3. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  4. Integrates multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  5. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  6. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  7. Mould 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.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from	Protect life strategies.	0 and prop	2 1 perty from 4	impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  2. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  2. Poes the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?  2. Integrates multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  3. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  4. Integrates multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  5. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  6. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  7. Mould 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.	
Percent of IRWMP Goal=  1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events  Strategic Considerations for IRWM	Protect life strategies.  = 4.6% 2	0 and prop	2 2 1 1 Deerty from 4 2	impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  O. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  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.  O. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  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.  O. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal  Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events  Strategic Considerations for IRWM	Protect life strategies.  = 4.6% 2	0 and prop	2 2 1 Deerty from 4 2	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.  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.  flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  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.  2. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.  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.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal  Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events  Strategic Considerations for IRWM	Protect life strategies.  = 4.6% 2	0 and prop	2 2 1 1 Deerty from 4 2	Impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  2. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  2. Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?  2. Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.  3. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  4. Integrates multiple design and local flood protection and stormwater management.  4. 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.  3. Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.  4. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.  4. Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal  Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events  Strategic Considerations for IRWM	Protect life strategies.  = 4.6% 2	0 and prop	2 2 1 1 Deerty from 4 2	impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  2. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  2. Poes 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.  2. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  3. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  4. Mould 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.  2. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.  2. 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	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal  Percent of IRWMP Goal= 1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events  Strategic Considerations for IRWM	Protect life strategies.  = 4.6% 2	0 and prop	2 2 1 1 Deerty from 4 2	Impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.  2. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  2. Project does not increase or improve habitat.  2. Project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?  2. Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.  3. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  4. Goding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management  4. 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 or protect life and property.  3. Projects would not reduce economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.  4. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.  4. Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?  4. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.  4. Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number:

Imperial IRWMP Project E	Evaluatio				Reviewer One
Criteria	Weight		ble Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Comments
				3. \$151 to \$300/af.	
				2. \$301 - \$450/af.	
	1			1. >450/af.	Estimated at approximately \$460 per AF for 20 years
3. Equitable cost sharing	2	0	6	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	
			1	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.	
			3	2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users, no effects on earlier 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.	
				Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.	
4. Promote Economic				Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net	
Development	3	1	9	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	
			3	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.	
				Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	
Baradharan ta Baran				generation. No solid documentation.	
Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	I	1		Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	
1. THICHIC33	2	1	10	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?	
	•		5	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.	
				3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	
				2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	
Technical Feasibility of Project				Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	
2. Technical reasibility of Froject	4	0	12	project?	
			3	3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies	
			3	and completed engineering designs.	
				2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.	
				The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	
				studies and has not been designed.	
				The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	Project information indicates limited funding to
					advance DAC projects, including this one.
3. Environmental Compliance	2	0	4	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	
			2	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	
				There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete environmental documentation.	
				There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.	
4. Permitting	1	0	2	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	
			2	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.	
		,		The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	
5. Funding	5	0	10	Are the project funding sources well defined?	
			2	<ol><li>Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations.</li></ol>	
				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	
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Cr	riteria			operations.	
Provides multiple benefits		_	-	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	
	5	0	5	recreation, or other benefits?	
			1	1= Yes	
Involves multiple participants				0= No  Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	
and stakeholders	2	0	4	project manages stationaries with purification.	
	1		2	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.	
			-	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	
				Project involves two to loar participants through agreements and randing.      Projects involves one stakeholder.	
Provides regional benefits	4	0	4	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	
	4	U	4	group?	
			1	1= Yes	
State Program Preferences	1 -	١ .	T -	0= No  Does the project support meet the state preferences?	
4. State Program Preferences	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	
			1	1= Yes 0= No	
Statewide Priorities	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	
		U	1	1= Yes	
			1	<u>1- 160</u>	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

**Project Number:** 

Imperial IRWMP Project	Reviewer One				
Criteria	Weight	Possil	ole Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Comments
				0= No	
5. Climate Change Adaption	2	0	2	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.	
				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	1	0	1	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.	
				The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	
3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	2	0	2	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	
			1	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.	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Car	nsdale/Si	am Schaeff	er Combo	
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluatio	n and I	Ranking	Criteria	
Criteria	Weight	Possil	ble Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Score
IRWMP Goals					
Water Supply Goal	Diversify th and future			pply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and sustainable supply to meet current	
Effect to agricultural users of	and rature	l l	, 	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	
water.	2	0	4		1
			2	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				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	
	3	1	15	regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, and/or	1
				industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	
			5	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.	
2. Drotost Curfoso Water Bights	1			0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.  Would the project patiming and system use of Coloredo River antitlements through	
<ol><li>Protect Surface Water Rights, maintain Colorado River yields.</li></ol>	4	0	8	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0
	1	1	2	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.	
				The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for	1
				storage or use of Colorado River supply.	
				The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.	
4. Conserves Colorado River				Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable	
Supplies.	4	0	8	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	1
				federal requirements?	
			2	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.	
				Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially	
				demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.	
				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				Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current	
substitution for Colorado River Water.	4	0	4	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	1
water.			1	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.	
				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	2	0	6	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	1
Management Strategies.			3	Integrates five or more RMS.	
			3	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.	1
				Less than three RMS.	
7. Plan Consistency.	2	0	4	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	1
				UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	1
			2	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.	4
				Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.	]
	1			Limited or no consistency with existing plan.	
8. Groundwater Rights.	1	0	2	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	1
	1	1	2	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	
				prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.	
				1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.	
				Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	
				potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.	
Water Quality Goal	Protect wa	ter qualit	ty for bene	ficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWQCB Basin Plan through	
	cooperation	n with st	akeholders	, local, and state agencies.	
Match Water Quality to use.	2	0	4	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	1
	1	1	2	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and	
				provide economic benefits.	4
				<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>	
				Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	1

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment
Project Number: 1

Project Reviewer: Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria **Possible Score** Question/Performance Measures Reviewe Weight high Score 2. Support DACs- Wastewater. Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements; 0 2 create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend Colorado River supplies? 2 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. Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public 3. Support DACs- Drinking Water 1 0 8 0 health, or creating economies of scale? 2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of 2 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? n 1 2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers 2 1. Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers. 5. Comply with Total Maximum Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board 1 n 2 0 Daily Loads (TMDLs) Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs? 2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs. 2 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 0 4 2 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** Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and **Enhancement Goal** agricultural land use 1. Environmental Enhancements Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts? 0 2. Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project 2 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 2 n 2 n 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. Flood Protection and Stormwater Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management Management Goal strategies Percent of IRWMP Goal= 4.6% 1. Reduce impacts from Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from 0 4 1 localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas? stormwater events 2. Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property. 2 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 6 Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population? 1 n 2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region. 2 1. Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within 0. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region. Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region? 2. Cost Effectiveness 1 12 4. < \$150/af.

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Ca	nsdale/So	am Schaefj		
Imperial IRWMP Project E					
Criteria	Weight	Possil	ole Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Score
				3. \$151 to \$300/af.	
				2. \$301 - \$450/af.	
2. Equitable sect charing				1. >450/af.	
Equitable cost sharing	2	0	6	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0
	1			All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.	
Ì			3	·	
				1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the	
				costs borne by new users.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly	
				equal proportions.	
4. Promote Economic				Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net	
Development	3	1	9	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	1
			_	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.	
			3	Clear documentation.	
				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			_		
1. Timeliness	2	1	10	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	3
	1	<u> </u>	5	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, < 1 Year.	
			3	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	
				2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	
2. Tank start Franch West of Buston	1	1		1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.	
2. Technical Feasibility of Project	4	0	12	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	1
	1		3	The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies	
			3	and completed engineering designs.	
				2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.	
				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.	
	1	1			
3. Environmental Compliance	2	0	4	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0
			2	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.     There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	
				environmental documentation.	
	1	1		There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.	
4. Permitting	1	0	2	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1
			2	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.     The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.	
				The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	
5. Funding	5	0	10	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1
			2	2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	
			۷	maintenance and operations.	
				1. Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.	
				No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and	
				operations.	
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Cr	riteria	1		Describe available availab	
Provides multiple benefits	5	0	5	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	0
	•	•	1	1= Yes	
	1	1	1	0= No	
Involves multiple participants     and stakeholders	2	0	4	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0
and stakeholders	<u> </u>			2 Decisate involves form as an additionate the control of the disc	
			2	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.	
				Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.      Project involves and status allows	
Provides regional benefits				Projects involves one stakeholder.  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder.	
3. Trovides regional benefits	4	0	4	group?	1
	•		1	1= Yes	
	1	ı		0= No	
State Program Preferences	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1
			1	1= Yes 0= No	
5. Statewide Priorities	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1
	1 -		1	1= Yes	1
			-	1	ı

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment
Project Number: 1

Project Reviewer: Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria Possible Score **Question/Performance Measures** Weight Reviewe high 0= No Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the 6. Climate Change Adaption 0 2 2 0 vulnerability to the effects of climate change? 1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the 1 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 Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region? 0 1 1 1 Contribution- Project 1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other 1 0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy. 8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State? 2 0 2 1 Support to Renewable Energy 1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the 1 0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluatio	n and l	Ranking	Criteria	
Criteria	Weight		ole Score	Question/Performance Measures	Project
IDWAAD Cools		low	high		Score
IRWMP Goals Water Supply Goal	Diversify th	e region	al water su	apply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and sustainable supply to meet current	
	and future	_		FF, F	
1. Effect to agricultural users of water.	2	0	4	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2
			2	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.	
2. Improve Water Supply.	3	1	15	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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	3
			5	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.	
				0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.	
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,				Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	0
maintain Colorado River yields.	4	0	8	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0
			2	2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.	
				The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.	
				The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado	
Conserves Colorado River	1	I		River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable	
Supplies.	4	0	8	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	4
				federal requirements?	
			2	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.	
				Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially	
				demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.	
				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	4	0	4	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?	4
Water.			1	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.	
			-	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	2	0	6	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2
Management Strategies.	I		3	Integrates five or more RMS.	
				1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.	
				0. Less than three RMS.	
7. Plan Consistency.	2	0	4	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan, UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	2
	<u> </u>	1	2	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.	
				Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.	
				Limited or no consistency with existing plan.	
8. Groundwater Rights.	1	0	2	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	1
	•	•	2	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	
				prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent	
				or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.	
				Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	
				potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.	
Water Quality Goal				ficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWQCB Basin Plan through	
Match Water Quality to use.				i, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	2
•	2	0	4	benefits?	2
			2	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.	
				Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water	
				not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Can	sdale/So	am Schaeff	fer Combo	
Imperial IRWMP Project E	<b>Evaluation and Rank</b>		ation and Ranking Criteria		
Criteria	Weight	Possik	ole Score	Question/Performance Measures	Project
		low	high		Score
Support DACs- Wastewater.		_	_	Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;	_
	1	0	2	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend Colorado River supplies?	2
			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.	
				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.	
				economies of scale, of provide recycled water to extend the colorado hiver supply.	
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	4	0	8	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	0
	· ·		Ū	health, or creating economies of scale?	-
			2	Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.	
				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.	
Effect on Existing Waterways	2	0	4	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	2
		0	2	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	<u>-</u>
			-	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	1	0	2	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	0
Daily Loads (TMDLs)				Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?  2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.	
			2	2. Improves compilance with established finibits <u>and</u> implement stormwater bivirs.	
				Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.	
				o. Does not help meet established finibes and does not implement stormwater bivir s.	
6. Preserve or Improve	2	0	4	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	4
			2	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing	
				water quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant	
				impacts to existing water quality.	
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and agricultural			ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and	
Environmental Enhancements				Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	
	3	0	6		0
			2	2. Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project	
			-	impacts.	
				Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.	
				Project does not increase or improve habitat.	
2. Integrated Design Elements	2	0	2	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational	0
	2	U		elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0
			1	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.	
				Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life strategies.	and prop	perty from	flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management	
management dual	strategies.				
Percent of IRWMP Goal=	4.6%				
Reduce impacts from	2	0	4	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	2
stormwater events				localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	
			2	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.	
				Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.	
				Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	
1 Public Acceptance (Public				Will the project he able to agin public cupport from the vate naving negulation?	
Public Acceptance/Public     Public Acceptance/Public	3	0	6	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	3
			2	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	
				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	3	1	12	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	3
			4	4. <\$150/af.	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number:

Criteria					
	Weight	Possib low	ole Score	Question/Performance Measures	Project
		IOW	high	3. \$151 to \$300/af.	Score
				2. \$301 - \$450/af.	
				1. >450/af.	
Equitable cost sharing				Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	
Equitable cost sharing	2	0	6	both the chances that receive the schejits pay for the costs of producing those sentings.	0
			3	2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.	
				Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the	
				costs borne by new users.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly	
				equal proportions.	
. Promote Economic evelopment	3	1	9	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?	3
	J.		3	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  Clear documentation.	
				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	
- Provide Brown				generation. No solid documentation.	
eadiness to Proceed Category  Timeliness				Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	
	2	1	10	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?	6
<del></del>			5	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.	
				3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	
				2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	
. Technical Feasibility of Project	1	1		Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	
. reclinical reasibility of rioject	4	0	12	project?	4
			3	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.	
				The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.	
				The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	
. Environmental Compliance	2	0	4	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0
			2	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	-
				There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete environmental documentation.	
			1	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.	
. Permitting	1	0	2	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1
			2	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.     The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.	
				The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	
. Funding	5	0	10	Are the project funding sources well defined?	5
			2	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	<u> </u>
				maintenance and operations.  1. Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no	
				defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.	
				No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and	
	iteria			No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.	
	<b>iteria</b> 5	0	5	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0
		0	5	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.	0
		0		No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	0
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants		0		No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes	0
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants	5		1	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes     O= No     Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	-
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants	5		1	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes     O= No     Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?  2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.	-
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants	5		1	O. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes O= No 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.	-
ther CDWR Statewide IRWMP Cri. Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants and stakeholders  Provides regional benefits	2	0	1 4 2	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes  O= No  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.	0
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants	5		1	O. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes O= No 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.	-
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	2	0	1 4 2	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes Des 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.  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?  1= Yes	0
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants and stakeholders  Provides regional benefits	2	0	1 4 2 4 1	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes Des 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.  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?  1= Yes D= No	0
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants d stakeholders  Provides regional benefits	2	0	1 4 2 4 1 2 2	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes Des 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.  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?  1= Yes Des No Does the project support meet the state preferences?	0
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	2	0	1 4 2 4 1	O. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes O= No 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. O. Projects involves one stakeholder. Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group? 1= Yes O= No Does the project support meet the state preferences?  1= Yes	0
Provides multiple benefits  Involves multiple participants d stakeholders  Provides regional benefits	2	0	1 4 2 4 1 2 2	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes Des 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.  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?  1= Yes Des No Does the project support meet the state preferences?	0

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number: 1
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	ivielissa Car	isuule/st	iiii Schuejj	er combo		
Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria						
Criteria	Weight	Possik	le Score	Question/Performance Measures	Project	
		low	high		Score	
				0= No		
6. Climate Change Adaption	2	0	2	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the	0	
	2	U		vulnerability to the effects of climate change?		
			1	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	1	0	1	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1	
Contribution- Project	1	U	1		<u> </u>	
			1	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other		
			1	projects.		
				0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.		
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	1			Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?		
Support to Renewable Energy	2	0	2	sees and project suppose companies of remember energy portion of the neglor of state.	2	
	•	•		1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the		
			1	Region or state.		
				The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.		

Project Reviewed: Project Number: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluatio	n and F	Ranking	Criteria	Reviewer Two
Criteria	Weight	Possible Score Question/Performance Measures		Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Comments
IRWMP Goals	Diversificate			and another the control of the contr	
Water Supply Goal	and future			pply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and sustainable supply to meet current	
Effect to agricultural users of water.	2	0	4	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	
			2	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	
				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, and/or	
	3	1	15	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural	
			_	supplies.	
			5	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.	
				0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.	1.2 MGD Capacity is equivalent to 1,344 AFY
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,	4	0	8	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	a superior superior participation of the superior participation of
maintain Colorado River yields.		J		development of groundwater storage of underruns?	
			2	2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.  1. The project would be integrated with other project or strategies, or altered to provide for	
				1. The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.	
				O. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.	
4. Conserves Colorado River				Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable	
Supplies.	4	0	8	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	
			2	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.	
				Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet	
				requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial	Tertiary Treated water would be available for industrial demand.
5. Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River	4	0	4	use.  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?	moustrai demand.
Water.		1	1	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.	
				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.	2	0	6	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	
			3	2. Integrates five or more RMS.	
				1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.	
7. Dlan Canaistan	1			0. Less than three RMS.	
7. Plan Consistency.	2	0	4	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan, UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	
			2	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.	
	1			0. Limited or no consistency with existing plan.	
8. Groundwater Rights.	1	0	2	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 or has no impacts on such aquifers.	
				May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.	
				Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	Durings may affect an industrial demand of higher
				potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.	Project may offset an industrial demand of higher priority.
Water Quality Goal			•	ficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWQCB Basin Plan through 5, local, and state agencies.	
Match Water Quality to use.	2	n with sta	kenolders 4	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	
		L		benefits?	
			2	<ol><li>Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li></ol>	
				1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water	
				not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	Project is to treat wastewater to match with

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Project Number:

Project Number:	0.4 - 12		6.1	1	
Project Reviewer:	Melissa Ca				Davis was T
Imperial IRWMP Project I					Reviewer Two
Criteria	Weight		ole Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
Support DACs- Wastewater.		low	high	Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;	Comments
2. Support DACS- Wastewater.	1	0	2	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.	
				Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.	
				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	4	0	8	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	
		•	2	Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.	
				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	2	0	4	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	
			2	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.      Project would not provide benefit or have possible impacts on water quality of drains or provide benefit or have possible impacts.	
				<ol> <li>Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.</li> </ol>	Treated water is designated for industrial use not
E. Camphoodst Total 2	1		l	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.    Would be a variety before the project country with Project   Water Country   Project   Projec	environmental use.
5. Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)	1	0	2	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 <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	
				Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.	
6. Preserve or Improve	2	0	4	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	
			2	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing water quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.	
				Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.	
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and			cosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and	
Environmental Enhancements	3	0	6	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	
	1	1	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	Based on Project Informatin, it is uncertain if Project
				project impacts.  O. Project does not increase or improve habitat.	will provide any regional suply for environmental water use or support habitat.
2. Integrated Design Elements	2	0	2	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	
	ı	1	1	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.	
				Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life strategies.	and prop	erty from	flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management	
Percent of IRWMP Goal=	4.6%				
Reduce impacts from stormwater events	2	0	4	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	
			2	2. Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.	
				Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.	
				Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	
Strategic Considerations for IRWN	1				
1. Public Acceptance/Public	3	0	6	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.	
			2	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within	
				In moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.    D. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	
2. Cost Effectiveness	3	1	12	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	
5550 2.100014011055	3	1	12 4	4. <\$150/af.	
			4	11 - 9250y UT	

Project Reviewed: Project Number: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluatio	n and	Ranking	Criteria	Reviewer Two
Criteria	Weight	Possi	ble Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Comments
				3. \$151 to \$300/af.	Rough annual costs of \$465 per AF for 20 years for
				2. \$301 - \$450/af.	the WWTP upgraded were estimated based on Proje
		,		1. >450/af.	Information
3. Equitable cost sharing	2	0	6	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	
				2. All costs for now water would be paid for by now years, no effects an surrent rate base	
			3	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	
4. Promote Economic	1		1	equal proportions.  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net	
Development	3	1	9	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	
				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
			3	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.	
				Clear documentation.	
				Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.	
				D. Limited occurrentation:     D. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	
				generation. No solid documentation.	
Readiness to Proceed Category				In the second se	
1. Timeliness	2	1	10	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?	
	1	<u> </u>	5	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.	
			3	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	
				2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	
	1	1	1	1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.	
Technical Feasibility of Project	4	0	12	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	
	I	l		The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies	
			3	and completed engineering designs.	
				2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but	
				incomplete or partial designs.	
				<ol> <li>The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.</li> </ol>	
				-	Duning the information in disable limited from the discount
				0. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	Project information indicates limited funding to advance DAC projects, including this one.
3. Environmental Compliance	2	0	4	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	ı	1	2	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	
				There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	
				environmental documentation.	
4. Permitting	1	0	2	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.      Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	
4. I emiliang	<u> </u>	U	2	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.	
				The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.	
				The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	
5. Funding	5	0	10	Are the project funding sources well defined?	
			2	2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	
1			-	maintenance and operations.	
				Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.	
				No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and	
				operations.	
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Co	riteria				
Provides multiple benefits	5	0	5	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	
	1	<u> </u>	1	recreation, or other benefits? 1= Yes	Limited to WWTP improvement at one DAC and help
			-	0= No	with water quality of discharge to drain.
2. Involves multiple participants	1	_	4	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	
and stakeholders	2	0	4		
<del></del>			2	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.	
				Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	
				0. Projects involves one stakeholder.	
3. Provides regional benefits	4	0	4	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	
	1	<u> </u>	1	group? 1= Yes	One DAC community that
			1	1= Yes 0= No	One DAC community that may provide treated water for industrial uses.
4. State Program Preferences	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	
		<u> </u>	1	1= Yes	
			<u> </u>	0= No	
5. Statewide Priorities	2	0	2	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	
		•	1	1= Yes	

Project Reviewed: HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment

1
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo **Project Number:** 

Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria					Reviewer Two
Criteria	Weight	Possil	ble Score	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer
		low	high		Comments
			0= No		
6. Climate Change Adaption	2	0	2	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the	
	2	U	2	vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	
			1	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the	
			1	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	1	0	1	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	
Contribution- Project	1	U	1		
			1	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other	
			1	projects.	
				0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	_			Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	
Support to Renewable Energy	2	0	2		
-	•			1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the	
			1	Region or state.	
				0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.	Project information indicates purpose is to provide
					water supply for geothermal industry.

Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)

2

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer: Imperial IRWMP Project E	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
entena		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
IRWMP Goals					
Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and				
Effect to agricultural users of	sustainable supply to meet current and future demands  Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?				
water.	,	2		2	
	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				Project is to develop 50,000 AFY desalination plant to treat brackish surface water from the Alamo River or
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.				from IID drains.
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	4		4	
	5. >50.000 acre feet.				The section of the se
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				The project will treat brackish water from drain and deviler to suitable use. The Project Information does
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				not define if the brackish drain water is in need of
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.				replacement or needs to be mitigated. The treated water would go to uses to offset delivery of CO River
	1. 0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.				Water.
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?	1		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		There is potential for this project to be integrated		Project provides use of CO River, but, does not provide for storage in District. CO River water is
	River Supply.		with other projects to include storage.		stored in the river system and exchange in delivery.
4. Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable			_	
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	1		2	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				Desal of drain water results in water available for additional beneficial uses.
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				auditional beneficial uses.
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	1		1	
Water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	The project would not create a source of supply that could be used by a current user as a		Project would create a source of supply from brackish surface water from the Alamo River and IID drains,		
·	substitute for Colorado River supply and subsequent reapportionment.		which conceivably substitutes Colorado River water.		
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2		2	
ivianagement strategies.	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?	1		1	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.				
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	1		2	
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.				
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.		The produced water would be conveyed to IID conveyance facilities for distribution to agricultural		Project matches desal drain water with non- agricultural uses that are not presently part of the
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have		users as a substitute for using Colorado River water.		overlying groundwater users. This helps to preven
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		If ag users use groundwater this water supply could protect and optimize groundwater use.		and address overdraft as long as the drain water was not already part of the groundwater balance.
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the				
Match Water Quality to use.	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic			_	
. ,,	benefits?	1		2	
	<ol><li>Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li></ol>				
	1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water				
	not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	ł			
1	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		0	
	2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and				
	provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.	1			
	<ol> <li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li> </ol>	1			
	Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create	1	This project could assist in creating economic benefits		
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		by supplying a variety of projects with water as well as create a source of supply for ag users.		The project is to treat drain water, not wastewater.
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	1	and a source of supply for ug users.	0	project is to treat drain water, not wastewater.
	health, or creating economies of scale?	1		U	
	2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of	1			
	scale.				
	scale.  1. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.	-	There is potential for assisting in creating an economy of scale if water is provided for industrial		Project is to treat drain water; does not address
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.     Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		There is potential for assisting in creating an economy of scale if water is provided for industrial use.		Project is to treat drain water; does not address drinking water for DACs.
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.	2	economy of scale if water is provided for industrial	2	

Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)

2

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				Based on the Project Information, poor quality drain
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				water is to be cleaned up using desal.
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?	0		0	
Daily Loads (TWDLS)	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		Not discussed an arcicut submitted form		Based on the Project Information, TMDLs or
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1	Not discussed on project submittal form.	1	implenting a stormwater BMP not identified.
	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.				Based on Project Information, project is to make
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				available a reclaimed water supply thru desal of drain
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.  Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				water source.
Enhancement Goal 1. Environmental Enhancements	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.  Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	1			1
1. Environmental Enflancements	Project increases or improve habitat and could support mitigation of other impacts:  2. Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project.	0		0	-
	impacts.				
	<ol> <li>Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.</li> </ol>				No indication in the Project Information that the
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.				project will improve habitat.
Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
Flood Dystostion d Charmer	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  Protect life and property from floading and develop regional and legal fload protection and				
Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
1. Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	1		1	
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?  2. Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				-
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
Strategic Considerations for IRWN		1	T .		
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		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.				Uncertain based on Project Information
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	1		1	-
	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af.				
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.				
	1. >450/af.		Cost is listed as \$466/AF		
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		2	
	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
	<ol> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> </ol>				
	0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly				It is anticipated all costs for desal of drain water
4. Promote Economic	equal proportions.  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net		Not provided on project submittal form.		would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses.
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	2		1	
	<ol><li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.</li></ol> Clear documentation.				
	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	1			Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and when geothermal energy will be
Readiness to Proceed Category	generation. No solid documentation.				developed.
1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	2		2	
	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, < 1 Year.	_			-
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.				
	Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.     Long-term, >6 Years to develop.				
2. Technical Feasibility of Project	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	2		2	
	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.				
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.				
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.				
2 Facility 100 "			Information included in Draft IID Plan		
3. Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	0		0	-
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	1			
l	environmental documentation.	j			

Project Reviewed:

Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)

2

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Circeita	*****	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.	500.0	Comments	500.0	Comments
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		0	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	1			
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	0		0	
5. I dildilig	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	0		- 0	
	maintenance and operations.				
	Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no				
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and				
	operations.				
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C		•			
1. Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1		1	
	recreation, or other benefits?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		0	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.	1			Project Information identifies IID only.
Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder				Troject mormador identification only.
5. Frovides regional benefits	group?	1		1	
	1= Yes				1
	0= No				
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	1		1	
	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.				
	Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to	1			
	the effects of climate change.				
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project					
	<ol> <li>The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.</li> </ol>				
	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		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.		This is discussed explicity on the project submittal form.		

New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project

6

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer: Imperial IRWMP Project 1	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	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				
Effect to agricultural users of water.	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	1		1	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.		The project does not propose to affect water supply for either		The New River Bioremediation project, once operational, would supply water to an environment
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.		agricultural or municipal use. The explanation of the project's water supply benefit appears to benefit ecosystem restoration		use and benefit agriculture thru improvement of water quality of the component of the New River
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		moreso than water supply.		that is related to ag return flows.
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural	1		0	
	supplies. 5. >50,000 acre feet.				
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				
	5001 to 10,000 acre feet.     0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		No water supply amount is discussed.		No water supply yield estimate provided in project submital form.
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	0	ivo water supply amount is discussed.	0	Submittal lottii.
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	U		U	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.      The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for		The project lists GW storage as an aspect of a met DWR RMS, however no further information is provided at this time. It		
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.		appears GW storage would be additive to this project, and not a		The location of the Project and connectivity to an
	0. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.		direct goal of this project. This is not to say groundwater storage is not a viable option for clean water from this system at this time.		underlying gw basin for storage of CO River Supply is not clearly defined.
Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	0		0	
	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	1			The Project would conserve local water thru
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.		No supporting documentation was provided at this time. There is		conversion of poor quality water into supply usable
	<ol> <li>Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial</li> </ol>		a beneficial use for wetland habitats that is in herent in this project and this score will most likely change once supporting		for a new environmental demand/use. Therefore, it may not add to the CO River Supply since it is not
	use.		documentation is provided.		being delivered in place of an existing ag demand.
<ol><li>Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River</li></ol>	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	0		0	
Water.	Region?				
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.      The project would not exceed a source of supply that could be used by a surrent year as a source of supply that sould be used by a surrent year as a source of supply that sould be used by a surrent year as a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.		The project states the 'clean' water would be used for constructed		
	<ol> <li>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.</li> </ol>		wetlands developed for wildlife habitat restoration and therefore does not act as a substitute for Colorado River supplies.		See previous comment.
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2	,,	1	
Management Strategies.	Integrates five or more RMS.		This project claimed 14 Regional Management Strategies (RMS)		
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.		were satisfied by this project. The finding of this researcher is the		This Project has claims several RMS, however, they
7. Plan Consistency.	Less than three RMS.  Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,		project meets 7 of the total RMS listed.		are not directly connected nor strongly supported.
,	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	0		1	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				Concept to reduce waste nutrients from tributaries
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				entering the Salton Sea is supported in Salton Sea
Groundwater Rights.	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		planning.
	groundwater?	0		0	
	<ol><li>Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.</li></ol>				
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.				
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have				
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	2		1	
	benefits?  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and				
	provide economic benefits.				
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>				Project is to evaluate field scale of treatment process
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide		The project hopes to treat New River water for habitat		and is expecting to provide some level of economic
Support DACs- Wastewater.	economic benefits.  Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;		remediation.		benefit.
	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend	0		0	
	Colorado River supplies?  2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and				
	provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	<ol> <li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li> </ol>				
	Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create				The direct benefit of this Project supporting DAC
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				wastewater disposal is not clearly identified in the Project Information.
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	0		0	
	health, or creating economies of scale?  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.	1			
					The direct benefit of this Project supporting DAC
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		Drinking water standards are not discussed as a goal or benefit of this project.		drinking water standards is not clearly identified in the Project Information.
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	2		2	
	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.      Project would not provide benefit or have positive impacts on water quality of drains or.	1			
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				This Project is capable of positive effect on water
E Complete W. E. 1111	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.      Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.      Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		Project intends to improve the water quality.		quality of drain water.
<ol><li>Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)</li></ol>	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0		0	
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
l		]			

Project Reviewed: New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project
Project Number: 6
Project Reviewer: Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo	,			
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Criteria	Question in circumatice measures	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.	30016	Comments	30016	Comments
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		D. C. J. J. C. J. T. M. D. J. D. M. D.		Description of the Bustines
C. December on Income	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	_	Project does not discuss TMDLs or stormwater BMPs.		Does not apply to Project
Preserve or Improve		0		1	
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect				
	existing water quality.  1. Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water				
	quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				Based on the Project information, it protects existing
	impacts to existing water quality.		Project does not discuss improving groundwater resources.		wq but does not directly improve gw quality.
Environmental Protection and	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	2		2	
	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.		Braiact intends to increase /improve habitate by constructing		Broject will important babitat and could support
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.		Project intends to increase/improve habitate by constructing wetlands and removing waste nutrients from the water.		Project will imoprove habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.
2. Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational	_	8		
	elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		1	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.		Project discusses recreational elements as a possibility, however		
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.		there is no final design with those aspects provided at this time.		
Flood Protection and Stormwater	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and				
Management Goal	stormwater management strategies.				
1. Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	1		1	
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	,, protectine and property.		The project does not appear to reduce or significantly affect		Exact location of Project is unknown and stated
	0. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.		economic damages or protect life or property from stormwater		purpose is primarily for water quality treatment, not
			damages in particular.		flood retentioin.
Strategic Considerations for IRWN					
1. Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	0		0	
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
	Imperial Region.				
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		None stated in the Project information
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
	4. <\$150/af.				
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.				
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.				
	1. >450/af.		No cost per acre foot is provided		No cost per af provided in Project information.
Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?		No cost per acre foot is provided		No cost per ai provided in Project information.
5. Equitable cost sharing	bo the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits.	0		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.				
	O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly				Since all identified funding is either grant or local
	equal proportions.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		cost share, no effect on current rate base.
4. Promote Economic	Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net	1		1	
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	1		1	
	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue				
	generation. Clear documentation.				
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue				
	generation. Limited documentation.		This project has potential for creating jobs as well as new		
	O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue		industries (fertilizers, energy source, nutraceuticals, etc.) if the		Project information states potential for economic
	generation. No solid documentation.		evaluation yields favorable results.		activity, limited documentation.
Readiness to Proceed Category	Describe and lead to the shifts for Coulob Ideas to the shifts to be and the shift to be a simple and t				
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		4	
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.				
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.				
	Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.				
	Long-term, >6 Years to develop.				Project sponsor is in place.
2. Technical Feasibility of Project	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	1		1	
	project?  2. The project has detailed decumentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies.				
	<ol><li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li></ol>				
	The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies,				
	but incomplete or partial designs.				
	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?	1		0	
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.				
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete				
	environmental documentation.				5
4 Dosmitting	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.      Describe associated by a promise of a plan to obtain possible?	4	This documentation was not provided to us.	^	Exact site location not identified.
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		0	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.     The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				Permits and env doc identified but not clearly known
E Funding	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1		1	or scheduled
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?  2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	1		1	
	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval;				
	no defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance				Statement of a local cost match and proposed
	and operations.				budget, but no documented funding source.
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Co	riteria				

New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project

6

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				Projecst lists other governmental agencies as funding
	Projects involves one stakeholder.				sources.
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?	0		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project information states ability to address DAC
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	needs, which is not well supported and the project is
	1= Yes				not elible for storm water and flood managmeent
	0= No				funding.
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				Drought prepardness and DAC benefits are not
	0= No				supported.
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		1	
	<ol> <li>Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.</li> </ol>				
	<ol> <li>Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.</li> </ol>				Very minimal positive effect.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	0		1	., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., .
	<ol> <li>The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.</li> </ol>				
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.		This is unknown at this time. The production of methane as a byproduct could affect GHG levels in the region.		
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	0		1	
	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.		This is unknown at this time. It is a possibility.		Minimal component of potential for methane gas use.

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)
7
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
IRWMP Goals		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and				
Effect to agricultural users of	sustainable supply to meet current and future demands				I
water.	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2		2	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.     Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		Intent of project is to provide 25,000 afy of new		Project is to develop 25 KAFY desalination using well
2. Improve Water Supply.	Does the project provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply that contributes to the		supply, which could benefit ag water supplies.		field and groundwater.
	regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	3		3	
	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			The project will use desal to treat groundwater. The treated water would go to uses to offset delivery of
	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		25,000 afy as stated		CO River Water.
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?	1		2	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.      The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				Project provides use of CO River, but, does not
	The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.				provide for storage in District. CO River water is stored in the river system and exchanged in delivery.
Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				stored in the river system and exchanged in delivery.
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	1		2	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially	1			
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.  O. Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				Desal of groundwater results in water available for additional beneficial uses.
5. Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River	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		1	
Water.	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				
Integrate Resource	substitute for Colorado River supply and subsequent reapportionment.  Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	_			
Management Strategies.	Integrates five or more RMS.	2		2	
	Integrates 1/4e of more RMS.     Integrates 3-5 RMS.	1			
	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?	1		1	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
Groundwater Rights.	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?				
o. Groundwater rights.		2		1	
	<ol><li>Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.</li></ol>				Project matches desal of groundwater with non-
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				agricultural uses. This project may not help to prevent and address overdraft since it is making use
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.  O. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have				of groundwater, however, it depends on if the
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.				groundwater to be used as the desal supply is counted in the groundwater balance.
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	2		2	
	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.				
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.				
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?	1		0	
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  O. 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.				The project is to desal groundwater, not wastewater.
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	1		1	
	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.				Project is to desal groundwater and has the
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1		1	possibility of addressing drinking water for DACs.
0	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.				
					1 of 5

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)
7
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	rivers.				Based on the Project Information, groundwater is to
5. Comply with Total Maximum	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.  Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board				be cleaned up using desal.
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0		0	
	2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.	-			
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				Based on the Project Information, TMDLs or
			Not in project submittal form.		implenting a stormwater BMP not identified.
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	2		1	-
	water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.				Based on Project Information, project is to make us
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				of poor quality groundwater, but, not necessarily
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.  Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,	L			improve it or protect it.
Enhancement Goal	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.		<u> </u>		
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0		0	
	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.	]			No indication in the Project Information that the
2 Integrated Design Flores	Project does not increase or improve habitat.  Peac the project interests a miscompatal appearance marks as other respectional elements.				project will 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?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
Elood Protoction and Stammer	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and				
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
1. Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	1		1	
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?  2. Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.	-		-	-
	Projects would neduce economic damages, protect life and property.      Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	1. Projects would not reduce economic damages of protect life and property.				
	0. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
Strategic Considerations for IRWM		_			I
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.	0		1	-
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				Uncertain based on Project Information
2. Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	1		1	
	4. <\$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af.				
	3. \$151 to \$300/di. 2. \$301 - \$450/df.				
	1. >450/af.	1	Listed cost at \$480/AF		
3. Equitable cost sharing	1. >450/at.  Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	Listed cost at \$480/AF	1	
3. Equitable cost sharing		0	Listed cost at \$480/AF	1	
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	Listed cost at \$480/AF	1	
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	Listed cost at \$480/AF	1	It is uncertain if all costs for desal of groundwater
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	0	Listed cost at \$480/AF  Not discussed on project submittal form.	1	It is uncertain if all costs for desal of groundwater would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.
4. Promote Economic	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.  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net				would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or
4. Promote Economic	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.	2		1	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or
4. Promote Economic	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.  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.				would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or
4. Promote Economic	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.  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?				would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or
4. Promote Economic	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.  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.				would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information,
4. Promote Economic Development	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.  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.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue				would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information,
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	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.  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.  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.	2		1	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development	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.  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.  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.  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?				would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	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.  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.  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.  Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	2		1	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	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.  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.  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.  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		1	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geothermation is project in the pro
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	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.  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.  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		2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  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.  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.  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.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	2		1	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  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.  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.  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?  1. 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.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	2		2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geothermation is project in the pro
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  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.  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.  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. Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  3. The project have 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	2		2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  1. Cost for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  1. 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.  2. In Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.  3. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  1. 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.  3. Long-term, > 6 Years to develop.  4. Long-term, > 6 Years to develop.  5. Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  6. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.	2		2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.  1. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  1. Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, post post post post post post post post	2		2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  1. Cost shorne by new users.  1. Cost for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  1. 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.  2. In Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.  3. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  1. 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.  2. Long-term, > 6 Years to develop.  2. Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  3. The project thas detailed documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.  1. The project is partially documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	2	Not discussed on project submittal form.	2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  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.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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. 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, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.	2		2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness 2. Technical Feasibility of Project	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.  1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.  1. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  1. Cost be project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, be creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  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.  1. 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, 3 6 Years to develop.  2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.  2. 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 and completed engineering designs.  1. The project is partially 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.	2 2	Not discussed on project submittal form.	2	would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses or shared by local rate payers.  Based on projections in Project Information, uncertain if and whennew uses, such as, geotherma

Imperial IRWMP Project Review Score Sheet January 2012 East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)

7

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Scharff Communication in the Communication of the Communication of the Communication in the Communication of the Communication of

Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.				
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		0	
	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.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	0		0	
	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 Control  1. Provides multiple benefits		1			T.
1. Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	1		1	
	1= Yes			<b>-</b>	
	0= No	1			
2. Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?				
and stakeholders		0		1	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				1
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	_			Project Information identifies IID and other
					interested parties for regional geothermal energy development.
Provides regional benefits	Projects involves one stakeholder.  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder.				development.
3. Provides regional benefits	group?	1		1	
	1= Yes				1
	0= No				
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No	-			
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes	1			-
	0= No				
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability				
0,	to the effects of climate change?	1		1	
	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	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project	1. The section of the				4
	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	D. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	-			
	o. The project contributes to drid emissions, and does not support reflewable effet gy.				
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?				
Support to Renewable Energy	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1		1	
Ū,	1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in				
	the Region or state.				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	•			•	

City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project 8 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria					
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer -
IRWMP Goals		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
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				
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2		1	
water.	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	4		1	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
	5. >50,000 acre feet. 4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				Project information predicts a 0.100 mgd saving from
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.		approximately 100 afy is estimated to be saved, and approximately 92 acre feet (30 MG) of storage would		the WTP that will reduce demands from the CO River water system by 36.5 million gallons / year. This
2.2.4.6.6.4.4.4.2.2.4.4.	1. 0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		be available with the storage tank.		estimate is equivalent to 112 acft/yr.
<ol><li>Protect Surface Water Rights, maintain Colorado River yields.</li></ol>	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through development of groundwater storage of underruns?	1		0	
·	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		There is potential for storage and extension of Colorado River supplies for a very limited amount of		Project provides an estimated 112 acft/yr saved water, but, does not add storage capacity of CO River
	River Supply.		time.		Supply.
<ol> <li>Conserves Colorado River Supplies.</li> </ol>	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	0		1	
	federal requirements?	Ů		•	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				Project is a facility improvement that results in some water conservation, not necessarily a large scale
	use.				water conservation measure.
<ol><li>Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River</li></ol>	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		1	
Water.					
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	<ol> <li>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.</li> </ol>		A very limited supply.		An estimated 112 acft/yr would be saved.
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	1	A very inniced suppry.	1	All estimated 112 act yy would be saved.
Management Strategies.	Integrates five or more RMS.	1		1	
	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.				
	Less than three RMS.				
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	1		2	
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?     Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		City's capital improvement program.		Part of City of Brawley Capital Improvement Program
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.				
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.				
	0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have				
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		Not applicable with this project.		
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	2		0	
	benefits?  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and				
	provide economic benefits.				
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>				
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide				
Support DACs- Wastewater.	economic benefits.  Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;				
2. Support DACS- Wastewater.	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend	1		0	
	Colorado River supplies?				
	<ol><li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li></ol>				
	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		Uncertain if community is currently out of compliance. Possibility of creating a limited term		
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		economy of scale during construction, could assist in		
Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public		extending a small amount of Colorado River supply.		
5. Support DACS- Drinking water	health, or creating economies of scale?	1		1	
	Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of     coals.				
	scale.  1. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.				
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards on greate assessming of!-		Could not notable greate a limited to a second		Improves performance of existing services
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		Could potentially create a limited term economy of scale.		Improves performance of existing raw water treatement plant.
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1		1	
]	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	J			

City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project 8 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	50010	Comments	50010	Comments .
	rivers.  0. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				
5. Comply with Total Maximum	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	0		0	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?  2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.	U		- 0	
	2. Improves compilance with established twiots <u>and</u> implement stormwater bivirs.				
	1. Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				Poject is specific to meeting the needs of drinking
Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1		1	water for DAC area.
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing		1		1
	water quality.  1. Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water	4			
	quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.		Not applicable with this project.		
Environmental Protection and	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal  1. Environmental Enhancements	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.  Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?		T		T T
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0		0	
	<ol><li>Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.</li></ol>				
	Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other	1			
	project impacts.  0. Project does not increase or improve habitat.				
Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements	0		0	
	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?  1. Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.	U		0	
	The grates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.  O. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	-			
Flood Protection and Stormwater	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and	<u> </u>			
Management Goal	stormwater management strategies.				
Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	1		1	
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?  2. Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.		+		-
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
Strategic Considerations for IRWN					
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.	0		1	
	2. The degree of stakeholder support and low potential for connects within imperial region.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				Based on Project Information, not enough evidence to score higher.
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	4		2	
	4. <\$150/af.				If the project cost was all associated with the saved
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.	1			water, then the cost per acft/yr saved as the "yield" is
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.		At \$4,000,000 over a 20 year period and assuming 92		high. Cost of project associated with the local rate payer of volume of treated water was not provided in
	1. >450/af.	1	afy, the approximate cost per acre foot of water would be \$108.		the Project Information, thus, a score associated with "low-cost" per acft was not justifiable.
Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	would be \$106.	0	low-cost per acit was not justinable.
	2. All costs for now water would be paid for by now years, no effects on surrent rate base	0		-	
	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.				
	Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly	1			
4. Promote Economic	equal proportions.  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net		Not provided on project submittal form.		Uncertain who will have ability to pay for costs.
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	1		0	
	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.		-		-
	Clear documentation.				
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.				
	Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	ĺ	Could create limited term construction jobs and a		Constructing the improvements to the WTP would be
Readiness to Proceed Category	generation. No solid documentation.		few permanent maintenance positions.		the positive economic activity.
1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	3		3	
	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, < 1 Year.				
	Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.     Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	1			
	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?	1		1	
	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.	]			
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.				
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	†			Although technical reports not completed, the scope of work is well know and have been completed in
2 Environmental Co!					similar communities.
3. Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	0		0	
1	O	4	1		

Project Reviewed:

City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project

8

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Criteria	Question, Ferrormance measures	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	1. There are come existing studies or plans to complete studies, a clear plan to complete	30016	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete environmental documentation.				Environmental documents are not expected to be
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.				difficult or complex.
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		0	ameter of complex.
i Cillitang	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	0		0	
3. Fullating	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	- 0			-
	maintenance and operations.				
	Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no				
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and				
	operations.				
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C					
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?	U		0	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.				IID and City of Brawley
Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder				IID and city of Brawley
5. Fronties regional benefits	group?	0		0	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Limited to area served by City of Brawley
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes	_			-
	0= No				Critical water supply needs of a DAC within region
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	ericled water supply needs of a Brie within region
		-			-
	1= Yes 0= No				Addresses the safe drinking water needs of a DAC
Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability				Addresses the sale drinking water needs of a DAC
o. Cimate change Adaption	to the effects of climate change?	1		0	
	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		1	
	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	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?	0		0	
	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.	1			

Project Reviewed: Project Number:

City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project 9 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer: Imperial IRWMP Project I	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria	_			
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
IRWMP Goals	Proof the standard of the same and the same at the standard of				
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	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2	This project proposes to upgrade a treatment plant to	2	
water.		2	relieve a 5.9 MGD demand currently on Colorado	2	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.		River water and provide a new source of water for industrial demand. However it is not clearly stated if		
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.		that relief would benefit agricultural users		
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		specifically.		Project reduces competition for CO River Water
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	2		2	
	5. >50.000 acre feet.				
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.	1			
	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.		5.9 mgd ~ 6,500afy		5.9 MGD converts to 6,500 AF/YR
<ol><li>Protect Surface Water Rights, maintain Colorado River yields.</li></ol>	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0		0	
mamam colorado niver yielas.	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for		The purpose of the upgrade is to provide a water		
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.		source for a geothermal energy plant. It is doubtful		Project helps with reclaiming wastewater, already
	The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.		the project would be altered to include groundwater storage.		delivered source water, which then offsets demands on CO River. It does not add to GW storage.
4. Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	1		1	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.		As stated in the project submital form the project		
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet		would recycle water for use in a geothermal plant, as well as remain in compliance with its existing NPDES		Reason for score of 1 is the uncertainty of place for reclaimed water to be delivered. Once a geothermal
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial		permit. Conservation is applicable through		plant is located to be built, project would score
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current		wastewater treatment.		higher.
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0	This project specifically states the water treated	1	
Water.			would alleviate Colorado River supply demand and be reapportioned as industrial demand for geothermal		Although overall water balance may not change, the
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.		energy development, however this water is		treated water could replace CO River Water
	<ol><li>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.</li></ol>		considered a "new" source of supply for (presumably)		deliveries to future geothermal, thus matching a
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?		an as-yet built geothermal plant.		reclaimed water to an inducstiral use.
Management Strategies.		1		1	
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.	1			
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     O. Less than three RMS.				
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,				
<u> </u>	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	0		1	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				Proejct Information sheet unclear, however, reclaimed water project concepts are part of
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Unknown		UWMPs.
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	
	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent	-			
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.				
	0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	1			Project replaces demand for CO River Water; which
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		Unknown		reduces reliance on gw.
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	2		1	
	benefits?	2		1	
	<ol><li>Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li></ol>				
	1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water				
	not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide		Project intends to treat wastewater (poor quality		
	economic benefits.		source water) for the purposes of supporting geothermal energy development.		
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?	1		2	
	2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and				
	provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.	4			
	<ol> <li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li> </ol>		Uncurs if community is out of compliance with		
	Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create	1	Unsure if community is out of compliance with requirements. This project could create an economy		
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		of scale and if it does not could in turn extend the		
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	_	Colorado River supply.	_	
	health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.	1			
	O. Describe DACete mest displication	4	The purpose of the project is not to provide drinking		
	Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		water to any community. The project could be altered to do so but does not at this time.		
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	2		2	
<del></del>	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.		Project intends to upgrade from secondary to		Increased level of treatment would provide some

City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project

9

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

	ivaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
	A Desirability and provide heavy?	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	<ol> <li>Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.</li> </ol>		reclaimed water standards as well as remain in compliance with NPDES, which indicates an added		benefit, however, the existing improvements are to meet NPDES Permit requirements; future
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		benefit.		imporvements may not add more benefit.
<ol><li>Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)</li></ol>	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0		0	
Daily Loads (TIVIDES)	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.		Already complies with site specific NPDES and		
			presumably in line with the RWQCB. Because the project intends to remain in compliance it does not		
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.		improve compliance with established TMDLs or		
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		stormwater BMPs. Stormwater BMP compliance is unknown at this time.		
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	0	driknown at this time.	1	
	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.		Water from this project is intended for a geothermal		
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.		plant and not for groundwater remediation, use, recharge, etc.		Project not direcity improving gw quality; does match reclaimed water with use.
Environmental Protection and	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal 1. Environmental Enhancements	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.  Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?				
2. Environmental Environmenta	Treate the project moreuse of improve habitation support imagencing of other improve.	0		0	
	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.				
Integrated Design Elements	Project does not increase or improve habitat.  Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements		Not included on the project submittal form.		
2. Megratea Design Elements	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
Flood Protection and Ct-	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and		Not included on the project submittal form.		
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from				
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
			Not included on the project submittal form.		
Strategic Considerations for IRWN  1. Public Acceptance/Public	I Plan Implementation  Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	1		1	
	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	1		1	
			This project intends to expand on the geothermal energy industry while reducing the demand on		
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		Colorado River supplies. This will potentially create		
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		an economic boost as well as alleviate agricultural pressures and possible		
2. Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	4		4	Rough estimate ~\$100/AF additional cost based on
	4. < \$150/af.		Not included on the project submittal form. The		total estimated costs stated in the Project Information Form of \$12,500,000. Roughly \$650,000
	3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af.		project costs \$12.5 million and provides		per year over 20 years for 6,500 af-yr yield. Or,
	1. >450/af.		approximately 6,500 afy, over the course of 20 years the cost per acre foot would be approximately \$100.		~100/af increase in cost for reclaimed water treatment.
Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	the cost per acre root would be approximately \$200.	2	a countries
	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.	-		-	
	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.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly				This is an assumption that the project would be paid for by those who benefit. It is not clearly defined in
1.0	equal proportions.		Not included on the project submittal form.		the Project Information sheet.
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?	1		1	
	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				
	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.     Clear documentation.		If a geothermal plant is constructed based on the		
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue     approximation. Limited documentation.		amount of water provided by this plant then yes.		
	generation. Limited documentation.  O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue		However, it should be a requirement that this water is used for that purpose to provide the most		
Pondinger to Deg C-+	generation. No solid documentation.		economic benefit to the region.		
Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	4		2	
	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?	4		3	
	Immediate, < 1 Year.     Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.				
	2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.		As provided on the content when the		Funding sources are not developed or circarly
Technical Feasibility of Project	Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the		As provided on the project submittal form.		identified.
	project?	1		2	
	<ol><li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li></ol>				
	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.		This project has a draft alternative study as well as		
	0. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.		conceptual drawings, however no reconnaissance or		Draft alternative study and conceptural drawing are
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0	feasibility study has been designed.	0	in place.
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	U		U	
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete				
ļ	environmental documentation.				

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project

9

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Citteria	******	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.	50010	Not included on the project submittal form.	500.0	Commence
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0	Not included on the project submittal form.	0	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.			-	
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		Not included on the project submittal form.		
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1	Not included on the project submittal form.	0	
	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	_		_	1
	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		Not seeking Prop 84 or 1E funds, have obtained half		
	operations.		of the total estimated cost.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C					
<ol> <li>Provides multiple benefits</li> </ol>	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1	Desiration data and de 5 0 and antique NDDFC	1	
	1= Yes		Project intends to provide 5.9 mgd, maintain NPDES water quality standards as outlined in existing NPDES		1
	O. M.		permit, assists in water conservation, and promotes		
	0= No		economic development.		
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		0	
and stakenoiders	2 Desirate involves for an arrangement that the control of the disc				-
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.				
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	1		0	
	group?		Dravides regional banefit in alloviating demand on		-
	1= Yes 0= No		Provides regional benefit in alleviating demand on Colorado River supplies.		
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1	i ''	1	
	1= Yes	1	This project can effectively resolve a significant water- related conflice by providing a water supply of 5.9 mgd and alleviating demand on Colorado River water.	- 1	-
	0= No				Only meets 1
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1	This project uses and re-uses water more efficiently.	1	
	1= Yes		This project should be integrated with the		
	0= No		geothermal energy industry to meet the multi-		
Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability		benefit project.		Only meets 1
6. Climate Change Adaption	to the effects of climate change?	0		0	
	<ol> <li>Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.</li> </ol>				
	0. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to				
	the effects of climate change.		Not included on the project submittal form.		
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project					4
	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	projects.  0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1		1	
	o. The project contributes to arra emissions, and does not support reliewable energy.		Unknown		
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	1	OHATOWII	1	
Support to heliewable therey	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	-		Yes, the project will provide a water supply for the		Decidest provides water supply to not on!
	0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.		purposes of expanding the geothermal energy industry in the region.		Project provides water supply to potential renewable
	1	1	maasa y III die region.		energy.

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer: City of Brawley Water Meter Project

12

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
IRWMP Goals		JCOTE	Comments	Score	Comments
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	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	1	Project states a conservation of 1 mgd if implemented, which calculates to approximately	2	
	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.		1,120 afy. Unsure of benefits to agricultural users, not		
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.		specifically stated in the project submittal form.  There COULD be a positive impact by offsetting the		
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		need for urban delivery and reapportioning water to		Conserved water reduces demand on CO River Water
2. Improve Water Cumply			agricultural users.		delivery.
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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1		1	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				-
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.	1			
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.		Only calculates to 1,120 afy, but does not truly		
	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		provide a new supply as conserve an old one.		1MGD equates to 1120 AF/YR
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?	0		0	
namean colorado River yielus.	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for	1			
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado      Storage or use of Colorado      The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado		Does not discuss storage or use of the Colorado River		Project has potential to reduce demand of CO River
4. Conserves Colorado River	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable		Supply.		Supply
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	1		2	
	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.		The project would adequately monitor usage		
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet		throughout the city, howeer supporting		
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial		documentation of a resaonable and beneficial use was not provided.		Water conservation resulting from metering is consistent with state requirements.
5. Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River	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?	0	It does not appear this project would create a source	1	
Water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.		of supply, but would rather more closely monitor the		
	The project would not create a source of supply that could be used by a current user as a	1	use for which the water is already intended. It is not clear as to what other use the proposed savings		Project has potential to reduce demand of CO River
	substitute for Colorado River supply and subsequent reapportionment.		would be used.		Supply
6. Integrate Resource Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	1	Conveyance Improvement-Yes-water meters will provide a representation of water use in the system	2	
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.		and allow for conservation measures to be in place.  2. Urban Water Use Efficiency-Yes-monitors urban water use		
	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.		3. Industrial Process Water Use Efficiency-Yes- monitors industrial use 4. Water Exchanges-Yes-an accurate representation		
	0. Less than three RMS.		of water use in the system will assist in water exchanges 5. Drinking Water Treatment-No-this project does not		
			discuss improving water treatment or water quality		
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?	1		2	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Project is identified in the Capital Improvement Plan for 2012		Capital improvement plan and metering in required element of UWMP
3. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	Ť		-	-
	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly neips to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.	]			
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.	4			
	<ol> <li>Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.</li> </ol>	1	Door not discuss groundwater		
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the		Does not discuss groundwater.		
	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	0		0	
	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and				
	provide economic benefits.	4			
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>		Designs done not intend to make honoficial use of		
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	1	Project does not intend to make beneficial use of poor quality water. Economic benefit may arise from		
2.6	economic benefits.		meter use, however it is not stated in this project.		
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?	0		0	
	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.  O. Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create	1			
	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	0	Not discussed in project submittal.	1	Meterinf of potable water, not wastewater.
	health, or creating economies of scale?				

City of Brawley Water Meter Project

12

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	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.		Not discussed in project submittal.		Help reduce cost of treatment by demand reduction.
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	0	Not discussed in project submittal.	1	repreduce cost of treatment by demand reduction.
	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				Project has potential to reduce demand of CO River
	rivers.		Monitoring how much water is flowing through the		Supply, however, water would likely be delivered ot
Comply with Total Maximum	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.  Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board		pipes, not the quality of that water.		additional industrial demand in furture.
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0		0	
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	1 Improved the state of the sta				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		Not discussed in project submittal.		Project not related to TMDL or stormwater BMPs.
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	0	Not discussed in project submittui.	1	respect not related to TMBE of Stormwater Shiri S.
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing				
	water quality.				
	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	1			
Environmental Bustanti	impacts to existing water quality.	L	Not discussed in project submittal.		
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0		0	
		U		U	
	<ol><li>Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.</li></ol>				
	Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other	1			
	project impacts.				
2 1 1 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2	Project does not increase or improve habitat.		Not discussed in project submittal.		
Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.		Not discussed in project submittal.		
	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and				
Management Goal	stormwater management strategies.				
1. Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	1		1	
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
			Not discussed in project submittal.		
Strategic Considerations for IRWN  1. Public Acceptance/Public	A Plan Implementation  Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?		Γ		Т
1. Fublic Acceptance/Fublic	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	0		0	
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for connects within imperial kegion.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
	Imperial Region.  O. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		Possible stakeholder protests over the monitoring of		
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	2	water use.	2	Payment capacity of rate payers is extremely low.
E. COST ETICCHIVE/ICSS	4. <\$150/af.	3	Not discussed in the project submittal form, however for a \$4 million dollar project and a 1,120 afy "yield"	3	
	4. < \$150/ai. 3. \$151 to \$300/af.	1	the possible cost per acre foot for the first year		
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.	1	would be \$180 per acre foot for approximately 20 years. However, long term costs have not been		Based on rough calculation of spreading the \$4M cost in Project information over 20 years with a potential
	1. >450/af.	<u> </u>	calculated.	<u> </u>	water savings of 1,120 AF/Yr, it will cost ~\$180/AF
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		0	
	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
	2. All cooks for fiew water would be paid for by fiew 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.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly	-			It is expected these are rate payors within the distance
	costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.	<u></u>	It is expected these are rate payers wihtin the district installing the meters.
4. Promote Economic	Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net				
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	0		0	
	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				
	Clear documentation.				
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.				
	Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	1			
D	generation. No solid documentation.				
Readiness to Proceed Category  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		4	
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.				
	Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.     Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	1			
	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	2		3	
	project?  3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies				
	and completed engineering designs.				
i e	2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but				
	incomplete or partial designs.				

City of Brawley Water Meter Project

12

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
C. I. C. I.		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	500.0		50010	Comments
	studies and has not been designed.		The project does not have technical reports and		
			documentation, but does have a completed		Haban and add the same and the
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.		environmental review, regulatory approval, and a completed permitting process.		Urban water district metering is common frequent practice.
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	2	completed permitting process.	2	practice.
3. Environmental compilance		2			4
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.				
	<ol> <li>There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete environmental documentation.</li> </ol>				
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		Environmental review is complete.		Project only requires Cat Exclusion
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	2	Environmental review is complete.	2	1 roject only requires cat exclusion
Crimening	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.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
r rdia-	·	0	Yes, the City Building Permit.	0	Only need City permits
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?  2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	U		- 0	1
	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	1		1	
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and				
	operations.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C					
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,				
·	recreation, or other benefits?	0		0	
	1= Yes				
	0= No		Provides only conservation benefits at this time.		Limited to urban water conservation thru metering.
2. Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?				
and stakeholders		0		0	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				1
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	1			
					Project is for one DAC community; Requirement of
2 Daniidaa aasiaaal baaafita	0. Projects involves one stakeholder.				State for communities to install meters.
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	0	If the project delivers the 1 mgd savings (1,120 afy) then that could help alleviate the regional demand	0	
	group? 1= Yes		on Colorado River water. However, it is unclear if this		
	0= No	1	would be a regional credit, or a city credit.		Single DAC.
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1	would be a regional creat, or a city creat.	1	Single Brief
		1		1	4
	1= Yes 0= No	_			Two of the preferences.
Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?				Two or the preferences.
3. Statewide Priorities		1		1	
	1= Yes	1		1	
	0= No				Two of the priorities.
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability	1		1	
	to the effects of climate change?				
	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the	1	Water metering would allow for quantifying the	1	
	effects of climate change.  O. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to	1	amount of water used and provide an avenue for		Decicat halos with alimate
	the effects of climate change.	1	further water conservation efforts if climate change affects the region.	1	Project helps with climate change thru water demanded reduction.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?		anects the region.		reduction.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions     Contribution- Project	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the regions	1		1	
Contribution Froject	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.	1		1	
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1			
	and account support terrande citerage			1	
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?				
Support to Renewable Energy		0		0	
<u> </u>	1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in				
	the Region or state.	1		1	
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.	1			
	, ,	1			

Keystone Water Reclamation Facility

13

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
IDW/MD Cools		Score	Comments	Score	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				
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	0		2	
water.	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				First phase of this facility supplies 2.5 MGD or 2,800
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.	1	Not discussed in the project submittal form.		acre-feet/year of treated wastewater or storm water to non-agricultural uses.
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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1		1	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
	5. >50,000 acre feet. 4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				Project's first phase contributes 2,800 acre-feet/year; up to 16,800 acre-feet/year at project buildout of
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				15MGD. However, presently no municipal,
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.		Project intends to provide 2.5 mgd (~3,000 afy) of		commercial, or industrial demands are realized or under contract for delivery of this reclaimed water
	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		treated water for heavy industrial use.		supply.
<ol><li>Protect Surface Water Rights, maintain Colorado River yields.</li></ol>	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0		0	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	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	-			Project has potential to off-set future CO River
	River Supply.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		deliveries to non-agricultural uses.
<ol> <li>Conserves Colorado River Supplies.</li> </ol>	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	1		1	
	federal requirements?	1		1	
	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.				
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial		Water conservation measures in terms of treating existing wastewater and stormwater for the purposes		
	use.		of industrial use (beneficial use).		
<ol><li>Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River</li></ol>	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?	0		1	
Water.		Ü		-	
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.		Project does not provide a source of supply as a		First phase of this facility supplies 2.5 MGD or 2,800
	<ol><li>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.</li></ol>		substitute for a current use, but intends to provide a		acre-feet/year of treated wastewater or storm water
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2	source of supply for a future use.	2	to non-agricultural uses.
Management Strategies.	2. Inhanata Fire and DNC	2		2	
	Integrates five or more RMS.     Integrates 3-5 RMS.		Removed Multi-purpose flood management from the		
	Less than three RMS.		list of selected RMS as it does not appear this facility would assist in major flood control.		
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	0		2	
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?     Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				County of Imperial has set aside an area known as
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		Mesquite Lake Specific Plan. The City is in final stages of property acquisition.
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		2	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.				Project matches reclaimed water with non- agricultural uses that are not presently part of the overlying groundwater users. This helps to prevent and address overdraft as long as the wastewater and stormwater were not a
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>				
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have				
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		balance.
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	2		1	
	benefits?  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and				
	provide economic benefits.	]			
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>				
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide		Source water is wastewater and stormwater runoff that is currently un-used and would be used for		Investment in treatment is necessary to match
	economic benefits.		industrial purposes.		quality of source water to future demand.
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	2		2	
	Colorado River supplies?				
	<ol><li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li></ol>	-	This project will meet all provisions of CA Title 22		
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				Country of the country of
	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.		requirements, could assist in an economic boost by providing heavy industrial plants with a water source,		Creation of the economies of scale are in planning stages, not realized until industrial uses are
2. Comment DAGs. Database Maria			as well as treat wastewater/stormwater.		constructed.
Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	1		0	
	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.	1	This project could assist in creating an economy of		
			scale and does not in itself create an economy of		
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		scale, however does not state the water will be of a drinking water level.		Project receives wastewater and stormwater; does not address drinking water for DACs.
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1	Water is stated as having an intended use and the	1	,
	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	]	project does not indicate drains or rivers will be affected. It is probable the water will benefit water		

Keystone Water Reclamation Facility

13

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer: Imperial IRWMP Project E	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	<ol> <li>Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.</li> </ol>		quality in those systems, however since it is unknown where the water is going at this time the benefit is		Based on the Project Information, direct benefit to
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		unknown as well.		the water quality of a drain or river is not identified.
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?	0		0	
Daily Loads (TIVIDES)	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		Based on the Project Information, TMDLs or implenting a stormwater BMP not identified.
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	0	The discussed in the project submitted form.	1	mpening a stormwater sim not tachtined.
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing				
	water quality.  1. Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water				
	quality.				Based on Project Information, project is tomake
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		available a reclaimed water supply thru treament of surface water sources.
Environmental Protection and	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,	•			
Enhancement Goal 1. Environmental Enhancements	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.  Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?				
		0		1	
	Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.				
	Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other		There appears to be minimal intent to improve habitat with water treated by this facility. Most		No indication in the Project Information that
	project impacts.		discussion revolves around heavy industrial or		improved habitat could be used for mitigtoin of oth
Integrated Design Elements	Project does not increase or improve habitat.  Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements		recreational uses. The project offers landscape irrigation, parks, golf		projet impacts.
2. Integrated Design Elements	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	1	courses, or other recreational uses as benefits this water could be used for, but does not include them	1	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.	1 _	as part of the project. However it is stated the project	· <u> </u>	
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.		will incorporate constructed wetlands.		
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
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?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.	1			
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
Strategic Considerations for IRWN					T
1. Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	1		1	
	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within	1	The possibility of job creation may provide an avenue		
	Imperial Region.  O. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		for stakeholder support, however the possibility for		
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	1	revenue may be	1	
	4. < \$150/af.	-		*	Hard to determine based on the Project Information
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.		The project will provide 2.5 mgd (~3,000 afy) and cost		provided; rough calculation of \$65M for cost of a project divided by 2800 AF/YR to 16,800 AF/YR over
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.		\$65 million. The cost per acre foot over a period of 20		20 year period results in \$1,160 to \$194 range in cos
2. Favitable and shorter	1. >450/af.		years will be approximately \$1,100.		per acre-feet.
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	1		2	
	2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
	Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the		A tiered rate structure is currently in place (with		
	costs borne by new users.		water smart readers). Those methods will continue to		
	<ol> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> </ol>		be used for servers connected to the Keystone Water Reclamation Facility.		It is anticipated all costs for reclaimed water supply would be paid thru fees for new industrial uses.
4. Promote Economic	Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net		neciamation racinty.		would be paid till a rees for new industrial uses.
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	1		1	
	1				
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				
	Clear documentation.				
	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	-			
Readiness to Proceed Category	Clear documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.				Based on projections in Project Information
Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	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.  Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	4		3	Based on projections in Project Information
	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.  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		3	Based on projections in Project Information
	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.  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?  1. Immediate, < 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	4		3	Based on projections in Project Information
	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.  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.	4		3	Based on projections in Project Information
	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.  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?  1. Immediate, < 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	-			Based on projections in Project Information
1. Timeliness	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.  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.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	4		3	Based on projections in Project Information
1. Timeliness	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.  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.  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	-			Based on projections in Project Information
1. Timeliness	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.  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.  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	-			Based on projections in Project Information
1. Timeliness	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.  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.  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.	-			Based on projections in Project Information
1. Timeliness	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.  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.  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	-			Based on projections in Project Information
1. Timeliness	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.  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?  1. 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.  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	-	The project has completed the Draft environmental		Based on projections in Project Information
Timeliness     Technical Feasibility of Project	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.  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.  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 partially 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.	2	The project has completed the Draft environmental document (MND). The final design is 90% complete.	2	Based on projections in Project Information  Project stated as 90% design completed
1. Timeliness	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.  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?  1. Immediate, < 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.  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.  Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	-			
Timeliness     Technical Feasibility of Project	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.  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.  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 partially 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.	2		2	

Keystone Water Reclamation Facility
13 Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

	Reviewer Comments d and comments received.
Criteria  Question/Performance Measures  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?	Comments
9. 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 permits have been obtained or are in the process. 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. 0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations. 0. The permit have been obtained or are in the process. 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. 0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations. 0. The provided in Place.  1. Financial plan and commitments are well defined? 1. Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no defined resource defined for maintenance and operation not provided, however local funding is secured and a plan in place to schedule and finalize project funding.  0. The permits have been obtained in place. 0. The provided in Place. 1. Financial plan and commitments from imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned. 1. Financial plan and sommitments from imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned. 1. Financial plan and sommitments from imp	Comments
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. 0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations. 0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations. 0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations. 0. Poose the project funding are to schedule and finalize project funding. 0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations. 0. Poose the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	
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.  O. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	d and comments received.
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 known and there is a plan and schedule.  5. Funding  Are the project funding sources well defined? 1. 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. 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?  The project will require building permits from Imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits from Imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits from Imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits from Imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits from Imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits from Imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits from Imperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits for mimperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require building permits for mimperial County, RWQCB, and NPDES. A schedule is planned.  1. The project will require during a planned.  1. The project funding planned.  1. The project will require during a planned.  1. The project	
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.  2. 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.  0. No financial plan and commitments to maintenance and operations.  0. No financial plan and commitments to maintenance and operations.  0. No financial plan and commitments to maintenance and operations.  0. No financial plan and commitments to maintenance and operations.  1. Provides multiple benefits  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1. Provides multiple benefits	
1. The permit requirements are known and there is a pian and schedule in piace.  0. The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.  5. Funding  Are the project funding sources well defined?  1. 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 setablished; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Documentation not provided, however local funding is secured and a plan in place to schedule and finalize operations.  Dether CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria  Descriptions  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	
0. The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.  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. Provides multiple benefits  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	
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. 0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations. 0. Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria 1. Provides multiple benefits 1. Provid	
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.  Documentation not provided, however local funding is secured and a plan in place to schedule and finalize project funding.  Dither 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. Provides multiple benefits	
1. Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.  O. 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. Provides multiple benefits  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	
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?  Description:  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	
0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and operations.  Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria  L. Provides multiple benefits  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1	
operations.   project funding.	
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria L. Provides multiple benefits  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1	
L. Provides multiple benefits Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	
recreation, or other benefits?	
1- Voc	
1-105	
0= No	
2. Involves multiple participants and participants?  2. Involves multiple participants?  2 1	
Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.	
Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	
0. Projects involves one stakeholder.	
b. Provides regional benefits  Does the project provides tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	
Describe project provide tangine regional benefits of only to a single of minited state indicated a function of a function of the function of	
1- Yes	
0= No	
State Program Preferences Does the project support meet the state preferences?	
1= Yes	
0= No	
. Statewide Priorities Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	
1= Yes Removed "Climate Change" and "Environmental Stewardship" as those two items are not expresely	
0= No discussed on the project submittal form.	
5. Climate Change Adaption  Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	
Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.	
enects or commete change:  0. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to	
the effects of climate change.	
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Opes the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	
1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.  1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.	
O. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.  O. 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.	

IID Systems Conservation and Improvements Projects for IWSP

14

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer: Imperial IRWMP Project I	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Circuit		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
IRWMP Goals					
Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and				
Effect to agricultural users of	sustainable supply to meet current and future demands  Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?				
water.	Social project have an ejiject to mater supplies instantanij avanasie to agriculture.	1		2	
	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				Impacts of conserved water are identified and
	0. Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.				required mitigation for any project implementation.
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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	2		2	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.	4			
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet. 3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.				
	O to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		8,000 afy is stated in the project submittal form.		Stated yield of 8,000 ac-ft/yr.
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	2		2	
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?			-	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.  The project sould be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for				
	<ol> <li>The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.</li> </ol>				
	0. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado				
Conserves Colorado River	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	2		2	
	federal requirements?				
	<ol><li>Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.</li></ol>				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially	1			
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				Project is to conserve water thru implemention of
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				conservation measures; implementation will require mitigation for reduction of drain flow that supports
	use.				habitat.
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				
substitution for Colorado River Water.	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	1		1	
Trucci.	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.				
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2		2	
Wanagement 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		2	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				Although not mentioned by specific project
	1. Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				components, conservation measures are the basis of
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Interim Water Supply Plan, consistent with a variety of plans, including the General Plan.		water conservation actions mentioned in several planning documents .
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	2	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2	,
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to			=	
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aguifers.				
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.  O. 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				
1 Match Water Quality to ver	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	1		2	The available information is illustration
	2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and				The project information indicates the conserved water would be from tailwater or dains and be
	provide economic benefits.  1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water	-	Unclear if water requires treatment prior to delivery, however end users/beneficial use not identified,		delivered to new uses. It is not clear if the conserve
	not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				water will require treament prior to delivery to the new use. It is clear the new use is not drinking water
	0. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide				use; it is most likely to be used for cooling purposes
2 Support DACs - Wastowater	economic benefits.  Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;		although stated as industrial.		for alternative energy.
Support DACs- Wastewater.	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend	0		0	
	Colorado River supplies?				
	<ol><li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li></ol>	1			
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				Although this project has the potential to provide a
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				stored water supply and extend the CO River supply,
	<ol> <li>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.</li> </ol>				it does not assist in meeting wastewater disposal and
	economics of scale, or provide recycled water to extend the colorado river supply.				permit requirements, therefore, the score remained zero.
	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public	0		0	
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water					
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	health, or creating economies of scale?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of				
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of	-			This project upuld
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>	-			This project would assist with water supply for alternative energy projects, which may benefit DAC
	Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.     Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.     Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.				
Support DACs- Drinking Water  4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.      Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.	1		1	alternative energy projects, which may benefit DAC

IID Systems Conservation and Improvements Projects for IWSP

14

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Important New Project Footbasis on and Expendity Annual Project September 1 (September 1)   Important Sept
Service of the proof of the pro
The control of the co
Comply with the flatement of expertance and expertance of
Comply and the Coloranse and Control of the Coloranse and
E. Complete with Front Machinisms.  In the Complete of the Com
Set to find (1900)   Represented or implement of immerial Mills of the property of the propert
2. Improve containing making and in a containing making and interest a
1. Inspirence compliance with established TMOL agreequence strommetate BMPs. 6. Frenerous integrace 1. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by shall all to be seed greated principal solutions. 2. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by shall all to be seed greated principal solutions. 3. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by shall all to be seed greated principal solutions. 3. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by shall all to be seed greated principal solutions. 3. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by shall all to be seed greated principal solutions. 3. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by shall all to greate a solution groundwater quity by reproduce greater and principal solutions. 3. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by required to greater and principal solutions. 4. Pregion could reprove groundwater quity by required to greater and principal solutions. 4. Pregion could reflect one control and propert militiation of the reprove groundwater and propert militiations. 4. Pregion could reflect one control and propert militiation of the reprove groundwater and propert militiations. 4. Pregion control and propert militiation of the reprove groundwater and propert militiations. 4. Pregion control and propert militiation of the repropert for propert for an appear and propert militiation of the reproduction of the re
8. Preserve or improve 1. Preserve or improve 2. Preserve or improve 3. Preserve or improve 3. Preserve or improve 4. Preserve or improve
6. Frenche or improve  Will first project pursuant or improve against against partial from the project pursuant or improve against against partial from the control of the project pursuant or improve against against partial from the control of the project pursuant or improve pursuant or
S. Processe or Improve  Whealth for project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resource?  1. Project would not improve guiding or specified or project or specified project or project guiding.  1. Project would not improve guiding would will not guid provided colling a project or project guiding.  Bright and the specified project or project guiding would will not guid provided colling a project guiding would will not guid provided colling and guiding and guiding and guiding would would not guide the project guiding would would not guide the project guiding would be project guiding would would not guide the project guiding would would not guide the project guiding would would not guide the guiding would be guide to guiding would be guide guiding would be guiding would be guide guiding would be guide guiding would be guid
2. Project words improve groundward quality and waited for groted existing waiter   1. Project words in the private of groundward quality and waited for groted existing waiter   2. Project words in the private groundward quality and waited for groted existing waiter   3. Project words in the private for groundward quality and waited for groted existing waiter   3. Project words in the private for existing waiter   4. Project words in the private for existing waiter   5. Project words in the private for existing waiter   6. Project words in the private for existing waiter   6. Project words in the private for existing waiter   7. Project words in private groundward and waiter   8. Project for existing waiter and waiter for existing waiter   8. Project for existing waiter and waiter for existing waiter   9. Project words for existing waiter waiter for existing waiter   9. Project for existing waiter
2. Project would improve groundwarder quality and would not protect existing water country.  3. In Project would are timp are any groundwarder quality and would not protect existing water.  4. Project would are timp are any groundwarder quality and would not protect existing water.  5. Project would are timp are any groundwarder quality and would not protect existing water.  6. Project would are improve groundwarder quality are would be proposed to provide the project of the project groundwarder quality are would be provided to the project groundwarder quality are would be provided to the project groundwarder quality.  6. Project formation and such as a supposed and provided the project formation.  7. Project formation and such as a supposed and project groundwarder project groundwarder.  8. Project formation and such as a supposed and project groundwarder.  9. Project formation and project groundwarder quality and project groundwarder.  9. Project formation and such as design to another management of project groundwarder.  9. During an accommendation of the project groundwarder project groundwarder.  1. Endows an another formation and project groundwarder.  1. Endows an accommendation and project groundwarder.  1. Project could recover during any groundwarder.  2. In Project could recover during any groundwarder.  3. 1. Project could recover a commendation and project groundwarder.  3. 1. Project could recover during any groundwarder.  3. 2. Froject could recover a commendation and project groundwarder.  3. 2. Froject could recover a commendation and project groundwarder.  3. 3. 1. Project
Project would not improve groundwater quality and wood not protect continue quality and wood not protect continuely sperificant.   Project and continue quality and wood not protect continuely sperificant.   Protect and continuely quality and wood not protect the multipolity.   Protect and continuely quality and wood not protect the multipolity.   Protect and continuely quality and wood not protect the multipolity.   Protect and continuely quality and wood not protect the multipolity.   Protect and continuely quality and wood not protect the multipolity.   Project the content of under the protect of protect integration of other impacts.   Protect the continuely quality and wood not protect the protect to protect the protect.   Protect the quality and protect the protect to protect the protec
Service services and somewhat the continue of process and regions and somewhat registry or count have process and registry to the continue of
Second continued to the continued of the continued to t
March Control Protection and Section (as electron qualities completed in the Indicate consistent with municipal.)
The content and product and effective and particle in product and production and signature in the position of production and
2. Project increase or improve hisbitat or anyour intigation of other project   1. Project increase or improve hisbitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project   1. Project horsaise or improve hisbitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project   1. Project horsaise or improve hisbitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project mitigation of project transports   2. Project horsaise or improve hisbitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project mitigation of information or improve hisbitation or impro
Project increases or improves labilate and could support miligation of other project   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improve habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improve habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improve habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improve habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improve habitat, but cannot be used to support miligation of other   Project increases or improve habitation of the support miligation of other increases or improve habitation of the support military to th
2. Integrated to recover or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project position improves in the following the project
Impacts   Impa
Project in or cessor in improve hobital, but cannot be used to apport mitigation of other positions and state of the control
Description of the project integrated treatment of the project integrated minimates or improve habitation of the federal minimates of the project integrated minimates of the project integrated minimates or provide minigate freedom minimates or provide minimates or provided minimates or p
D. Project does not increase or improve habitat.   O   Project depart disreptore encountered, spears agree, parks, or other recreational elements   O   Project depart disreptore encountered, spears agree, parks, or other recreational elements   O   Project depart disreptore encountered to provide multiple benefits.
In the design to achieve multiple benefits?  1. Interpret multiple design decides to produce multiple benefits?  2. Obes not integrate multiple design decidence to provide multiple benefits?  1. Obes not integrate multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits?  1. Obes not integrate multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits?  1. Finded impacts and stromwater reverts and mining man developed grade device progress and protect (if is and property from a consider at surmaniant and progress and protect (if is and property from a consider at surmaniant and progress).  1. Finded impacts and advantages, protect life and property.  2. Finded at impacts and advantages protect life and property.  3. Finded impacts and advantages protect life and property.  3. Finded impacts and advantages protect life and property.  4. Finded impacts and advantages protect life and property.  5. Finded impacts and advantages protect life and property.  5. Finded impacts and advantages protect life and property.  5. Finded impacts and propert advantages protect life and property.  5. Finded impacts and propert advantages protect life and property.  5. Finded impacts and property advantages provided and property advantages property advantages.  5. Finded impacts and property advantages property advantages property advantages.  5. Finded impacts and property advantages prope
International Coal   Interna
October 10   Oct
Road Procession and Stormwater   Protest life and property from flooding and dioal flood protection and stormwater weeks
Section   State   St
1. Reduce impacts from stormwater events in localized stormwater events and unsuff from whom areas?  2. Project would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.  3. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  4. Project would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.  5. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  5. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  5. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  5. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  5. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  5. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  6. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  7. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  8. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  8. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  9. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  1. Additional project health of the project hea
Startegic Considerations for IRVM Plan Implementation  Strategic Considerations for IRVM Plan Implementation  1. Notice and expected the spin public support from the rate paying population?  2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Louise Acceptance/Public  2. Louise Acceptance/Public  3. In Moderate degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Louise Acceptance/Public  3. In Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  4. CS 1550/st.  3. State 0. State of the project is also stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  5. Cost Effectivenes  4. CS 1550/st.  4. CS 1550/st.  5. State 1540/st.  5. State 1540/st.  5. State 1540/st.  5. State 1540/st.  6. Live to other project submitted from the rate paying population?  4. CS 1550/st.  6. State 1540/st.  7. State 1540/st.  7. State 1540/st.  8. State 1540/st.  8. State 1540/st.  8. State 1540/st.  9. State 1540/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. Cast would lively be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring programs.  9. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring programs.  1. Costs for power water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring prov
Startegic Considerations for IRVM Plan Implementation  Strategic Considerations for IRVM Plan Implementation  1. Notice and expected the spin public support from the rate paying population?  2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Louise Acceptance/Public  2. Louise Acceptance/Public  3. In Moderate degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Louise Acceptance/Public  3. In Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  4. CS 1550/st.  3. State 0. State of the project is also stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  5. Cost Effectivenes  4. CS 1550/st.  4. CS 1550/st.  5. State 1540/st.  5. State 1540/st.  5. State 1540/st.  5. State 1540/st.  6. Live to other project submitted from the rate paying population?  4. CS 1550/st.  6. State 1540/st.  7. State 1540/st.  7. State 1540/st.  8. State 1540/st.  8. State 1540/st.  8. State 1540/st.  9. State 1540/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. ASSO/st.  1. Cast would lively be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring programs.  9. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring programs.  1. Costs for power water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for provide measuring prov
2. Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.   2. Project could increase economic damages or protect life and property.   2. Public Acceptance/Public   2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   2. High degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   2. High degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   3. Most provided on project submitted form.   4. S 1519/16.   3. S 1519/16.
Description of Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.   Strategic Considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation
Description of Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.   Strategic Considerations for IRWM Plan Implementation
Strategic Considerations for HRWM Plan implementation  1. Public Acceptance/Public  2. High degree of stakeholder support and moderate porting for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Hoderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  4. More of the cost part and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  5. Lost Effectiveness as the cost par care foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?  4. Substance of the cost part and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  5. Substance of the cost part and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  6. Substance of the cost part and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  7. Substance of the cost part and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  8. Equitable cost sharing  8. Equitable cost sharing  9. Deferential continuous part of the cost of producing those benefits?  1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; no effects on current rate base.  1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; more float to substance of the payer provides in more districts.  1. Cost for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; in roughly approached to the payer payer and provides in the project provides in more distribution.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  9. Cereates potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  1. Moderate opportance water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers are project or programs without the ender for international programs distributed to provide and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly provided in the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the
1. Public Acceptance/Public   Will the project be oblic to gain public support and low potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   1. High degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   2. Light degree of stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   3. Light degree of stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   4. < \$150/4f.   5. \$150 to \$300/4f.   5. \$301 - \$\$500/4f.   6. \$301 - \$\$500/4f.   7. \$301 - \$\$500/4f.   8. \$400 the project sin the Region?   9. \$400 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   1. \$200 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   1. \$200 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   1. \$200 the until state 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. \$200 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   2. All costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.   3. \$200 the project provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Intended commentation.   4. The degree provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation to the foliation provide degree and the project of the said as stal in an alternative energy portion for forther region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portion for the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portion for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.   2. The intention of the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project of portion for the regi
1. Public Acceptance/Public   Will the project be oblic to gain public support and low potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   1. High degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   2. Light degree of stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   3. Light degree of stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region.   4. < \$150/4f.   5. \$150 to \$300/4f.   5. \$301 - \$\$500/4f.   6. \$301 - \$\$500/4f.   7. \$301 - \$\$500/4f.   8. \$400 the project sin the Region?   9. \$400 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   1. \$200 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   1. \$200 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   1. \$200 the until state 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. \$200 the until state that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   2. All costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.   3. \$200 the project provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Intended commentation.   4. The degree provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation to the foliation provide degree and the project of the said as stal in an alternative energy portion for forther region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portion for the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portion for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.   2. The intention of the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project of portion for the regi
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.  2. Cost Effectiveness  3. If the cost per care foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?  4. \$\( \text{s\( \text{S\( \text{S\( \text{s\( \text{or\)}}\)}} \) 1. \$\( \text{s\( \text{s\( \text{or\)}}\) 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\ 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\) 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\ 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\) 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\ 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\) 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\ 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\ 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\) 1. \$\( \text{or\)}\ 1. \$\( or\)
1. Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.  2. Cost Effectiveness  3. Established on the high ranking of the Goal at this suggests high degree of Stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.  4. < 5150/3f. 3. \$151 to \$300/4f. 2. \$301 - \$450/3f. 3. \$151 to \$300/4f. 2. \$301 - \$450/3f. 3. \$250/4f. 3. \$250
Imperial Region.   O. United or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.   Not provided on project submittal form.   Based on the high nating of the Goal and his suggests high degree of Stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.   Not provided on project submittal form.   It is a support of the Goal and his suggests high degree of Stakeholder support and potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   No solid documentation.   Solid contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   No solid documentation.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity resulting for project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the costs be project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity to implement a project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity to implement a project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity to implement a project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate
Imperial Region.   O. United or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.   Not provided on project submittal form.   Based on the high nating of the Goal and his suggests high degree of Stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.   Not provided on project submittal form.   It is a support of the Goal and his suggests high degree of Stakeholder support and potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   No solid documentation.   Solid contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   No solid documentation.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity resulting for project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the costs be project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity to implement a project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity to implement a project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid contributing to economic activity to implement a project or program without the need for new generation to valuate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   No sear to even the additional funding?   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.   Solid documentation to evaluate
1. United or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.  2. Cost Effectiveness  3. Equitable cost sharing  4. < \$1530/af. 3. Si51 to \$300/af. 1. >450/af. 3. Si51 to \$300/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  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation. 1. Indicate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 2. Cost brone by new the benilty for Stokeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding? 4. Immediate, c 1 Year. 3. Realiness to Proceed Category 2. Timeliness  Does the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project or project? 3. Realiness to Proceed Category 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project or project?  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project or project?  1. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 2. Mild-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 3. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 4. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 5. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 5. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 5. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 6. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 7. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 7. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 7. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 8. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 8. Longitern, 9 Fears to develop. 9
4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 4. \$150/af. 4. \$150/af. 5. \$150/a
At the present level of planning, it is understand to experience to the project count of distinct of the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in a site project. Yes will be project to we the ability for Stokeholders to oct quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  1. Timeliness  Does the project have the ability for Stokeholders to oct quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  2. Tetchnical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have the ability for Stokeholders to oct quickly to implement a project or project for the region and would therefore assist in a site matter and programs distributed to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project for the region and would therefore assist in a site matter and programs distributed to make a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  1. Timeliness  Does the project have the ability for Stokeholders to oct quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  1. Timeliness  Does the project have the ability for Stokeholders to oct quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  1. Long-term, or Versar to develop.  1. Long-term, or Versar to develop.  2. Tetchnical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project for the region and would therefore assist in a project for the region and would therefore assist in project.
2. Sign1-ShOJari. 1. s450/Jari. 2. Sign1-ShOJari. 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; on 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  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. Unlimited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlimited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlimited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. So solid documentation.  1. Timeliness  Does the project how 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.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project how be technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  Possible for the project how the contribution to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project how the contribution to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  1. Timeliness  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  3. Technical Feasibility of Project  4. The project for the benefits pay for the costs of producing the east of producing the early of the indicate of the project how the cost of producing the east of project how the cost of project how
2. 3501 - 3450/3f. 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  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, pot 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. D. Limited on an potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. D. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. So solid documentation.  1. Timeliness  Does the project how the ability for Stokeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediates, 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Tetchnical Feasibility of Project  Does the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  Does the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  Does the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  1. Timeliness  Does the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.
1. > ASO/af.  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  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. No solid documentation.  1. Indicate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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, 5. 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project thouse the chinical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  3. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  4. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the
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  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. Unlined documentation.  O. Limited of no no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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, c 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 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?  1. Timeliness  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?
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 proporptions.  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. Unlitted documentation.  1. Unlited of or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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, c 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 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?  1. Timeliness Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have the chilical for between the project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have the chilical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfo
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. Moderale potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unitied or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timelines  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.  1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project?  At the present level of planning, it is uncreasing in the med of distribution space in creating and payers in roughly equal proportions.  At the present level of planning, it is uncreasing in the defined method of distributions of the project Information proudly and Cities?  2
At the present level of planning, it is und regarding the defined method of distrib geual proportions.  4. Promote Economic Development  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. Utilited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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.  1. Long-term, 9 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1. Timeliness  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have
At the present level of planning, it is und regarding the defined method of distrib geual proportions.  4. Promote Economic Development  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. Utilited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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.  1. Long-term, 9 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1. Timeliness  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have
O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Promote Economic Development  Development  Development  Development  Development  Dest the project provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness  Dest 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, c 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Dest the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1. Timelines Description for the region and would therefore assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  1. This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in
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.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  3. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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, 5 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1. Timeliness  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?
Development    Commit activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?   2
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. United or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness  Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or project or project.  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, 5 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  1. Timeliness  Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or project.  3  3  4  5  6  7  8  8  8  8  8  8  8  8  8  8  8  8
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.  1. This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  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, 5 Years to develop.   2. Technical Feasibility of Project   Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?   1. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?   1. Long-term, 1 to general to the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?   1. Long-term, 2 Years to develop.   1. Long-term, 2 Years to develop.   1. Long-term, 2 Years to develop.   1. Long-term, 3 Years to develop.   2. Mid-term, 3 Years to develop.   3. Long-term, 4 Years to develop.   4. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   3. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   4. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   5. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   6. Long-term, 1 Year.   7. Long-term, 1 Year.   8. Long-term, 2 Year.   9. Long-term,
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.  1. This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  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, 5 Years to develop.   2. Technical Feasibility of Project   Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?   1. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?   1. Long-term, 1 to general to the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?   1. Long-term, 2 Years to develop.   1. Long-term, 2 Years to develop.   1. Long-term, 2 Years to develop.   1. Long-term, 3 Years to develop.   2. Mid-term, 3 Years to develop.   3. Long-term, 4 Years to develop.   4. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   3. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   4. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   5. Long-term, 5 Years to develop.   6. Long-term, 1 Year.   7. Long-term, 1 Year.   8. Long-term, 2 Year.   9. Long-term,
Readiness to Proceed Category 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. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  This project could assist in an alternative energy portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  3. Possible 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. 1. Long-term, 36 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Documentation includes a tech memor of portential economic activity resulting from project.  3. Possible project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or a great project and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  3. Possible project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or a great project and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  3. Possible project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or a great project and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  3. Possible project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or a great project and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  1. Immediate, < 1 Year.  3. Possible project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or a great project and would ther
Readiness to Proceed Category  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. Technical Feasibility of Project  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  District or portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  portfolio for the region and would therefore assist in creating an economy of scale.  3
Readiness to Proceed Category  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. Technical Feasibility of Project   Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1
Readiness to Proceed Category  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, 3 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 the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or additional funding?  4. Immediate, 4 Year. 3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or additional funding?  4. Immediate, 4 Year. 3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 4. Immediate, 5 Years to develop. 4. Immediate, 5 Years to develop. 4. Immediate, 6 Years to develop. 5. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 6. Years to develop. 7. Technical Feasibility of Project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1. Timeliness  1. Timeliness
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, 36 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?
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, 5 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?
3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 2 to 6 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project   2. Technical Feasibility of Project   2. Technical Feasibility of Project   2. Technical Feasibility of Project   3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  4. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  5. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  6. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  7. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  8. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  9. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project    1. Long-term, Year    2. Lon
2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, 5 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1 project?
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?  1 project?
2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1
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
2. The project is partially occumented, and has recommaissance, and/or reasonity studies, out incomplete or partial designs.
1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility
studies and has not been designed.
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.     There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete

IID Systems Conservation and Improvements Projects for IWSP

14

Malissa Canadale (Sam Schneffer Combo Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.				
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1		1	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	2		2	
	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				
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C	operations.				
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,				
1. 1 Tovides murupie benefits	recreation, or other benefits?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.	-	No other stakeholders are listed.		
Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder		INO Other Stakeholders are listed.		
3. Provides regional benefits	group?	1		1	
	1= Yes				Conserved water would potentially befefit all water
	0= No				users in Region.
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	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		1	
	Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the				
	effects of climate change.				
	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		1	
	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	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		1	
	1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				Conserved water will be available as a firm water
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				supply to support other uses, such as, alternative energy development.

Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture :

15

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Circond		Score	Comments	Score	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				
Effect to agricultural users of	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?				
water.	,	1		1	
	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				The project, once operational, would require a supply
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		No impacts and no benefits to water supply.		or water, which may be reclaimed water.
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1		0	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				
	5. >50,000 acre feet. 4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.	1			
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.				No water supply yield estimate provided in project submital form; this project is more of a new use or
	1. 0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.				reuse of water that is reclaimed.
<ol><li>Protect Surface Water Rights, maintain Colorado River yields.</li></ol>	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	0		0	
mamtain Colorado River yielus.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?  2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for				
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.				The project is to make use of water or reuse
	The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.				reclaimed water; storage is accomplished in the CO River System.
4. Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	0		1	
	federal requirements?  2. Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly				-
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.  O. Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				The Project would conserve local water by making
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				use of water in less quantity than previous land use
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	use. Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				or by reuse of reclaimed supply.
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0		0	
Water.					See previous comment, although, in the case of
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				replacing an ag crop with higher water use, then it
	<ol> <li>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.</li> </ol>				could provide some supply. The Project Information is not definitive enough to score higher.
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2		1	is not definitive enough to score nigher.
Management Strategies.	2 144-44-5	2		1	
	Integrates five or more RMS.     Integrates 3-5 RMS.				
	three areas 3-3 kms.     Less than three RMS.	1			
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	0		0	
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	U		- 0	4
	2. Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
Groundwater Rights.	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?		Not answered on the project submittal form.		
o. Groundwater riights.	with the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		0	
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to provent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifors.				
	May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.				
	<ol> <li>Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.</li> </ol>				
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the				
water quality doar	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	2		1	
	benefits?  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and				1
	provide economic benefits.				
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>				Decide is the and use of a page quality water that has
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide				Project is the end use of a poor quality water that has been treated/reclaimed and it would provide some
Support DACs- Wastewater.	economic benefits.				level of economic benefit.
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	0		0	
	Colorado River supplies?				4
	<ol><li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li></ol>				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	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.	1			
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	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.	1			
	1. Assists when 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?	1		1	
- ,-	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.				
		_		•	

Project Reviewed:

Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture : 15 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Number: Project Reviewer:

2. Project would represe groundware quality so that is can be used go would you for the control of project and so of p	Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
March   Company   Compan	Imperial IRWMP Project E					
Security will full Visional Control Co	Criteria	Question/Performance Measures				
Processing Continues   Processing of the proce				Desirat intends to use suisting quality and not		
As position (Particular Department of the property processes of the collection of the processes of the processes of the processes of the collection of the processes of t						
2. Transport completion with contribution PRICE Light improvement controlled PRICE   1. Transport on Improvement Contribution PRICE Light Contribution of Contribution Contribution PRICE   2. Transport on Improvement Contribution PRICE Light Contribution Contribution PRICE   3. Transport Contribution PRICE Light Contribution Contribution PRICE   4. Transport Contribution PRICE   5. Transport Contribution PRICE			0		0	
Control or simple out embodied fields and search of implements of the manufacture of the	Daily Loads (TMDLs)					1
Control or simple out embodied fields and search of implements of the manufacture of the		1 Improves compliance with established TARDIs or implement stormwater PARIS	_			
Properties of Implicate   Company			_			
2. The control contr		U. Does not help meet established IMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				
Section of the control of the contro	6. Preserve or Improve				1	
South Project Control						
B. Pilipi Leading to proceed proceduring significant of the control of the cont						
International processor and control processor against exception and widely finding control processor. See Control processor against control processor against control processor. See Control processor against control processor against control processor against control processor. See Control processor against control proc			_			Based on the Project information, it will make use of
The company of the property of	Environmental Protection and					a supply or reuse of reclaimed water.
Project increases or improves balant and clause support mitigation of affiling report   Project increases or improve balant, for committee or to support mitigation of affiling report   Project increases or improve balant, for committee or to support mitigation of affiling report   Project increases or improve balant, for committee or to support mitigation of affiling report   Project increases or improve balant, for committee or to support mitigation of all projects or increases or improve balant, for support balant, for the project increases or improve balant, for the project increases or improve balant, for support balant, for the project increases or improve balant, for the project increases or increases or increases or improve balant, for the project increases or increases	Enhancement Goal	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				1
The project of the control of company to register plants to the question support on integration of other project plants to the control of contr	Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	1		1	
C. Project interaction or improved industrial and common for used to support militarial common for used to proper the control control proper the control control proper the control proper the control control proper the control control proper the control prope						
Description Continued to the Project of the Control of Control o			_			
2. Acceptance Design Fermion Section of Program in International Control of Program in International C		project impacts.				
Internation of the design on other membrane benefits   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	2 Integrated Design Florents					Project has potential to imoprove habitat.
Does not integrate multiple analysis interests of protection and Somewater Protectific and people from forcing and developing from a forcing and protect of great property.  2. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection and Solidard demonstrate events.  3. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection and solidary developed and of the force and property.  3. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  4. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  4. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  4. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  4. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  4. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  4. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  4. Projects would not reflece excountic damages or result in pederal important protection.  5. Project sould consider a protection of the result of the reflects within the period in project in the register of the reflect within the period in project in the register of the reflect within the period in project in the register of the result in the register in the register of the result in the register in the register in the register of the result in the register in the regis	2. Integrated Design Elements	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
Placed Procedures and Stamman Process of the company of concepting and developing your and stated programs of the property of the process of			-			
An international continuence management strategies.   Indicate impacts from the standard and property from the standard standard from white or execute in the standard standard from white or execute in the standard international property.   Indicate impacts for the continuence and standard from white or executed international property.   Indicate impacts for the continuence and standard from white or executed international property.   Indicate impacts for the property of the standard international property in the standard international property.   Indicate impacts for international property in the standard international property.   Indicate international property in the standard international property in the standard international property.   Indicate international property in the standard property in the standard international property.   Indicate international property in the standard property in the standard property.   Indicate international property in the standard property in the standard property.   Indicate international property in the standard property in the standard property in the standard property.   Indicate international property in the standard property in the standard propert	Flood Protection and Stormwater					
Solution for events is a solution of somewhere events and modiff from whom areas?  1. Projects would not related excessions disrange, protect life and property.  1. Projects would not relate excession damages or protect life and property.  2. Project could increase according damage or protect life and property.  2. Project could increase according damages or result in potential implicit to life or property.  2. Project could increase according damages or result in potential implicit to life or property.  2. Project could increase according damages or result in potential implicit to life or property.  2. Project could increase according damages or result in potential implicit to life or property.  2. Project could increase according damages or result in potential for conflicts within improve a damage of the property of	Management Goal					
2. Projects would reduce common damages, protect life and gropperty 2. Projects would reduce common damages or repetit in protect life and gropperty 3. Projects would not reduce a common damages or repetit in protect life and gropperty 4. Property could increase economic damages or repetit in protect life and gropperty 5. Projects could make a common damages or repetit in protect life and gropperty 5. Projects could make a common damages or repetit in protect life and gropperty 6. Project could make a common damages or repetit in protect life and gropperty 7. Projects could make a common damages or repetit in protection for conflicts within property life and gropperty 8. Projects desired and protection for conflicts within inspertid life and gropperty 9. Project life and group and common damages or repetit in protection in project in fine metal reports 9. Social fine common damages or repetit protection for conflicts within inspertid life and gropperty 9. Social fine common damages or repetit protection for conflicts within inspertid life and gropperty 9. Social fine common damages or repetit protection for conflicts within inspertid life and gropperty 9. Social fine common damages or repetit protection for conflicts within inspertid life and gropperty and protection for conflicts within inspertid life and gropperty and gropperty and group and gropperty and group and gropperty and gropperty and group and gropperty and gr	· ·		1		1	
Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	Stormwater events					1
Project Conditionation for HINNIAN Plant Implicates section (amages or reselt in propertied and project project and manages or reselt in project and manages or reselt in project and manages or project project and manages or project project and manages or project proje		Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				Exact location of Project is unknown and stated
Strategic Considerations for IRNAM Plan Implementation  1. Public Acceptance (Public  2. Public Acceptance (Public  3. Public Acceptance (Public  4. Moderate degree of Stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  2. Cost Effectiveness  3. Public and a state of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  3. December or no stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  4. Cost Strategies on a size of a stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  4. Cost Strategies on a size of a stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  4. Cost Strategies of the stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  4. Cost Strategies of the stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  4. Cost Strategies of the stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperful Region.  5. Equilable cost sharing  7. Equilable cost sharing  8. Equilable cost sharing  8. Equilable cost sharing  9. De the entitles that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?  1. Cost such for new words and paid fine by new users, no effects on current rate base.  2. Equilable cost sharing  3. Equilable cost sharing  4. Fromose Economic  4. Fromose Economic  5. Cost for new words and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly  4. Fromose Economic  5. Cost for new words and programs distributed to mean and existing rate payers in roughly  6. Fromose Economic  6. Orestent potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  7. Cost state control for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  8. Equilable cost sharing and programs distributed to mean and existing rate payers in roughly  9. Experimentation on the source of the complete of potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  9. Cost state required for		Project could increase economic damages or result in notential impacts to life or property.	_			
1. Rublic Acceptance/Public  Will the project to de the capils public support prior the rate paying appointment  2. High disperse of stakeholistic response and low potential for conflicts within imperful flegion.  3. Moderate degree of stakeholistic rupport and moderate potential for conflicts within imperful flegion.  4. Cost (Moderate degree of stakeholistic rupport and moderate potential for conflicts within imperful flegion.  5. Turning from 1 public flegion.  6. Turning from 1 public flegion.  6. Support of the project prior public disperse and potential for conflicts within imperful flegion.  7. Support Seldovid  8. Support Seldovid  8. Support Seldovid  9. Support Seldovid  9. Support Seldovid  1. Support S						
2. High degree of stakeholder support and fow potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  1. Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  2. Cott Effectiveness  3. the cost part and fow potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  4. x 5350/at.  4. x 5350/at.  3. 5515 05500/at.  4. x 5350/at.  3. 5515 05500/at.  3. 5515 05500/at.  4. x 5350/at.  3. 5515 05500/at.  4. x 5350/at.  4. x 5350/at.  4. x 5350/at.  4. x 5350/at.  5. Could be conflicts the review the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?  5. Could be conflicts the review would be paid for by new suers, no effect on current rate base.  5. Could be row water and program distributed to new and existing rate payers, with at least 75% of the costs benefits payer for we water and program distributed to new and existing rate payers with at least 75% of the costs benefits payer for we water and program distributed to new and existing rate payers with at least 75% of the costs benefits payer project provide measurable excommic benefits to imperial Region in terms of net excommic existing, row water and program distributed to new and existing rate payers with at least 75% of the costs benefits payer project provide measurable excommic existing, row water and project submittal form.  4. Promote Economic  4. Promote Economic  5. Cost for confortivity in the confortivity in the excommic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  4. Promote Economic  5. Readiness to Proceed Category  4. Immediates  5. Readiness to Proceed Category  5. The project is project how ether shiftly for Excellential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  5. The project is project how ether winding of contributing to economic act			0		1	1
Imperial Region:   O. Limited on satakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region:   O. Limited on so takeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region:   O.   State cast per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?   O.     A   No cost per a fol water yield provided in fregion:   Statistics 5300/sf.   S. 55510/sf.   Not provided on project submittal form.   Not provided on project submittal form.   O.   Statistics 5300/sf.   Not provided on project submittal form.   O.   O.   O.   O.   O.   O.   O.			U			1
Imperial Region:   O. Limited on satakeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region:   O. Limited on so takeholder support and potential for conflicts within imperial Region:   O.   State cast per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?   O.     A   No cost per a fol water yield provided in fregion:   Statistics 5300/sf.   S. 55510/sf.   Not provided on project submittal form.   Not provided on project submittal form.   O.   Statistics 5300/sf.   Not provided on project submittal form.   O.   O.   O.   O.   O.   O.   O.		4 Madesate description of the label of the control	_			
2. Cost Effectiveness  1. S the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?  4. < \$150/3/1. 3. \$151 to \$30/3/1.						
4. < \$150/at.  3. 5151 to \$300/at.  3. 5151 to \$300/at.  3. 5151 to \$300/at.  3. 5151 to \$300/at.  4. Costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.  1. 500/at.  2. All costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 79% of the costs for more water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Formote Economic  4. General concumentation.  5. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  6. Concumentation of the project for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  6. Clear documentation.  9. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  9. Clear documentation.  1. Intellines 1. The project information states potential for positive economic activity.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project information states potential for positive economic activity.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project information is a demonstration to evolute the		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				None stated in the Project information
1. St51 to 5000/dil.   2. St01 -5400/dil.   2. St01 -5400/dil.   3. Equitable cost sharing   Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?   O     2. All costs would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users, no effects on current rate base.   3. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users, no effects on current rate base.   4. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users, no effect on current rate base.   6. Promote Economic   Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, rote time globs, revenue generation.   6. Promote Economic   Clear documentation.	2. Cost Effectiveness		0		4	-
2. 331. 3-301/8.  1. 3-4501/8.  3. Equitable cost sharing  Do the emitters 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 brome by new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs brome by new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs brome by new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs brome by new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs with a properties of the project provide measurable economic benefits to imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, to reating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs of the project provide measurable economic benefits to imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, or extending jobs, revenue generation.  1. Costs for new water and programs distributed to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Costs for new potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Createst potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Evaluation of the need for new agreements or additional funding?  1. Inmelines  2. Description of potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Evaluation of the need for new agreements or additional funding?  3. New Term, 10. 3 Years to develop.  2. Humanidate, 2 1 Years.  3. The project has detailed documentation in evaluation for the project or portion of the project payer and potential for contr			_			
1\$450/af.  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.  2. Cost store new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Promote Economic  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to 100, Imperial County and Cities?  1. Index provided on project submittal form.  2. Costs to contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  3. Cost receive prefer to contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  4. Cost receive project submittal for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  5. Cost receive project submittal for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  6. United on opportation for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  7. Intellects  Does the project how the ability for Starbolders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  1. Intellects  2. Technical Fessibility of Project  3. The project is a feeling of the project to the technical documentation to evaluate the technical fessibility of the project?  2. Technical fessibility of the project to see the project how technical documentation to evaluate the technical fessibility studies, but incomplete of engineering designs.  3. The project is a feeling documentation and clearance?  3. The project is a feeling documentation or evaluate the technical fessibility studies, but incomplete of engineering designs.  4. The project is not evaluate the project to make the project to make the project to make the project to make the project in a feeling documental documen		2. \$301 - \$450/af.				
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; 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; 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; with at least 75% of the costs of the costs for new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for new users.  1. A fromote Economic activity, post provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlined of non potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlined documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlined documentation on potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlined documentation on potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlined of commentation of postitive generation. No solid documentation of activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlined of commentation of postitive generation. In the many post post to develop.  1. Timeliness  1. Timeliness  1. Timeliness for postitive generation of the post to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of the project to comment to evaluate the technical documentation, includi		·		Not provided on project submittal form.		
1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for new suchs.  0. Cost for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Fromote Economic  Development  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.  Clear documentation.  1. Imile liness  Does the project provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  Clear documentation.  1. Immediate, ct 19 each of the potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  Clear documentation.  1. Immediate, ct 19 each of the project through the need for new operements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, ct 19 each of the project through the need for new operements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, ct 19 each of the project through the need for new operements or additional funding?  5. Near Term, 1to 3 fears to develop.  Could be completed within one year. Ready to construct.  Could be completed within one year. Ready to construct.  Project sponsor is ready, funding is not in place.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project.  3. The project is admenstration level site.  Could be completed within one year. Ready to construct.  Project sponsor is ready, funding is not in place.  Project sponsor is ready, funding is not in place.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. Lines and has not been designed.  On The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  1. There are some existing studies or plants to complete studies, a clear plan to complete  1. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation.  1. There are some existing studies or plants to complete studies, a clear plan to c	3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		2	
Costs for new susers.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  A Promote Economic Development  Oces 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?  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  1. Intelled or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  2. Intelled or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  3. Intelled or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  4. Immediate, S I Year.  3. Near Term, 1.10 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  2. Technical Feasibility of Project is possible and completed equal designs. 1. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed equal designs. 1. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Documents not provided.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  Project is a demonstration level site.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Documents not provided.		2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				1
O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Promote Economic Development  Developmentation  Developmentatio		Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the				
equal proportions.  A Promote Economic Development  Development  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. Clear documentation. 2. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation. 3. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 4. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 3. Near term, to a Visual documentation or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding? 4. Immeliness  Does the project have the ability for Stokeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding? 4. Immeliness  Does the project have the ability for Stokeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding? 5. Near Term, to 1 Svears to develop. 5. Most Term, 1 to 1 Svears to develop. 6. Linique term, 3 to 5 Years to develop. 7. Technical Feasibility of Project 7. Technical Feasibility of Project 8. Near Term, 1 to 1 Svears to develop. 8. The project has detailed documentation in evaluate the technical feasibility studies, and completed engineering designs. 9. 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, but incomplete or partial designs. 1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incompleted engineering designs. 1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incompleted engineering designs. 1. The project is not well documen						
Development    Commit activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?   1				Not provided on project submittal form.		
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. O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. So solid documentation. O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category 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. Mild-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  1. The project have technical documentation in covaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.  2. The project is partially documented, does not have 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 not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.  0. The project is not well documented, documentation and clearance?  1 Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  2 Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete  1 The project some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	Promote Economic  Development		1		1	
Clear documentation. 1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness  Does the project have the obility for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, cl Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project. Project sponsor is ready, funding is not in place.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, and completed engineering designs.  2. The project is partially documented, does not have 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, but incomplete or partial designs.  1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  1. The project is not well documented.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance?  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  1 Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.						
generation. Limited documentation.  0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation to solid documentation.  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.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  3. The project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  and completed engineering designs.  2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, and complete or partial designs.  1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  1. The project is not report to the well documented, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  1. The residence of the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  1. The residence of the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  1. The residence of the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documental documentation.  1. The real come existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete						
Durited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.    Readiness to Proceed Category						
1. Timeliness Description of 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. Mich-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.  1. Long-term, > 6 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project Description of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  3. The project have technical 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.  Documents not provided.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. There are some existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete			_			Project information states potential for positive
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, 5 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 have technical 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.   Documents not provided.   Project is a demonstration level site.   Documents not provided.   Project is a demonstration level site.   Project i	Readiness to Proceed Category	generation. No solid documentation.				economic activity.
## A Immediate, < 1 Year.  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 is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.  2. The project is partially documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  1. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. There are some existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	Timeliness		4		4	
3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 3. Long-term, 6 Years to develop. 4. Long-term, 6 Years to develop. 5. Technical Feasibility of Project 5. Technical Feasibility of Project 6. Technical Feasibility of Project 7. Technical Feasibility of Project 8. The project have technical 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.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. There are some existing studies and completed environmental documents. 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete					-	-
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.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. There are some existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	1			
2. Technical Feasibility of Project    Does the project No. 2   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.   Documents not provided.   Project is a demonstration level site.			<u></u>			Project sponsor is ready, funding is not in place.
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.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1. There are some existing studies and completed environmental documents. 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	2. Technical Feasibility of Project	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	1		2	
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.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete						
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.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete			-			
studies and has not been designed.  0. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		incomplete or partial designs.				
0. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility				
Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  Documents not provided.  Project is a demonstration level site.  1  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete  Documents not provided.  1  1		-	1			
2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	2. Facilitation 11.1.0.			Documents not provided.		Project is a demonstration level site.
1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	3. Environmental Compliance		1		1	-
environmental documentation.  If funding is received through the IRWMP process, a		There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	1			
	I	environmental documentation.	1	If funding is received through the IRWMP process, a		

Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture :

15

Melissa Canadale/Snm Schaffer Comba Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		CEQA document would be prepared		May not be required for this scale.
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		1	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				Likely categorical exemption under CEQA may e
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		Not required for proposed scale.		required for this scale.
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		1	
	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				Statement of a local cost match and proposed
	operations.		Seeking Prop 84/1E funding.		budget, but no documented funding source.
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Control  1. Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,				1
1. Frovides multiple benefits	recreation, or other benefits?	1		0	
	1= Yes			_	
	0= No				
Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?				
and stakeholders	sees the project installed manaple statistical state participation.	0		1	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.				
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	1		1	
	group?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability	0		1	
	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.	4			
	0. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to				Manuacha la calaba a ffe a
7 C	the effects of climate change.  Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?				Very minimal positive effect.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project		1		1	
	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	projects.  0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1			
	o. 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?	0		0	
	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.				

Ave 72, Martinez Canyon Groundwater Storage Project

18

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Criteria	Question/ Ferrormance intensures	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
IRWMP Goals		30010	Comments	30010	connents
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	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2		2	
water.	2 No Secretary I had a figure of the secretary of the sec	-			-
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.				
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	4		3	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				Alsh and also Bartast Information and a second
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				Although the Project Information states a capacity estimated at 40,000 af annually, it does not statean
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet. 2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.				annual average Yield, therefore, level 3 for project
	to to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		Project has identified 40,000 afy as a possible storage amount.		yield was selected based on observation that every year may not utilize the full 40,000 af capacity.
Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through		aniount.		year may not utilize the full 40,000 at capacity.
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	2		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	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	1		1	
	federal requirements?				
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially	1			Groundwater banking conserves water by allowing
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				storage of surface supplies at time when surface
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				supplies cannot be delivered to a coincent demand.
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				The Project is being ranked similar to other water saving projects.
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				saving projects.
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	1		1	
Water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				-
	<ol> <li>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.</li> </ol>				
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?			_	
Management Strategies.		2		2	
	Integrates five or more RMS.				
	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.				
7. 81 6	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		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.				
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.				Although not mentioned by project name, groundwater banking in CWD for IID is mentioned.
Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?				groundwater banking in CWD for IID is mentioned.
8.00		1		2	
	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.				
	0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have		If the study finds groundwater storage feasible then there is a possibility groundwater rights will be		
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		optimized/protected.		
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the				
Match Water Quality to use.	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic				
	benefits?	0		0	
	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	-			
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>				
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	1			
	economic benefits.				
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	0		0	
	Colorado River supplies?	U		U	
	2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and				
	provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorade River supply.				
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  O. Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create	1			
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
2.6					
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of				1
	scale.				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.				
	Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.				
	and the state of t				
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1		1	
	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	]			

Ave 72, Martinez Canyon Groundwater Storage Project

18

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Criteria	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
	question/Performance inteasures	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	1. Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or				
	rivers.  O. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.	4			
Comply with Total Maximum	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board				
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0		0	
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	A Louis No. 17 April				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				
Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1		2	
	Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing	-			
	water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water		The section is a second to the		
	quality.  0. Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant	1	The project is currently unknown to be feasible. The project says nothing of improving groundwater		
	impacts to existing water quality.		quality and only discusses a groundwater facility.		
Environmental Protection and	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal  1. Environmental Enhancements	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.  Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	1			
		0		0	
	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				
	<ol> <li>Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.</li> </ol>				
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.	L_		<u></u>	
2. Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements	0		0	
	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?  1. Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				1
	The grates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.  O. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	†			
Flood Protection and Stormwater	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and				
Management Goal	stormwater management strategies.				
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?	1		1	
storniwater events	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.	-			
	1. Trojects would not reduce economic damages of protect me and property.				
	0. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
Strategic Considerations for IRWN	M Plan Implementation	L			
Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	0		2	
	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	-		_	-
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
	Imperial Region.  O. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				Based on the high ranking of the Goal and Objective, this suggests high degree of Stakeholder support
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?				
14. COSE ETICLEIVETIESS		1		0	this suggests high degree of Stakeholder support
2. COST Effective (1855)		4		0	this suggests high degree of stakeholder support
2. Cost Effective less	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af.	4		0	una auggesta nign degree or attinerronner aupport
2. Cost Effectivelless	4. < \$150/af.	4		0	
a. Cost Lifethvelless	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af.	4	Not well defined at this time.	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet
Cost Ellectiveness     Equitable cost sharing	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af.		Not well defined at this time.		Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	Not well defined at this time.	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.		Not well defined at this time.		Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af.  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		Not well defined at this time.		Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
	<ul> <li>4. &lt; \$150/af.</li> <li>3. \$151 to \$300/af.</li> <li>2. \$301 · \$450/af.</li> <li>1. &gt;450/af.</li> <li>Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> </ul>		Not well defined at this time.		Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet
	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.  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				Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 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.  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net	0	Not well defined at this time.  Not provided on the project submittal form.	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet
3. Equitable cost sharing	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af.  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.				Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af.  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.  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?	0		0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic	4. < \$150/af.  3. \$151 to \$300/af.  2. \$301 · \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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.	0		0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af.  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. 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. 1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$60/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$60/af. 2. \$301 - \$60/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 3. \$152 for a substitute 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.  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. Limited documentation.	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding
Equitable cost sharing      Promote Economic Development	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af.  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. 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. 1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet
Equitable cost sharing      Promote Economic     Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	<ol> <li>4. &lt; \$150/af.</li> <li>3. \$151 to \$300/af.</li> <li>2. \$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>1. &gt;450/af.</li> <li>Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>1. Costs would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> </ol>	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing      Promote Economic Development	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.  Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?  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.  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. Limited 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	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	0	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing      Promote Economic     Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$60/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$60/af. 1. >450/af. 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. 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. Limited documentation. 0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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.	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing      Promote Economic     Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 3.	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing      Promote Economic     Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$45	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing      Promote Economic     Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 3. \$150/af. 3. \$	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. <\$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af. 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. 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. Limited 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.  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. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	0	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 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.  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. 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.  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. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 2. The project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project? 3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. <\$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 1. >450/af. 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. 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. Limited 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.  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. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$450/af. 4. >450/af. 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. 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. 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.  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. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, >6 Years to develop. 3. 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 incompleted or partial designs.	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$450/af. 3. \$450/af. 4. \$450/af. 5. \$450/af. 5. \$450/af. 6. \$10 the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits? 6. \$20 the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits? 7. \$20 the costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base. 7. \$20 the costs borne by new users. 8. \$20 the costs borne by new users. 9. \$20 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? 9. \$20 the project provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. 9. \$20 the project provide measurable to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation. 9. \$20 thinted or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 9. \$20 the project have the ability for \$20 takeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding? 9. \$20 thinted on \$20 tensor to develop. 9. \$20 thinted on \$20 tensor to develop. 9. \$20 the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project? 9. \$20 tensor to partial designs. 1. \$20 tensor to partial designs. 1. 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	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$450/af. 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. 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. Limited documentation. 1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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. 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 not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$450/af. 3. \$450/af. 4. \$450/af. 5. \$450/af. 5. \$450/af. 6. \$10 the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits? 6. \$20 the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits? 7. \$20 the costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base. 7. \$20 the costs borne by new users. 8. \$20 the costs borne by new users. 9. \$20 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? 9. \$20 the project provide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. 9. \$20 the project provide measurable to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation. 9. \$20 thinted or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 9. \$20 the project have the ability for \$20 takeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding? 9. \$20 thinted on \$20 tensor to develop. 9. \$20 thinted on \$20 tensor to develop. 9. \$20 the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project? 9. \$20 tensor to partial designs. 1. \$20 tensor to partial designs. 1. 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	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$450/af. 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. 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. Limited documentation. 1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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. 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 not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.	1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
3. Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness  2. Technical Feasibility of Project	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$152 does to me water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base. 4. Costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base. 5. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users. 6. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions. 6. 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? 7. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. 7. Limited documentation. 8. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 8. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation. 8. 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? 8. Immediate, < 1 year. 9. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 9. Ling-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 9. Long-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 9. Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project? 9. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs. 9. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed. 10. The project is not well documented documentation and clearance? 11. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	1 1 1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2 3	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
3. Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness  2. Technical Feasibility of Project	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af. 2. \$303 - \$450/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 3. \$152 to 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.  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. Limited documentation. 0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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, 4 1 Year. 3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 3. The project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project? 3. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs. 1. 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.  O. The project have environmental documentation and clearance?	1 1 1	Not provided on the project submittal form.  If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable	2 3	Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet  Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this

Imperial IRWMP Project Review Score Sheet Ave 72, Martinez Canyon Groundwater Storage Project

18
Melissa Consdale/Som Cale Constale/Som Cale Co January 2012

Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		Not applicable with this project.		
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		0	
	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.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		Not applicable with this project.		
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	0		0	
	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		Drainet cooks Dran 94/15 funding		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Co	operations.		Project seeks Prop 84/1E funding.		
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,				
	recreation, or other benefits?	1		0	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project is focused on Water supply
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	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		1	
	1= Yes				Stored water would potentially befefit all water users
	0= No				in Region.
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	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		1	
	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the				
	effects of climate change.				
	Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to				
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	the effects of climate change.				
Contribution- Project	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	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?	0		1	
3,	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				Stored water will be available as a firm water supply to support alternative energy development.

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer: Ave. 62, Thomas Levy Recharge Site.

19

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments
IRWMP Goals		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
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				
Effect to agricultural users of	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2		2	
water.	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.	-		-	
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	4		3	
	5. >50,000 acre feet. 4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				Although the Project Information states a capacity
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				estimated at 20,000 to 30,000 af annually, it does not
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.		Project has identified 20,000 - 30,000 afy as a		state an annual average Yield; level 3 for project yield was selected, however, every year may not utilize the
Protect Surface Water Rights,	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.  Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through		possible storage amount.		full capacity.
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	2		2	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.				
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?	1		1	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.     Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.     Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				Groundwater banking conserves water by allowing storage of surface supplies at time when surface supplies cannot be delivered to a coincent demand.
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current	1		1	The Project is being ranked similar to other water saving projects.
substitution for Colorado River Water.	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	1		1	
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.     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.				
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2		2	
iwanagement strategies.	2. Integrates five or more RMS.				
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     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		2	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				Although not mentioned by project name, groundwater banking in CWD for IID is mentioned in
Groundwater Rights.	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?			_	several planning documents.
o. Groundwater nights.		1		2	
	<ol> <li>Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aguifers.</li> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>		If the study finds groundwater storage feasible then		
	<ol> <li>Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.</li> </ol>		there is a possibility groundwater rights will be optimized/protected.		
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	0		0	
	2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>				
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.				
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?	0		0	
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.     Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				
	O. 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.  O. 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.				
Support DACs- Drinking Water					
5. Support DACS- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of	0		0	
	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?	1		1	
	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.				

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Ave. 62, Thomas Levy Recharge Site.

19

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Citteria	<b>.</b>	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	1. Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or				
	rivers.				
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				
5. Comply with Total Maximum	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	0		0	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	Ů		- U	-
	2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				
Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1		2	
d. Freserve of improve		1		2	-
	<ol><li>Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing water quality.</li></ol>				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water				
	quality.		The project is currently unknown to be feasible. The		
	0. Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant		project says nothing of improving groundwater		
	impacts to existing water quality.		quality and only discusses a groundwater facility.		
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?				
		0		0	
	2. Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project				
	impacts.				
	Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other				
	project impacts.  O Project does not increase or improve habitat	1			
2 Integrated Decign Flaments	Project does not increase or improve habitat.  Poss the project integrate environmental open space, parks or other recreational elements.				
Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	1			
Flood Protection and Stormwater	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and				
Management Goal	stormwater management strategies.				
		1			
Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from	1		1	
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?				-
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic demograp or result in national impacts to life or property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
Strategic Considerations for IRWN	1 Plan Implementation				
1. Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	0		2	
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		1		1
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
	Imperial Region.  O. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				Based on the high ranking of the Goal and Objective,
2. 6 555					this suggests high degree of Stakeholder support
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	4		3	
	4. < \$150/af.				Uncertain of cost per af based on the cost information provided in the Project Information
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.				sheet. However, if project is between \$20M - \$25M
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.				and yields average annual of 5,000 to 10,000 af, then
	1. >450/af.		Not well defined at this time.		it is in the item 3 range.
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		0	
	2 All (6				4
	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				Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
	equal proportions.  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net		Not provided on the project submittal form.		provided in the Project Information sheet
Promote Economic     Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	1		2	
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to no, imperial county and cities:	-		_	
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				1
	Clear documentation.				
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue		A. A. W. W		
	generation. Limited documentation.  0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	1	If the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge facility is viable there is potential for measurable		Documentation includes a tech memo regarding potential economic activity resulting from this
	generation. No solid documentation.		economic benefits to the region.		project.
Readiness to Proceed Category					
1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	4		3	
-	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?				-
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	1			
	Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.     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	1		2	
	project?	_		_	-
	<ol><li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li></ol>				
	and completed engineering designs.  2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but	1			
	incomplete or partial designs.				
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	1			
	studies and has not been designed.	]			
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	1			Project has been studied and modeled, but, no
					engineering designs completed.
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0		1	
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.				
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete     surjection property decomposition.	1			
I	environmental documentation.	1		l	

Imperial IRWMP Project Review Score Sheet January 2012 Ave. 62, Thomas Levy Recharge Site.

Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		Not applicable with this project.		
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		0	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.	1			
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		Not applicable with this project.		
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	0	Not applicable with this project.	0	
5. runung	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	U			
	maintenance and operations.				
	Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no				
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and	1			
	operations.		Project seeks Prop 84/1E funding.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C	riteria				
1. Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?	1		U	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project is focused on Water supply
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	-			
		4			
2 Danida animal bandita	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		1	
	1= Yes				Stored water would potentially befefit all water users
	0= No	1			in Region.
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	m region.
	1= Yes	-	1		
	0= No	1			
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?				
5. Statewide i Horities		1		1	
l	1= Yes	4			
C Climate Channe Adapti	0= No				
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability	1		1	
	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.				
	Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to	1			
	the effects of climate change.				
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?				
Contribution- Project	3	1		1	
	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	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?	0		1	
	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.	1			Stored water will be available as a firm water supply
	3, 11 3, 1				to support alternative energy development.

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer: East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project 20 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
IRWMP Goals		30016	Comments	30016	Comments
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				
Effect to agricultural users of water.	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2		2	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
2. Improve Water Supply.	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.  Does the project provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply that contributes to the				
2. Improve water supply.	regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	4		4	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				If Foot Many and the hard with the foot of the
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet. 3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				If East Mesa proves to be a suitable site for an IID groundwater storage project, it may provide a Project
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.		Project has identified 40,000 afy as a possible storage		yield that is expected to be in the 40,0000 to 60,000 acre-feet per year range. At this time it is uncertain,
2. 2	1. 0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		amount.		thus, I've scored it a level lower than the highest.
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		2	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado				
Conserves Colorado River Supplies.	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	1		1	
	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				Groundwater banking conserves water by allowing storage of surface supplies at time when surface supplies cannot be delivered to a coincent demand. The Project is being ranked similar to other water
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use. Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				saving projects since it is a planning project not fully realized.
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		1	
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	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.				
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2		2	
	Integrates five or more RMS.     Integrates 3-5 RMS.				
	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		2	
	2. Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				Although not mentioned by project name,
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				groundwater banking is mentioned in several
Groundwater Rights.	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	-		2	planning documents .
-	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	1		2	
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.		If the study finds groundwater storage feasible then		
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		there is a possibility groundwater rights will be optimized/protected.		
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	0		0	
	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				
	Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				
	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?	0		0	
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.     Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create				Although this project has the potential to provide a stored water supply and extend the CO River supply, it does not assist in meeting wastewater disposal and
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				permit requirements, therefore, the score remained zero.
Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of	0		0	
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not 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.				This project would assist with water supply for alternative energy projects, which may benefit DAC economy.
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1		1	
<u> </u>	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.				

East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project Project Reviewed: Project Number:

environmental documentation

Project Reviewer Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combi Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria Reviewer Reviewer 1. Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or 0. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers . Comply with Total Maximum Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Λ Λ Daily Loads (TMDLs) Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs 2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs. 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? 1 2 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 wate uality The project is currently unknown to be feasible. The Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant project says nothing of improving groundwater impacts to existing water quality. quality and only discusses a groundwater facility Environmental Protection and Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses **Enhancement Goal** Environmental Enhancements Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts? 0 0 2. Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts Project does not increase or improve habitat. 2. Integrated Design Elements Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements Λ Λ into the design to achieve multiple benefits? Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits. 0. Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits Flood Protection and Stormwater Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and Management Goal stormwater management strategies. 1. Reduce impacts from Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from 1 1 stormwater events 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 Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population: Public Acceptance/Public 0 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 Based on the high ranking of the Goal and Objective, Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region. his suggests high degree of Stakeholder support . Cost Effectiveness s the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region 4 3 nformation provided in the Project Information 4. < \$150/af sheet. However, if project can yield 50,000 af/yr. hen a rough estimate of \$100M expense spread ove 3. \$151 to \$300/af 20 years gets to a minimum price of \$100/af. It could 2. \$301 - \$450/af. pe more or less per af. Item 3 range score was 1. >450/af Not well defined at this time selected due to the uncertainty of the information. Equitable cost sharing Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producina those benefits? Ω 0 All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate bas 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 Incertain based on lack of defined cost information Not provided on the project submittal form egual proportions. provided in the Project Information sheet Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net 4. Promote Economic economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities? Development 1 2 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. f the feasibility study shows a groundwater recharge ocumentation includes a tech memo regarding 0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue facility is viable there is potential for measurable potential economic activity resulting from this conomic benefits to the region eneration. No solid documentation roject. Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or 4 3 program without the need for new agreements or additional funding? Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop . Long-term, >6 Years to develop 2. Technical Feasibility of Project Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the 2 1 project? 3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility Reconnaissance level evaluation of the East Mesa tudies and has not been designed area and preliminary cost for a number of project The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives. concepts were completed as part of the Draft IID Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance? 3. Environmental Compliance 2. Existing studies and completed environmental doc 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete

East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project
20
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		Not applicable with this project.		
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		0	
	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.		Not applicable with this project.		
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	0	,	0	
	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.		Project seeks Prop 84/1E funding.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C					
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?				
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project is focused on Water supply
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	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		1	
	1= Yes				Stored water would potentially befefit all water users
	0= No				in Region.
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	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		1	
	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		1	
The second of th	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.				
Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	0		1	
3,	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.	1			Stored water will be available as a firm water supply
	, ,				to support alternative energy development.

East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project 20 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria Reviewer Reviewer Question/Performance Measures

Project Reviewed:

Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Painted Canyon Groundwater Storage Project
21
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
IDMARD Cools		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
IRWMP Goals Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and			<u> </u>	
	sustainable supply to meet current and future demands				
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2		2	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	5		4	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				Although the Project Information states a capacity
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				estimated at 80,000 to 100,000 af annually, it does
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				not state an annual average Yield, therefore, level 4 for project yield was selected based on observation
	5001 to 10,000 acre feet.     0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.				that every year may not utilize the full 80,000 to
Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	_		_	100,000 af capacity.
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	2		2	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	<ol> <li>The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.</li> </ol>				
	0. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado				
Conserves Colorado River	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and	1		1	
	federal requirements?  2. Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				Groundwater banking conserves water by allowing
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				storage of surface supplies at time when surface supplies cannot be delivered to a coincent demand.
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				The Project is being ranked similar to other water
Support for in-lieu uses or	Use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				saving projects.
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	1		1	
Water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	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.				
<ol> <li>Integrate Resource Management Strategies.</li> </ol>	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	0		1	
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.				
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     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?	1		2	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.  O the first and a second consistency with suitable plan.  O the first and a second consistency with suitable plan.				Although not mentioned by project name,
Groundwater Rights.	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	_		_	groundwater banking in CWD for IID is mentioned.
		2		2	
	<ol><li>Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.</li></ol>				
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.  O. 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				
Match Water Quality to use.	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	0		0	
·	benefits?	U		0	
	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				
	<ol> <li>Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>				
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide				
	economic benefits.		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
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	0		0	
	Colorado River supplies?				
	<ol><li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li></ol>				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  O. 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.				
Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
	health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.				
	Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.				
			Not discussed on project submittal form.		
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1		1	
1	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	J		l	

Painted Canyon Groundwater Storage Project
21
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
	Project would not provide benefit or have possible impacts on water quality of drains or	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	<ol> <li>Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.</li> </ol>				
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
<ol><li>Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)</li></ol>	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0		0	
Dully Lodds (TIVIDES)	Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.				-
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		Not discussed on one look or her land forms		
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1	Not discussed on project submittal form.	2	
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing				
	water quality.	1			
	<ol> <li>Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.</li> </ol>				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant		Not discussed on one look or her land forms		
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.  Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
Enhancement Goal	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0		0	
	Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project				
	impacts.				
	<ol> <li>Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.</li> </ol>				
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.	1			
2. Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements	0		0	
-	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?  1. Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
	Thregrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.     Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	1			
Flood Protection and Stormwater	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and				
Management Goal	stormwater management strategies.				
Reduce impacts from	Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from				
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	1			
Strategic Considerations for IRWN  1. Public Acceptance/Public	A Plan Implementation  Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	0		2	
11 abile receptance, abile	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	U			
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				Based on the high ranking of the Goal and Objective, this suggests high degree of Stakeholder support
2. Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
	4. < \$150/af.				
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.				Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information
	2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.	1			provided in the Project Information sheet; Cost
Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?		No cost is provided on the project submittal form.		estimate for feasibility study was provided.
5. Equitable cost sharing	be the children that receive the series buy for the costs of producing these series is	0		0	
	2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
	<ol> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the</li> </ol>	1			
	costs borne by new users.				
	Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.		Not discussed on project submittal form.		Uncertain based on lack of defined cost information provided in the Project Information sheet
4. Promote Economic	Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	2		2	
	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				
	Clear documentation.	4			
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.				Documentation includes a tech memo regarding
	Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue				potential economic activity resulting from this
Readiness to Proceed Category	generation. No solid documentation.				project.
1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	4		3	
	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, < 1 Year.			l j	-
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	1			
	Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.	1	Project is a feasibility study.		The Feasibility Study phase can be implemented immediately.
Technical Feasibility of Project	Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	-	Froject is a reasibility study.	1	mmeulately.
, ,,	project?	2		2	
	<ol><li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li></ol>				
	2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but	1			
	incomplete or partial designs.  1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	1			
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.				
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	1			
2.5					
3. Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0		0	
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.     There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	1			
1	environmental documentation.	]			

Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Painted Canyon Groundwater Storage Project
21
Malissa Cansdale (Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.				
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		0	
	2. The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	<ol> <li>The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.</li> </ol>				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	1			
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	0		0	
	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 C					1
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?  1= Yes				Drainet is to provide water benting conseits for water
	0= No	1			Project is to provide water banking capacity for water supply.
Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?				supply.
and stakeholders	boes the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
	<ol><li>Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.</li></ol>				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.	1			
	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		1	
	1= Yes				Stored water would potentially befefit all water users
	0= No				in Region.
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability	1		1	
	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.  O. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to				
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	the effects of climate change.  Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?				
Contribution- Project	Does the project diject greenhouse gas emissions in the region:	1		1	
Contribution 1 roject	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.				
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	1		1	
Support to Renewable Energy	A The section of the description of the section of				-
	<ol> <li>The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.</li> </ol>				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				Stored water will be available as a firm water supply
					to support alternative energy development.

Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG
32
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Section 1 Sectio	Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
March   Marc			Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Security of the control of the contr	Criteria	Question, Crommance measures				
1. Third is great to all control of the control o	IRWMP Goals					
Litter Congress Process and Company of the Company	Water Supply Goal					
The content of the			1			
2. To provide the control of the con		Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	0		1	
1. Second programment of the control of the contr	water.	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies				-
The print of control print of an experience for the print of the pri			-			
2						
special organization of the table 2000 count or processing special count or processing	2 Improve Water Supply			Not provided in the project submittal form.		
Section of Control C	2. Improve water suppry.					
Explane to 1500 to 150			1		0	
Explane to 1500 to 150		E >50 000 agra foot				-
Building to SE 2000 for test		•				
Design for the control of the contro						
In Protects for five with the project registration of the project registration registr						
1. Process Service Services Services and ser				Would provide storage of approximately 30 acre feet.		
The Contribution of the Co	3. Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	0		0	
The project could be religious with other projects or controllary such as the project count of projects and projects or controllary such as the project count of projects and projects or controllary such as the projects or controllary such as the projects of the project count of projects and projects or controllary such as the project count or cou	maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	U		U	
Conserve Colorado Boros   March Serve Conserve Colorado Boros   March Serve Colorado Boros   March Se		2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
Concrete Control No.  1. Program of the property and, there will, and production of production of the property of the control of the property of the control of the production of the production of the property of the control of the production of t						
Countered Collision files  Would be prigited implement works conservation inscription of the property of the counter of the property of the property of the counter of the property of the propert						
In proposition of the property and the control industry as recorded, states and industry as recorded, states and industry as recorded and states of the property and the propert						
Power requirements or suggest decorrection measures that suppos requirements and strongly decorrections or suggest decorrection of secured and set feedful as.	Conserves Colorado River					
2. Information water conservation measures that assistance of the respect of commentation of researching of the respect of commentation of researching and production of the respect of th	Supplies.		0		0	
demonstrate or support dissumentation of responsible and benefitie use.  1. Implications with conservations with conservations and the support of the conservation of the conservation resource of the project of support of the conservation of the c						-
L Injudicate to water conservation measures that ment requirements and parally demonstrate or segont featurementation of resource of segont featurements or resource of significant production of the control of the con						
Oce set implement water conservation measures do not met- sequenterson, color post for increased and second case of commentary to expert descriptions of reagonables and secondary  Materia.  1. Posters would provide a source of supply and allow for reagonables more within the important Region?  On the project would are created assure of supply and allow for reagonables more within the important Region?  On the project would provide a source of supply and allow for reagonables more within the important Region?  On the project would provide a source of supply and allow for reagonables more within the important Region?  On the project would need to expect a source of supply and allow for reagonables more within the important Region?  On the project would need to expect a source of supply and allow for reagonables more within the important Region of the project contable the step is an advantable and reagonable and advantable and reagonable more within the step is a source of supply and allow for reagonables more and and and allo						
Support for a Nouser's equivements, one and demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and sending of the control support of the control of support of suppo						
Support for in lieu uses or would only are solder enough water for energenous contribution for control five or work of Calcinosis filters applies, and allow for respectations within the largeral Region?  1. Process would provide a source of supply that could be used by a current user as a control control for the supply and sold or more provide and sold provides according to the supply and sold or the project in control or sold provides according to the supply and sold or the sold provides according to the supply and sold or the regions of the sold provides according to the supply and sold or the regions of the sold provides according to the supply and sold or the regions of the sold provides and sold provides according to the supply and sold or the sold of the sold provides and sold provides according to the sold provides and sold or the sold of the sold provides and sold or the sold of the sold provides and sold or the sold of the sold of the sold provides and sold or the sold of the so				Door not implement water consequation measures		
So Support for inferences or word of the project provides as any official control for inference or supply of the country of supply and subcomment of the project making the project maki						Drinking water healthe and safety project.
Modern  1. Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for respontanement.  0. The project would not create a source of supply that could be used by a current user as a substitution for Control town user upon the country of the supply that could be used by a current user as a substitution for Control town users upon the country of the supply that could be used by a current user as a substitution for Control town users upon the country of the supply that could be used by a current user as a substitution.  2. Integrates S-RNS.  3. Less parties S-RNS.  4. Consisted degree of consistency. Projects consistent with City was consistency. Projects consistent with City was consistency. Projects consistent with City was consistency. Projects consistent with the ground on the City's Visited Material Project and Country Connected and the Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country of the City's Visited Material Project and Country of the C	5. Support for in-lieu uses or			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Projects wood provide a source of supply in and allow for responding comments of supply and subsequence responding comments of subsequence respondi	substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0		0	
Discrepance for control of contro	Water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				1
Substantion for Colorands River supply and substantion for Colorands River supply and substantion for Colorands River supply and subsequent respondentment.    Integrate Resource   With the provider dayby or integrate Resource Management Strategies?   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1						
Multiple project golpy or integrate Resource Monagement Strategies?  1. Integrates five or more MMS. 1. Integrates five or more MMS. 2. Integrates five or more MMS. 3. Integrates five or more MMS. 3. Integrates five or more MMS. 3. Integrates five or more MMS. 4. Integrates five or more MMS. 5. Integrates five or more MMS. 5. Integrates five or more MMS. 6. Integrates five five or more MMS. 6. Integrates five five or more MMS. 6. Integrates five five or more MMS. 6. Integrate five five five or more MMS. 6. Integrate five five five five five five five fiv						
Management Variagings.  2. Integrates 59 Misc. 3. Lises have here Misc. 4. Integrates 59 Misc. 5. Lises have here Misc. 5. Lises have here Misc. 6. Created eigned of consistent with City and County General Prior, State or Federal Land Use Plan. 7. Plan Consistency. 8. Grostot degree of consistency. Project consistency with existing glan. 9. Limited or no consistency with existing large and protective scarce of market plan and protective scarce of market plan and protective scarce of market plan and protective scarce glan and protective scarce and granted scarce glan and granted scarce glan and granted scarce g	6. Integrate Resource			create a new one.		
L Integrates 3-5 MAS.  Q Less that three RMS.  Q Less that three RMS.  A the project consistency. In the project consistency with the goals of the City of County described Plans, State or Federal Land Use Plan.  L Moderal edgree of consistency. Project consistency with cally from Plan County (and project protect consistency with existing plans).  B. Groundwater Rights.  G. Unined or no consistency with existing plans.  B. Groundwater Rights.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater right or optimize the use of groundwater and is identified in the City's Capital Improvement Program.  2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater uses (pumpers), closenty helps to revered a address overdard in the san inmacts on auch angifers.  D. Would not sustain or protect or overlying groundwater uses (pumpers), or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdard.  Protect water quality for beneficial use consistency with the plans to such angifers.  D. Would not sustain or protect groundwater uses (pumpers), or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdard.  Protect were quality for beneficial use consistency with regional community interests and the MODO Scan Plan through cooperation with trapletions (many potentially significant impact by causing overdard.)  Protect would rest water quality for beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide common beneficial use of poor quality source water or provide common beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide common beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide common beneficial used from rectifications of scale; or provide received water or the common beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide common beneficial used from rectifications of scale; or provide received water or the common beneficial used of poor quality water source water or provide common beneficial used from rectifications of scale; or provide received water or active study.  2. Support DACs: W	Management Strategies.		1		1	
D. Less than three MAS.  If the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,  UMMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?  1. Moderate degree of consistency. Project deathy identified in GP or other plan.  1. Moderate degree of consistency with existing plan.  3. Or condivator Rights.  Will the project size of consistency with existing plan.  2. Sustains and protects use of overhing groundwater uses of promote present consistency with existing plan.  2. Sustains and protects use of overhing groundwater uses (pumpers); clearly helps to revene or address overdief for his impact on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overhing groundwater uses (pumpers); clearly helps to revene or address overdief for his impact on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overhing groundwater uses of powering promotes and the exposed poveration of his impact on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overhing groundwater uses of overhing groundwater uses of overhing uses of overhing groundwater uses of overhing uses of the city of the cost the local community is unable to found it.  Water Quality Goal  Protect water quality for beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic hearings.  1. Match Water Quality to use.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water on otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  2. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide and provide economic benefits.  2. Support DACs: Waterwater.  3. Support DACs: Waterwater.  Would the project inpace with regularized use of poor quality water source water or provide and provide economic benefits.  2. Support DACs: Waterwater.  Would the project upport adject water to extend the Colorado River supply.  3. Support DACs: Drinking Water.  Would the project upport adject water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Assist DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale, or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado R			_			
7. Final Condistency.  If the project consistent with City and County General Plans, State or Federal Land Use Plans.    Will be project in Consistent with City and County General Plans, State or Federal Land Use Plans.   Moderate degree of Consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.   Indicate degree of Consistency with existing plan.   Unified or not consistency with existing plan.   Unified or not consistency with existing plan.   Will the project protect correlative groundwater infest for season in the City's Capital Improvement Program.   Project would be provided to the Improvement Program of the City's Capital Improvement Program.   In May seath and protect us of conviving provided versors (pumpers), does not prevent or address overdiff or the Improvement exists assisting or provided versors (pumpers), does not prevent or address overdiff or the Improvement exists assisting or provided versors (pumpers), does not prevent or address overdiff or the Improvement exists assisting or provided versors (pumpers), does not prevent or address overdiff or the Improvement exists assisting or provided versors (pumpers), does not prevent or address overdiff or the Improvement exists assisting or provided versors (pumpers), does not prevent or address overdiff or the Improvement exists assisting or provided versors with regional community interests and the MVGCR Basis Plans Improvement exists assisting or provided versors with the Plans of the City's Capital Improvement Program.    In Match Water Quality to use   Will the project adjusted by Capital Improvement Program   1						
DWMAP or existing Capital racinity Plans    2. Greated ladgered of consistency. Projects class dearly identified in GP or other plan.   3. Moderate degree of consistency. Projects class clarify identified in GP or other plan.   4. Moderate degree of consistency with existing plan.   5. Groundwater Rights.   Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of overlying groundwater users (jumpers); clearly helps to revent or address overdraft or his missures to such assistance or address overdraft or his missures to such assistance or address overdraft or his missures to such assistance or address overdraft or his missures to such assistance or address overdraft or his missures to such assistance or address overdraft.   World and sustain or protect groundwater users (jumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or his missures to such assistance or address overdraft.   World and sustain or protect groundwater users (jumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or his missures (jumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft.   World and sustain or protect groundwater users (jumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft.   World and sustain or protect groundwater users (jumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft.   World and sustain or protect groundwater users (jumpers); does not prevent or address.   World and sustain or protect groundwater users (jumpers); does not prevent or address.   World and sustain or protect groundwater with regional community interests and the protect water protect groundwater (jumpers); does not prevent and protect groundwater with regional community interests and the protect water (jumpers); does not provide expect would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide expect would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide expect would not make beneficial use of poor qual	7 Plan Consistency					
2. Greatest degree of consistency. Projects complete spears 1. Modurest degree of consistency. Project competition/filled in GP or other plan. 2. Intitled or no consistency with existing plan. 3. Groundwater Rights 2. Sustain and protects used or overlying promotivester rights or optimize the uses of groundwater? 3. In May sustain and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers), does not prevent or address overland for his impact on such aquifers. 3. In May sustain and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers), does not prevent or address overland for his impact on such aquifers. 4. In May sustain and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers), does not prevent or address overland for his impact on such aquifers. 5. O'Would not sustain or protected groundwater users (pumpers), does not prevent or address overland for his impact on such aquifers. 6. Waster Quality Goal 6. Protect water quality for beneficial uses of poor quality such and provide exceeding users of poor quality water and provide exceeding users (pumpers), does not prevent or address overland for his impact on such aquifers. 7. In Match Water Quality Goal 7. Protect would make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide exceeding users of poor quality water and provide exceeding users of poor quality water and provide exceeding users of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide exceeding beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide water to extend the Colorado River supply. 7. Engine community into compliance with requirements, create seconomies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply. 8. Support DACs- Drinking Water 8. Support DACs in meeting water support DACs in meeting wate	7. Flan Consistency.		1	The project is consistent with the goals of the City of	2	
**Master Pital and is identified in the City's Capital Improvement Program  8. Groundwater Rights.  **Will the project protect correlative groundwater uses of groundwater use of groundwater uses of groundwater uses of promoters and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to proved and process use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to proved and process use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to proved and process on address overlated to his mispact on such apaulfers.  1. May sustain and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact on such apaulfers.  2. Would not sustain or protect groundwater user of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact on such apaulfers.  3. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact to such apaulfers.  4. Protect water quality for beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?  5. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits.  6. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  7. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water on otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  8. Support DACs- Wastewater.  9. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.  9. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.  9. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.  1. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.  2. Support DACs- Wastewater.  2. Support DACs in meeting water support DACs in meeting water water and review opport water and provide economic or scale; or provide recycled water to es		Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
Improvement Program   to the cost the local community is unable to fund it.		Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.	-			
8. Groundwater Rights.    Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?		Limited or no consistency with existing plan.				
2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has iniquates on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has iniquate on such aquifers.  0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater user of cerelying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.  Protect water quality for other-ficial 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.  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic henefits.  1. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic henefits.  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  3. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water source water on to otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements; create economies of scale; and provides economic souls are continued to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Support DACs- Wastewater.  Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements; create economies of scale; and provides excycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Support DACs- Drinking Water  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Drinking water support DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  3. Does not assist DACs to meet standards or create economies of scale.  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Support the project offect the water quality of drains or ri	8. Groundwater Rights.		0	improvement rogram		to the cost the local community is unable to fund it.
a. I. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater uses (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aguifers.  0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.  Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the Review of the Community of the Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the Review of the Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits.  Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.  Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.  Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.  Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements; create economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Bings community into compliance with requirements, does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  Project would provide expected water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Als states and a scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  Project would provide expected water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Bings community into compliance with requirements, does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Bings com			U		1	
1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact to sush a quifers.  0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.  1. Watch Water Quality Goal  Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RIVQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  1. Match Water Quality to use.  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide expended water there quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  1. Project would trans beneficial use of poor quality water source water on to otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  2. Support DACs- Wastewater.  3. Support DACs- Wastewater.  4. Sings community into compliance with requirements; create economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Cloirado River supply.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  2. Support DACs- Drinking Water  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  2. Support DACs in meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Cloirado River supply.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  2. Support DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Cloirado River supply.  2. One so thaw any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Cloirado River supply.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  2. Sussiss DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  3. Support DACs was the project affect the water quality of drains or reate economies of scale.  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  5. Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  5. On the proj						
or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.  0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.  Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RVMCR Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Mould 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.  2. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  3. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  4. Support DACs- Wastewater.  Common benefits.  5. Project would provide sender of provide provide source water or provide economic benefits.  6. Project would provide sender that is already treated.  7. Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.  8. Support DACs- Wastewater.  8. Support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements; create economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  9. 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.  1. Brings community into compliance with requirements, does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Support DACs- Drinking Water  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  6. Does not have any effect of extend the Colorado River supply.  1. Support DACs in meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.		prevent of dudress overdrate of has no impacts on such againers.	_			
Mater Quality Goal   Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RYMCGB 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.   Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide conomic benefits.   Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide conomic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide conomic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water on therwise used and provide conomic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water on therwise used and provide conomic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water on the economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic sof scale; and provide economic sof scale; and provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic sof scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic sof scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for w						
Water Quality Goal Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the RWGCB Basin Plant through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  1. Match Water Quality to use.    Mould the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits.   Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.   Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water on to therwise used and provide economic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water on to therwise used and provide economic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide		0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have		Unclear if groundwater is the source of water to be		
RWOCE Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies  1. Match Water Quality to use.  Would the project would make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water 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 on to therwise used and provide economic benefits.  2. Support DACs- Wastewater.  2. Support DACs- Wastewater.  2. Support DACs wastewater.  3. Brings community into compliance with requirements; create economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supplies?  2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water  3. Support DACs- Drinking water was 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  3. Support 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.  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  3. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Wassists DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  2. Assists DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  3. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Support DACs and the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Support DACs and the project affect the water quality of drains or river						
1. Match Water Quality to use. benefits   2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits.   1. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.   1. Project would not 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 not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.   0. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.   0. Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   0.   0.   0.   0.   0.   0.   0.	Water Quality Goal					
Denefits   2   Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.   Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.   O   Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economics of scale; and provide recycled water to extend the requirements; create economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.   Despire to the project support DACs in meeting waster standards, does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.   Despire to the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.   A   Support DACs   Drinking Water   Drinking Water   Drinking water standards, address public health, water standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.   A   Sasists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.   Drinking Waterways   Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?   Drinking water sandards or create economies of scale.	Match Water Quality to use.					
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 wostewater disposal and permit requirements; create economic so fscale; and provide recycled water on event of the colorado River supplies.  2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides 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?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health, or creating economies of scale?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  1. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water ways  Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.  3. Support DACs- Drinking Water ways  Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, one not create economies of scale.  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project offect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1 1		benefits?	1		0	
1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  2. Support DACs- Wastewater.  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.  2. Support DACs- Drinking Water  Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?  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.  2. Support DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  3. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.  Project would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.  0. Operation of the project support DACs in meeting water and reuse opportunities to extend conomics of scale; and provides requirements; does not create economies of scale; on provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  2. Subject would provide beneficial use for water that is already treated.  0. Operation of the project affect water and reuse opportunities to extend all provides requirements; already treated.  0. Operation of the project support DACs in meeting water standards or create economies of scale; on provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River s						
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; or provide 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.  2. Support DACs- Drinkling Water  Would the project support DACs in meeting drinkling water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale; 2. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinkling water standards or create economies of scale.			†			
0. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits. 2. Support DACs- Wastewater. 3. Support DACs- Wastewater. 4. 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? 4. Brings community into compliance with requirements; create economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply. 5. Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply. 6. 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. 7. Support DACs- Drinking Water was an expectating public health, or creating economies of scale; and provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply. 8. Support DACs- Drinking Water was an expectating economies of scale; and provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply. 9. Support DACs- Drinking Water was an expectating economies of scale; and provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply. 9. Support DACs- Drinking Water was an expectating economies of scale; and provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply. 9. Support DACs- Drinking Water standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale; and provide public health, or creating economies of scale; and provide scale; a						
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?  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 standards, does not create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  0. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  1. Assists DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  2. Resolves health and safety issue of drinking water system and provides fire protection.		Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	1			
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?  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.  2. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  3. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1 1	2 (			already treated.		
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.  O. 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?  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.  2. Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  3. Support DACs—Drinking Water  1. Assists DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  3. Support DACs—Drinking Water  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. 1	2. Support DACs- Wastewater.		0		0	
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.  2. 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?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  3. Support DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  4. Effect on Existing Waterways  Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. 1		Colorado River supplies?				
1. Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  O. 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?  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.  2. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.  1. Assists DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.  O: 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?  1						
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?  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?  1 1			4			
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?  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?  1						
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?  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?  1. 1			1			
health, or creating economies of scale?  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?  1. The project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. The project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. The project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?						
health, or creating economies of scale?  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?  1. The project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. The project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?  1. The project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	2 Support DACs Drinking Weter	Would the project current DACs in meeting drinking water standards, anothering will-				
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?  1  1	J. Jupport DACS- Drinking Water		0		2	
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?  1  1						
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?  1  1			4			
system and provides fire protection.  4. Effect on Existing Waterways Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers? 1		Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.				
system and provides fire protection.  4. Effect on Existing Waterways Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers? 1		0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.				Resolves health and safety issue of drinking water
2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	4. Effect on Existing Waterways		1		1	-
		2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	]			

Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG
32
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

<u> </u>	contract on and Boot trace Office to				
Critonia	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	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	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	0		0	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?				-
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				Poject is specific to meeting the needs of drinking
Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?			1	water for DAC area.
o. Freserve of improve	Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used or would protect existing	1		1	-
	water quality.				
	<ol> <li>Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.</li> </ol>				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.  Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0		0	
	2. Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project				1
	impacts.  1. Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other	_			
	project impacts.				
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.				
Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.				
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
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?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	_			Project adds fire protection and not protection from
					flooding.
Strategic Considerations for IRWN  1. Public Acceptance/Public	A Plan Implementation  Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?		I	1	
1. I done Acceptance/I done	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	1		1	-
					The project may be favorably supported, however,
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				the rate paying population is limited by capacity to
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				pay. Thelocal population does not have the capacity to pay.
2. Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
	4. <\$150/af.				
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.		Cannot calculate this value because it is unknown		
	3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.		how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if		This project does not produce additional water supply, it is to provide fire protection.
Equitable cost sharing	2. \$301 - \$450/af.			0	This project does not produce additional water supply, it is to provide fire protection.
3. Equitable cost sharing	\$301 - \$450/af.     >450/af.  Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if	0	
Equitable cost sharing	2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if	0	
3. Equitable cost sharing	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>bo the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the</li> </ol>	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if	0	
3. Equitable cost sharing	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if	0	
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if	0	supply, it is to provide fire protection.
Equitable cost sharing  4. Promote Economic Development	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	0	supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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?	-	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.		supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net</li> </ol>	-	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.		supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	-	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.		supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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.	-	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.		supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic Development	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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.	-	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.		supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or</li> </ol>	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	1	supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.  1. Limited documentation.  1. 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?	-	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.		supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or</li> </ol>	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	1	supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Umited documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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.	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	1	Supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.  1. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  1. 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. Limited documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  2. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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.	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	3	Supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	2. \$301 - \$450/af.  1. >450/af.  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.  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.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	1	Supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Immediate, S 1 Year.</li> <li>Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.</li> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the</li> </ol>	0	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	3	Supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>Oo the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Immediate, &lt; 1 Year.</li> <li>Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.</li> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>Long-term, &gt; 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>The project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li> <li>The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but</li> </ol>	3	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	3	Supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.</li> <li>Limited documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Immediate, &lt;1 Year.</li> <li>Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.</li> <li>Ling-term, &gt;6 Years to develop.</li> <li>Long-term, &gt;6 Years to develop.</li> <li>The project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li> <li>The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incompleted engineering designs.</li> </ol>	3	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	3	Supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>Oo the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Immediate, &lt; 1 Year.</li> <li>Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.</li> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>Long-term, &gt; 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>The project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li> <li>The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but</li> </ol>	3	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.	3	Supply, it is to provide fire protection.  Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Immediate, &lt; 1 Year.</li> <li>Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.</li> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>The project has detailed documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li> <li>The project is partially documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility</li> </ol>	3	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.  Not provided in project submittal form.  The City has a rate study that identifies the project. It	3	Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is needed.  Preliminary Engineering Report completed, but,
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Immediate, &lt; 1 Year.</li> <li>Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.</li> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li> <li>The project is partially documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.</li> </ol>	3	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.  Not provided in project submittal form.	3	Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is needed.
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness 2. Technical Feasibility of Project	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>Moes 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?</li> <li>Immediate, &lt; 1 Year.</li> <li>Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.</li> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.</li> <li>Long-term, 5 Years to develop.</li> <li>Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>The project is not well documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li> <li>The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.</li> <li>The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.</li> <li>The project is not well documented.</li> <li>Does the project have environm</li></ol>	3	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.  Not provided in project submittal form.  The City has a rate study that identifies the project. It	3	A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is needed.  Preliminary Engineering Report completed, but,
4. Promote Economic Development  Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness 2. Technical Feasibility of Project	<ol> <li>\$301 - \$450/af.</li> <li>&gt;450/af.</li> <li>&gt;bo the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?</li> <li>All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.</li> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> <li>Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.</li> <li>Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.</li> <li>Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Immediate, &lt; 1 Year.</li> <li>Immediate, &lt; 1 Year.</li> <li>Long-term, 3 to 5 Years to develop.</li> <li>Mid-term, 3 to 5 Years to develop.</li> <li>Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?</li> <li>The project has detailed documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li> <li>The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.</li> <li>The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.</li> <li>The project have environmental documentation and clearance?</li> </ol>	3	how many acre feet would travel through the tanks if storag water required use.  Not provided in project submittal form.  The City has a rate study that identifies the project. It	3	Uncertain who will have ability to pay for project costs.  A storage tank project can be designed and built over a short time-frame, however, additional funding is needed.  Preliminary Engineering Report completed, but,

Imperial IRWMP Project Review Score	e Sheet				January 201
Project Reviewed:	Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG				
Project Number:	32				
Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Criteria	Question, retroinmence measures	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1		1	
4. i Crimitang	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
1	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
F. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		1	
5. Funding	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	1		1	
1	maintenance and operations.				
ĺ	Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no				
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
ĺ	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and				
ĺ	operations.		Seeking Prop 84/1E funding.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Co	riteria		•		
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?	1			
ĺ	1= Yes				
	0= No				
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		0	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
1	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
ĺ	Projects involves one stakeholder.				
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder				
	group?	0		0	
İ	1= Yes				
	0= No				Limited to one city.
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
<u> </u>	0= No				One, critical water supply needs of DAC within region
<ol><li>Statewide Priorities</li></ol>	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				One, addresses the safe drinking water needs of a
ĺ	0= No				small DAC
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	0		0	
	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the				
ĺ	effects of climate change.				
	<ol> <li>Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.</li> </ol>				
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
1	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
1	projects.				
	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?	0		0	
	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.				

Project Reviewed: Holtville Water Distribution System Project
Project Number: 34
Project Reviewer: Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo
Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
IRWMP Goals		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
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				
Effect to agricultural users of water.	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	1	Presumably if the project will provide potable water services to 96 homes (with the hope to build more)	1	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.		will increase the need for urban water which could		
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.		conceivably affect agricultural water. The water source is not clearly defined, nor if that water is		
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		already appropriated for this use.		
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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1		0	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet. 3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet. 2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.	-			
	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.	1	Does not indicate a new supply for users.		
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	0		0	
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?  2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project would be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for				
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.		Does not indicate groundwater storage or underruns.		
4. Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	0		0	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially	1			
	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		Water conservation is not discussed as a goal of this		
Support for in-lieu uses or	use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current		project.		Drinking water service area consolidation project.
substitution for Colorado River Water.	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0		0	
	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		As described the project would not be a source of		
Integrate Resource	substitute for Colorado River supply and subsequent reapportionment.  Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?		new supply or a substitute supply.		
Management Strategies.	will the project upply of integrate resource management strategies:	0		0	
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.		There is opportunity to provide water for recycling		
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     Less than three RMS.	-	with this project if it is incorporated with a treatment facility.		
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	2	racincy.		
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	2		1	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.     Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
	D. Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Identified in the City General Plan Land Use Element		
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0	(see form)	1	
	2 Contribution and marks to the first time and the contribution and the	U		1	
	<ol><li>Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.</li></ol>				
	1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.  O. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have				
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the				
Match Water Quality to use.	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic				
. 4	benefits?	0		0	
	<ol><li>Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li></ol>				
	1. Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water				
	not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide	1			
	economic benefits.		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
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	1	Community is identified as being out of compliance	0	
	Colorado River supplies?	_	with either no aaccess to potable water and using polluted open channels as a water source, or are	Ů	
	<ol><li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li></ol>		connected to potable water services outside of		
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;	1	adopted development standards. An economic benefit may be created IF the land is developed,		
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		however that is not guaranteed at this time. There is		
	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.		opportunity for a treatment plant or recycling opportunities at end-use of this community. This		
2 Support DACs Deighigs West			option could be explored further.		
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	1		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.		Brings a DAC into compliance by providing potable		
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		water using adopted development standards. The economy of scale as yet is uncertain. Could improve this coors with a proven economic bonefit		Consolidation of drinking water system and provides
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1	this score with a proven economic benefit.  It is forseeable providing a potable water system to	1	fire protection.
<u> </u>	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.		houses would assist with the quality of water in drains and rivers. however that aspect is not		
•		=	- Grand and invers. However trial aspect is not	•	

Holtville Water Distribution System Project
34
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		specifically discussed in the project submittal form. Would this project also include "return services"? If		
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		so then the water leaving these homes could be		
5. Comply with Total Maximum	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	0		0	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?  2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		Not discussed on project submittal form.		Poject is specific to meeting the needs of drinking water for DAC area.
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	0		1	
	<ol> <li>Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing water quality.</li> </ol>				
	Water quality.  1. Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.  Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
Enhancement Goal 1. Environmental Enhancements	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.  Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	1			T
I. Elimolimental Elimolicements	Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project	0		0	
	impacts.				
	<ol> <li>Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.</li> </ol>		Not discussed on project submittal form. It is conceivable if the quality of drain water is improved		
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.		the habitat could also be improved.		
2. Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.     Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.	1	Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and		processes on the project submittanionn.		
Reduce impacts from	stormwater management strategies.  Would the project help to reduce economic damages; and protect life and property from				
stormwater events	localized stormwater events and runoff from urban areas?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.      The second seconomic damages are second seconomic damages.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
Strategic Considerations for IRWN					
Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	1	The purpose of the project (bringing potable water to	1	
	High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		people who do not have it) would appear to garner stakeholder support due to its altruistic nature.		
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		Unsure of conflict potential due to uncertainty of water source. Documentation of where the water		
	0. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		comes from would be pertinent.		
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	1		0	This project does not produce additional water
	4. < \$150/af.				supply, it is to replace unreliable supply with a reliable, good quality supply thru consolidation of
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.				potable drinking water system which also provides
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.				fire protection. 96 households would be connected. Rough cost estimate is over \$132/mo per household
	1. >450/af.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		base on 20 years spread of estimated cost stated in Project Information.
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		1	
	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
	Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the				
	costs borne by new users.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly	1			
4 December 5	equal proportions.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		Uncertain who will have ability to pay for costs.
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?	1		1	
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.				
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	1			
	generation. Limited documentation.  0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	1	Possible economic benefits IF the unused acres are		
Positings to Proceed Catalan	generation. No solid documentation.		developed.		
Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	1		4	
	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.	-	If funding is provided this project would be ready to		
2. Tachnical Fossibility of Parity	Long-term, >6 Years to develop.		go and take 1 - 3 years to complete.		
2. Technical Feasibility of Project	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	3		2	
	<ol><li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li></ol>				
	2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.				
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	1			
	studies and has not been designed.  O. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	-	A preliminary engineering report is complete (2010) and identifies existing conditions and proposed		
2 Environmental Compliance			improvements, however it is not finalized.	_	Preliminary Engineering Report completed
3. Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	2		2	

Project Reviewed:

Holtville Water Distribution System Project

34

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Criteria		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	30010	connents	30010	comments
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		City has completed Environmental Review, NEPA		
	environmental documentation.		Environmental Information Document, and CEQA		
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		MND, complete as of 2010.		
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1	,,	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.		Pending ministerial and encroachment permits are		
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		scheduled to be obtained during the construction phase.		
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1	priase.	1	
5. i dildiig	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	-			1
	maintenance and operations.				
	Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no				
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and		Project seeks Prop 84/1E funds and a plan is in place		
	operations.		to finalize project funding.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Cr	iteria		-		
1. Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?	1		U	
	1= Yes		Project could provide economic benefits as well as		
	0= No		provide clean water to a DAC.		
2. Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
and stakeholders		U		1	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.		Participating agencies are EPA and BECC however they are not stakeholders.		
Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder		Single limited stakeholder group (the DAC that is		
3. Florides regional benefits	group?	0	directly affected). However the possibility of	0	
	1= Yes		economic growth could provide a regional benefit in terms of jobs. That is not listed as a definitive		1
	0= No		outcome of this project, though.		Limited to area serving 96 households
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No	1			One, critical water supply needs of DAC within region
<ol><li>Statewide Priorities</li></ol>	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				One, addresses the safe drinking water needs of a
	0= No				small DAC
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability				
3	to the effects of climate change?	0		0	
	Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the				
	effects of climate change.				
	Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to		The project could do this ifrecycling or conservation		
	the effects of climate change.		measures were implemented (metering).		
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project		1		1	
	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.	1			
	0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1			
Q. Casashawa Cas Fasiasi	Donath maintain and a second an				
Greenhouse Gas Emissions -     Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	0		0	
Support to kenewable Energy	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in		1		1
	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	· ·	1			
	0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
		l			

Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project
35
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer: Imperial IRWMP Project B	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
IRWMP Goals					
Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and				
Effect to agricultural users of	sustainable supply to meet current and future demands  Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?				T
water.	boes the project have an ejject to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	0		1	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
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, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	0		0	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.		.85 mgd ~ 1,000 afy. This project will not supply a		
	5001 to 10,000 acre feet.     0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		new source of water, merely upgrade an existing		
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through		source to meet NPDES requirements.		
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0		0	
	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.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
4. Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	0		0	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.	_			
	<ol> <li>Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.</li> </ol>		There is opportunity for this project to implement water conservation measures through the upgrade (metering).		
5. Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River	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?	0	7	0	
Water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	The project would not create a source of supply that could be used by a current user as a		This project is merely to upgrade treatment of an		
	substitute for Colorado River supply and subsequent reapportionment.		existing supply.		
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	0		0	
Management Strategies.	Integrates five or more RMS.				
	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.		Project currently meets one RMS. This project could meet more if it is integrated with other projects, or		
	Less than three RMS.		expands its purpose to meet more 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		2	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.		Consistent with the City General Plan, City Service		CA RWQCB has issued a Cease and Desist Order
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Area Plan, City Capital Improvement Program (2010),		regarding the WWTP NPDES permit.
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	
	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.				
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>				
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have	_			
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the				
Match Water Quality to use.	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic			•	
	benefits?	0	Unsure of the economic benefits of the treated water. Environmental benefits are a cleaner	0	
	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.		waterway system, however the end-use of the water is not listed. If it is to treat the water for delivery		
	Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water	-	downstream what are the delivery requirements (volume) of the plant remaining in operation? If there		
	not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.	_	is no current economic beneficial use for this water, what would be the beneficial economic use of the		
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.		water provided by the upgraded plant? How many homes/businesses could be served vs. how many currently are.		
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	1	This project will bring a DAC into compliance with	1	
	Colorada River supplies?  2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		requiremenst with the upgrade, however whether an economy of scale will be created or an extension of		
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;	†	Colorado River supplies remains to be seen. No significant permanent economic benefit is listed as a result of this project. Presumably the water currently treated by this plant is already allocated. If treating		
	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.	1			
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public		this water could provide a recycled use then Colorado River supply extension is feasible.		
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.	1	The treatment plant will not assist this DAC in		
		J	meeting drinking water standards, however it will		

Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project
35
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project E	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
	Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.	Score	Comments bring the treatment plant into compliance with the	Score	Comments
	-		existing NPDES permit.		
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	2	The treated water drains into Pear Drain, a tributary	2	
	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.     Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or		to the Alamo River (a tributary to the Salton Sea).		
	rivers.		Bringing treated water into compliance will conceivably benefit the water quality of the drain and		
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.		river.		
<ol><li>Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)</li></ol>	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	1		0	
Daily Loads (TIVIDES)	Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.		Stormwater BMPs are only discussed as part of the construction phase, however improving the water		
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		quality will conceivably assist in compliance to		
Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	0	established TMDLs.	2	
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing				
	water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	1		1	
		1		1	
	<ol><li>Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.</li></ol>				
	Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other	1	Improving the discharge quality will improve habitat,		Based on Project Informatin, it is uncertain if Project
	project impacts.  O. Project does not increase or improve habitat.	1	primarily for the Alamo River and the Salton Sea.		can provide any regional support for mitigation of
Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements		Other project impacts are unknown.		other project impacts.
	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
el de la companya de	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.				
Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
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?	1		2	
storniwater events	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	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.		Not discussed on the project submitted form		
Strategic Considerations for IRWM	I 1 Plan Implementation		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	0		1	
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within	-			
	Imperial Region.		Minimal stakeholder support as the stakeholders		
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		cannot afford it.		
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	2		0	
	4. < \$150/af.				
	3. \$151 to \$300/af. 2. \$301 - \$450/af.	_	The project costs \$6,149,000. Over the course of 20		Rough annual costsof \$181 per household for 20
	1. >450/af.		years, at a flow rate of approximately 1,000 afy the cost would be approximately \$308 per acre foot.		years for the WWTP upgraded were estimated based on Projec Information; it appears
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		2	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
		U		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	1			
	costs borne by new users.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly	1			
	o. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
4. Promote Economic	Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net				
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	1	Economic benefits appear to be limited to the	1	
			construction period. "If the WWTP is not rehabilitation and upgraded in the near future,		
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.		planned residential, commercial and/or industrial		
	occi accamentation.		projects may be restricted and not be permitted for development due to capacity issues." If the plant has		
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue		such a limited capacity (.85 MGD), then there is		
	generation. Limited documentation.		limited opportunity for economic growth. The		
	Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue	1	economic growth and benefit could be discussed in more detail and documentation could be provided to		
	generation. No solid documentation.		substantiate this claim.		
Readiness to Proceed Category		I			
1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	3		4	
	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?	3		4	
	Immediate, < 1 Year.     Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	1	Although the project is listed as commencing within 1		
	2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.		year, it is still in the preliminary design phase and not		
Technical Feasibility of Project	Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the		shovel ready.		
2. Common reasionity of Project	project?	2		2	
	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	1			
	incomplete or partial designs.	]			

Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project
35
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Citteria		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	Score	Comments	30016	Comments
	studies and has not been designed.				
	0. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.		A rate study and a preliminary engineering report		Rate study underway; design not initiate due to
			have been completed.		funding constrainsts.
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	1		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.		The project is exempt from CEQA. NEPA pending if		
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		federal funds used.		
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1		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.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		1	
	2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to				
	maintenance and operations.	1			
	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.		Seeking construction funding.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C					
<ol> <li>Provides multiple benefits</li> </ol>	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	1		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?	-		Ů	
	1= Yes				Limited to WWTP improvement at one DAC and help
	O= No		Water quality and environmental enhancement.		with water quality of discharge to drain.
2. Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	
and stakeholders		· ·		_	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.		Single stakeholder and DAC area. Possible		
	Projects involves one stakeholder.		(environmental) stakeholders downstream toward the Salton Sea.		
Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder		the salton sea.		
3. Flovides regional benefits	group?	1	The project would supply a regional benefit by	0	
	1= Yes		providing better quality water to the Alamo River and		
	0= No		ultimately to the Salton Sea.		Limited to one DAC location and a drain.
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
		1		1	-
	1= Yes 0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities					
3. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability	0		0	
	to the effects of climate change?				
	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the		Since the project is providing an upgrade to existing		Although the Project Informationstates an energy
	effects of climate change.	4	water supply, it is not forseen it affects regional		savings, it does not identify a significant change in
	0. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to		climate change vulnerability unless it also includes		energy to treate the wastewater, it does mention a
7. C	the effects of climate change.		storage, secondary treatment, etc.		reduction, but does not quantify one.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the CHC emissions relative to the				
	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	projects.  0. The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1			
	o. The project contributes to Grid emissions; and does not support renewable energy.				
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?				
8. Greennouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expunsion of renewable energy portfolio for the kegion or State?	0		0	
Support to renewable Energy	1. The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of				
	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Perion or state.				
	the Region or state.	4	While the project will use renewable energy sources,		
	0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.		it does not expand the energy portfolio of the region		
		1	or state, or assist in the expansion.		

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project 36 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria					
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	
IRWMP Goals		30016	Comments	Jeore	Comments	
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					
Effect to agricultural users of water.	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	1		1		
Nate:	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.					
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.		No impacts and no benefits to water supplies available to agriculture are forseeable with this			
2. Improve Water Supply.	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.  Does the project provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply that contributes to the		project.			
Zi improve video suppri	regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1		0		
	5. >50,000 acre feet. 4. 25,001 to 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.		The project is intended to upgrade sanitary sewer		Project focuses on Wastewater Collection System and	
Protect Surface Water Rights,	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.  Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through		outfall and not provide a water supply.		does not add to water supply	
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?	0		0		
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado					
A. Canana Calanda Bissa	River Supply.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.			
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?	0		0		
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.     Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.					
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial large.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.			
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?	0	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	0		
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.					
	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.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.			
<ol><li>Integrate Resource Management Strategies.</li></ol>	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	0		0		
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.					
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     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		2		
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.					
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.		City General Plan, City Service Area Plan, City Capital			
Groundwater Rights.	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.  Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?		Improvement Program			
o. Groundwater rights.		0		1		
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.     May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.					
	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		Not discussed in the project submittal form.			
Match Water Quality to use.	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic	0		0		
	benefits?  2. Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and	U		U		
	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.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide		The project is intended to upgrade sanitary sewer outfall and not make beneficial use of poor quality			
Support DACs- Wastewater.	economic benefits.  Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;		water.		Project focuses on Wastewater Collection System	
	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	1		1		
	provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.					
	<ol> <li>Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.</li> <li>Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create</li> </ol>					
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		The project would help a DAC meet wastewater disposal and permit requirements.			
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	1		0		
	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.		Uncertain the project would create or assist in the creation of an economy of scale.			
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	2		2		
	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.			l		

Project Reviewed:

Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project

36

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Part	Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
The process of the		valuation and Ranking Criteria				
The Content of the	<u>Criteria</u>	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
As the control for the following of the control form of the contro				Comments		Comments
Property of the Control (Control (Con				It is conceivable that replacing the sanitary sewer		
S. Comply and Price Seculation  A production of the Continue o						
The contribution of the co	5 Comply with Total Maximum			drains/rivers.		
Extraction of the control of the con			1		1	
The control of prince of an interprince of an in		Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
The control of prince of an interprince of an in		A Louis De Control of the Control of		Stormwater BMPs are only discussed as part of the		
In the control of timbods  A final expected preserve or improve controls of productionary companies  A final expected production and the control of timbods are produced and the control of the production and the control of the control of timbods are produced and the control of the production and the control of the control of timbods are produced and the control of the production and the control of the production and the control of the con		Improves compliance with established IMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				Project would reduce risk of raw sewage effluent
S. Description of the improvement of the process of		Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				
2. The control of the	6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	0	established IMDLs.	2	old pipes causing back-ups.
Size coulding.						
Test commental financian and continuous agreet, exception and support and production and continuous agreet and exception of affined production.  2. Financial financial and agreet research and production and continuous agreet and exception of affined production.  3. Financial financial and agreet research and production and continuous agreet agreement and continuous agreet ag						
Exposure state of the state and stat						
The contraction of the property contraction of the propert						Reduces risk of effluent discharging into
Intersection food  The proportion of the property of the prope				Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
L. Endocromanical Confinemental Confinements (Information) and the project incomes or improve habitate and read register of orders impacts of other impacts of the project incomes or impacts of improve habitates or impacts or impact						
Project increases or improvement abouts and counted support mitigation of other project   Project increases or improvement abouts, the classification of other   Project increases or improvement abouts, the classification of other   Project increases or improvement abouts, the classification of other   Project increases or improvement abouts, the classification of other   Project increases or improvement abouts, the classification of other   Project increases or improvement abouts, the classification of the project increases or improvement abouts, the classification of the classificatio				Τ		Τ
The project of control	1. Environmental Enhancements	would the project increase of improve habital of support mitigation of other impacts?	0		1	
The project of control		Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project				
Engrand Control (Control (Co		impacts.				
Process does not improve to improve to bilition.   Consideration of the project solution for t						
2. Integrated Design Learners Compared an integrate consistent of great project information of control to project control to pr				Not discussed in the project submittal form		Reduces risk of effluent discharging into drains
Interpret to design a where militage bearings   Value   Valu	2. Integrated Design Elements		•	Not discussed in the project submittal form.	•	neduces risk of emacine discharging into drains.
Does not record and Sourcestors and Sourcestors and property from Good and develop regions and sourcest and stroke projects and project all projects and project all projects and p		into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	U		U	
The properties and somewhater many controlling and covering regional and local flood professions and somewhater responses of s						
A propose for protect that and a protect that and protect the protect that and protect that an				Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
1. Richoic Impacts from Activimates events and anodify from what an execution of demages, and protect (if and properly from activimates events)  2. Projects would not relate a setting and properly from the property from the property of th						
Security Comments of the Control of Control	Wanagement Goal	Storriwater management strategies.				
Notificate everts  A Projects would not reduce consomic damages or provide the and property.  1. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and property.  2. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and property.  3. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and property.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and property.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and property.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and property.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  4. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  5. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  6. Projects would not reduce consomic damages or result in protect list and protects.  7. Projects would have a project would be provided for conflicts within protect list.  7. Projects would have appeared on the project in the Rejuent.  7. Projects would have a project would be past for by new work would be past for by new work would be past for by new work.  8. Eventually, and results are received the benefits and protects in the Rejuent.  9. A Promote Economic Consolidation of the project in the reverse would be past for by new work would be past for by new work.  9. Costs for new water would be past for by new water.  9. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and entiting as a project in output years.  1. Pr			1		1	
English would not englishe economic damages or protect life and property.  In Polish Acceptance (Private)  Designed could increase economic damages or protect life and property.  In Polish Acceptance (Private)  In Polish A	stormwater events					
Stretes Considerations for IRMA Plate Indiversals economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.  Stretes Considerations for IRMA Plate Indiversals economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property exhibit.  1. Public Acceptancy Plate  2. High degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Understate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Understate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. State of the property of the conflicts within imperial Region.  3. State of the property of the conflicts within imperial Region.  3. State of the property of the conflicts within imperial Region.  3. State of the property of the conflicts within imperial Region.  3. State of the property of the conflicts within imperial Region.  4. Could likely be stated between new and existing rate payers, with at least 75% of the cools for the propert submitted form.  5. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  4. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  5. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  5. Promote Economic Does the project provide measurable economic dending rate payers, with at least 75% of the cools bottom by two users, or distance or submitted form.  5. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  6. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  6. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  7. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  8. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  8. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  9. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  9. Promote Economic Does the project submitted form.  1. Notices potential for conflictuing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Notices potential for conflictuing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Understance of the policy the protes				Unsure of current 'economic damages' if any. It		
D. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or projectly indicated.  1. Notice Conditionations for White Perpetual Section of the Project individual control of the		Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
Strategic Considerations for IRVAN Plan implementation  1 Profile Acceptance/Politic  With the project be died to goal public support and low percentage for conflicts within imperial Region.  2. Finding agree of stakeholder support and low percentage for conflicts within imperial Region.  3. Finding agree of stakeholder support and low percentage for conflicts within imperial Region.  4. Finding agree of stakeholder support and low percentage for conflicts within imperial Region.  5. Cost Effectiveness  6. Be decirate of stakeholder support and properties for the Region?  4. Finding agree or angle for gived competitive with the other projects in the Region?  5. Sist Sist Sist Sist Sisted.  5. Sist Sist Sisted.  5. Sist Sisted Sisted Sisted.  5. Sist Sisted S		Project could increase economic damages or result in notential impacts to life or property				Based on the Project Information, risk is more with
1. Rublic Acceptance/Public  Will the project to each to goals public support from the rate poying appointability  2. High degree of stakeholder support and recommend for comflicts within imperital Region.  3. Summer on stakeholder support and recommend for comflicts within imperital Region.  3. Summer on stakeholder support and pubmertal for comflicts within imperital Region.  4. CSSSO).  4. CSSSO).  4. SSSO (SSS).  5. SSSO (SSS).  5. SSSO (SSSO).  6. SSSO (SSSO).  6. SSSO (SSSO).  6. SSSO (SSSO).  7. SSSO (SSSO).  8. SSSO (SS		o. Project codia mercase economic damages of result in potential impacts to me of property.				
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.  2. Cost Effectiveness  3. the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?  3. 51510 50500/at.  3. 51510 50500/at.  3. 51510 50500/at.  3. 52510 50500/at.  3. 52510 50500/at.  3. 6201 54500/at.  4. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.  5. Cost of the costs of producing the seven and existing rate payers, with at least 75% of the costs borne by reve water.  6. Costs for new water and unrargams distributed for and existing rate payers, with at least 75% of the costs borne by reve water.  8. Promote Economic Control of the project c						
1. Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within imperial Region. 2. Cost Effectiveness 3. In the cost per one plot of joint competitive with the other projects in the Region? 3. Estats is \$100/alf. 3. Estats is \$10	Public Acceptance/Public		1		1	
Imperial Region.		High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
Imperial Region.		Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
2. Cost Effectiveness 2. Substance of the cost per score foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region? 3. SSID SSID(Art. 3. SSID SSID(Art. 3. SSID SSID(Art. 3. SSID SSID(Art. 4. CSIS(Art.) 4. CSIS(Art.) 5. SSID SSID(Art. 5. SSID(Art.) 5. SSID(Art.) 5. SSID(Art.) 5. SSID(Art.) 5. SSID(Art.) 6. SSID(Art.) 6. SSID SSID SSID(Art.) 6. SSID SSID SSID SSID SSID SSID SSID SSI						
4. < \$550/af.  3. 5151 to \$500/af.  2. 501: \$450/af.  3. 5151 to \$500/af.  3. 5151 to \$500/af.  3. 5151 to \$500/af.  4. Formore Economic  Does the project submittal form.  4. Promote Economic  Does the project proide measurable economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.  2. Giractest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.  3. Interior. Moderate opstential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No gold documentation.  4. Promode Economic  Does the project holders dependent of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  4. Promode Economic  Does the project holders dependent of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  4. Formode Economic  Does the project holders dependent of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  4. Construction jobs would be temporary only. Uncertain of how effective the removal of the percent dependent of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No gold documentation.  4. Note of the project holders dependent of the project submittal form.  4. Treating in the project holders dependent of the project submittal form.  4. Since the project holders dependent of the project submittal form.  5. Formation of how effective the removal of the percent dependent to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. In united or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No gold documentation.  5. In the project how the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or new account without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  5. Proliminary temperation of the project how technical documentation on evaluate the technical formational funding?  6. Treating the project how technical documentation on evaluate the techni		0. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.		EPA and BEEC		
3. SEST to S000/aft   2. S007-5405/dit   2. S007-5405/dit   3. Polytode (cost sharing   2. All costs of producing those benefits pay for the cost of producing those benefits?   0   0   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. On effects on current rate base).   0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.   0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.   0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.   0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.   0. Costs of new project provide measurable economic benefits to imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, roughly, job creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.   1. Moderate proteinal or	2. Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
2. Sati - Section from households rough estimate of \$301/households rough estimate of \$301/households rough estimate of \$301/households rough estimate of \$301/households rough estimate of \$301/households/ear over 20 years to pay for this project submittal form.  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.  2. Costs for new water and program distributed to new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs for new water and program distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly  4. Fromote Economic  Development  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, pib creation to fluid, imperial County and Chies?  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  3. Indicate or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  4. Intended to read for new degreements or definition funding?  4. Immediate, at Year.  3. The project have the ability for Stokeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or definition funding?  4. Immediate, at Year.  3. The project has detailed documentation.  4. Intended to the project submittal form.  4. Intended to the project submittal form.  4. Intended to read the project submittal form.  5. The project has read for new agreements or definition for the project or program without the need for new agreements or definition funding?  4. Immediate, at Year.  5. The project has read for the submittal form.  4. Intended to the project submittal form.  5. The project has read for the project submittal form.  5. The project has partially defined, but his project has a detailed documentation.  6. The project is partially defined, but his project has potential to help meet		4. < \$150/af.				
2. Salfor .: Sal						
3. Equitable cost sharing  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 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 for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  2. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal progrations.  3. Enough the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net temperature economic ectivity, policy or ecotion, and revenue generation to 10, Imperial County and offices?  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  3. Indicate of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  4. Intended or propertial for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  5. Intended or propertial for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  6. United or propertial for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  7. Timeliness  8. Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness  9. Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness  9. Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness  1. Timeliness  1. Timeliness  1. Timeliness  1. Timeliness the project to we then being for Stachedders to est quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new generation of the project or program without the need for new generation of the project or program without the need for new generation of the project or program without the need for new generation of the project or program without the need for new generation of the project or program without the need for new generation of the project or program without the need for new generation of the project or proj						estimate of \$101/household/year over 20 years to
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; with at least 75% of the costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Fromote Economic  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, pib creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?  2. Greates potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  Clear documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation on potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation on potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. United documentation.  2. Construction jobs would be temporary only. Uncertain of how effective the removal of the program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immeliate, 2 1 Years to develop.  2. Most ferm, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Protect  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Technical feasibility of protect in mental for contributing to economissance, and/or feasibility studies and to not been designed.  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project to wet will documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and to not been designed.  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project to wet office.  Does the project to even discounted eventual documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies on plans to complete studies, a clear plan to complete of environmental documents.	2. Carritable and shoring			Not discussed in the project submittal form.		pay for this project
1. Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers, with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.  0. Cost for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Fromote Economic  Development  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.  Clear documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  Clear documentation.  1. Imiteliness  Does the project new the ability for Stokeholders to act quickly to implement a project or program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, 2 1 Year.  5. Near Term, 1to 3 Years to develop.  1. Long-term, 6 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  8. The project is not exhibited documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.  1. The project is not well documentated on the new documentation and clearance?  2. The project is partially documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but noncomplete or partial designs.  2. The project partial designs.  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project two evaluate devinormental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  2. The program of the project is constitution of commental complete is a completed environmental documents.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  3. Environmental	3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		0	
Costs for new suess.  0. Costs for new suetrand programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Promote Economic Development  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. Clear documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  3. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. On Limited or on potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Initiated or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of those effective the removal of the project of the project and the project of the project of the project in the project of the project o		All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
Costs for new suess.  0. Costs for new suetrand programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Promote Economic Development  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. Clear documentation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.  3. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. On Limited or on potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Initiated or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation of those effective the removal of the project of the project and the project of the project of the project in the project of the project o						
O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.  4. Promote Economic Does the project provide measurable economic henefits to imperial Region in terms of net economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to 180, 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. United documentation.  0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Uncertain of how effective the removal of the perceived barrier to economic growth would be.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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, 2 Heart.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Mid-term, 310 Streas to develop.  2. Mid-term, 310 Streas to develop.  3. Technical Feasibility of Project:  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility at the project or project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, and completed engineering designs.  1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, and completed engineering designs.  1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  2. Environmental Compliance  Oest the project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. The project is conceptually defined, pour points to complete on points to complete studies; a clear plan to complete on points to complete studies; a clear plan to complete on partial documents.						
equal proportions.  4. Promote Economic Development  6. Dees 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?  7. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  8. Mod discussed in the project submittal form.  9. Limited contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Indestrate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  2. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.  3. No activation jobs would be temporary only. Uncertain of how effective the removal of the perceived barrier to economic growth would be generation. No solid documentation.  4. Immediate, 2.1 Year.  3. Near Term 1.1 of Years to develop.  2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  3. The project have technical documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.  2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.  3. The project is not well documented, does not have 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, but incomplete engineering designs.  2. Evising studies and completed environmental documents.  3. Environmental Compliance  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete testudies; a clear plan to complete		·				Wastewater rate pavers would be associated with
Development    Construction jobs would be temporary only.   Construction flow well for the perceived barrier to economic growth would be.   Construction flow well for the perceived barrier to economic growth would be.   Construction flow well for the perceived barrier to economic growth would be.   Construction flow well for the perceived barrier to economic growth would be.   C		equal proportions.		Not discussed in the project submittal form.		
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. Intel documentation. 0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Uncertain of how effective the removal of the generation. No solid documentation. No solid documentation. Does the project how 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, 10 3 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 2. Indicterm, 3 to 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 is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and completed engineering designs. 1. The project is not well documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs. 1. The project is not well documented, documentation to help meet goals and objectives. 2. The project is not well documented, documentation and clearance? 3. Environmental Compliance Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance? 2. Esisting studies and completed environmental documents. 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete			0		1	
Clear documentation. 1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Unlited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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. 3. The project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical 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, but incomplete or partial designs. 1. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs. 2. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs. 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  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	Development	economic activity, Job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	U		1	
1. Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.  0. Limited no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  Readiness to Proceed Category  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, c. 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.  2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.  1. Long-term, 5 Vears to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Boes the project has detailed documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project.  2. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies, and completed engineering designs.  2. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  3. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  6. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but studies and has not been designed.  7. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but studies and has not been designed.  8. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. The roject is not well occuments.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.				
generation. Limited documentation.  0. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.  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. Indi-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and for 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, but incomplete or partial designs.  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or partial for the project have technical feasibility of the project have technical designs.  1. The project is partially decumented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  2. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete on partial designs.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete						
Readiness to Proceed Category 1. Timeliness  Does the project hove 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. Technical Feasibility of Project  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility studies and completed engineering designs. 2. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, and has not been designed. 3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have environmental documentation to lephans to complete designs and completed environmental documentation and clearance? 2. Esisting studies and completed environmental documental documentation. 3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance? 2. Esisting studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance? 3. Existing studies and completed environmental documentation and clearance? 4. Improved the admiration of the perceived barrier to economic growth would be.  Uncertain of how effective the removal of the perceived barrier to economic growth would be.  4. Improved the design of studies and predict or project or predict possibility of project or project have the bediefly of Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or project or partial designs.  2. Technical Feasibility of Project  3. The project have the chinical feasibility of the project have the technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  2. The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.  3. Environmental Compliance  Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documental documents.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.				Construction jobs would be temporary only		
Readiness to Proceed Category   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						
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 have technical 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, 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.  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	D. P					
## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Construction documents.  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Construction documents.  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  ## Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer		Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or				
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 project Project Project In Exprised Project Project In Exprised Project Project In Exprised In Expris	2icinicas		4		4	
2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop. 1. Long-term, 5 Years to develop. 2. Technical Feasibility of Project  Description to Project to 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.  Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents. 1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		4. Immediate, < 1 Year.				
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, but incomplete or partial 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						
2. Technical Feasibility of Project    Does the project Note in project 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 documents.  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	2. Technical Feasibility of Project		3		2	
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			3			
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  2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but has project have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, and one project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete						
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						
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  Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a construction documents.  2 2  2 Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		incomplete or partial designs.				
0. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.  Preliminary Engineering Report, Design Plans, and a Sewer Rate Study  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						
Sewer Rate Study construction documents.  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  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete						
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  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete		U. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.				
2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	3. Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	2		2	San accommends
1. There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete	· ·	1 1				
environmental documentation.		There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete				
	I	environmental documentation.	l			

Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project

36

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		Environmental Review and Study is complete		
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1	·	2	
	2. The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	<ol> <li>The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.</li> </ol>				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		NPDES permit is active		
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		1	
	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		Seeking Prop 84 and 1E funds. No local funding has		
	operations.		been secured.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C					
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?				
	1= Yes 0= No		Dage not avoide a "range" of honofite		
Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?		Does not provide a "range" of benefits.		
and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakenoiders and participants?	1		1	
	2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.	1			
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder				
	group?	0		0	
	1= Yes		Single/limited stakeholder group. The City of		
	0= No		Holtville.		
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	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?	0		1	
	Projects of climate change:     Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the				
	effects of climate change.				
	Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.				Limited help in adapting in the project does not add energy since it will be an all gravity system.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?				and an an gravity system.
Contribution- Project	<i></i>	1		1	
	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	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		0	
	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.		The project intends to implement a gravity drainage design, removing the need for pumps.		

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer: Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project 38 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer -	Reviewer	Reviewer
IDMARD Cools		Score	Comments	Score	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	•			
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	0		1	
Water	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	1			This project is planning project only; thus, it will not
	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		Not applicable with this project.		have a measureable impact to the water supply
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	0		0	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				
	5001 to 10,000 acre feet.     0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		Not applicable with this project.		Planning project only
3. Protect Surface Water Rights,	Would the project optimize and sustain use of Colorado River entitlements through	0	wer appreciate with this project.	0	raming project only
maintain Colorado River yields.	development of groundwater storage of underruns?  2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.	, ,			
	The project would provide for storage or use or colorado hiver supply.      The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for				
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.		Not applicable with this project.		
Conserves Colorado River     Cupplies	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable	0		0	
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	0		0	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly     demonstrate or support designation of spaceable and beneficial use.				
	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.				
	Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				
Support for in-lieu uses or	use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current		Not applicable with this project.		
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0		0	
Water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	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.		Not applicable with this project.		
<ol> <li>Integrate Resource Management Strategies.</li> </ol>	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	0		0	
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.				
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     D. Less than three RMS.				
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	2			
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	2		1	
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.     Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		City General Plan, City Development Impact Fee Nexus Study,City Service Area Plan		
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0	Nexas study, city Service Area Hair	1	
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	- U		-	
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.				
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>				
	0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have				
Makes Overlike Cool	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.  Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the		Not applicable with this project.		Since this is a planning project, difficult to determine.
Water Quality Goal	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	0		0	
	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.				
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.			L	
Support DACs- Wastewater.	Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;			0	
	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend Colorado River supplies?	0		0	
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;	ł			
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	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.				
Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public				
5. Support Since Drinking water	health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	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.	ł			
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	_			
Effect on existing waterways	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	0		1	
1		4		1	

Project Reviewed: Project Number:

Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project
38
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.	<u></u>		<u> </u>	Planning project only; future implemented projects could help drains or rivers.
5. Comply with Total Maximum	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	1		0	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?  2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				Planning project only; future implemented projects could help with stormwater BMPs.
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1		1	
	<ol><li>Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing water quality.</li></ol>				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.				
	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.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	1		0	
	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.  O. 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?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				Project is planning step towards implementation of
Flood Protection and Stormwater	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and				projects that may contain entegrated elements.
Management Goal	stormwater management strategies.				
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		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				Planning proejct only; future implemented projects
	0. Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				may reduce economic damages and protect life and property.
Strategic Considerations for IRWN					
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.	0		1	-
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
	Imperial Region.     Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
2. Cost Encetivelless	4. <\$150/af.	0		0	
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.	]			
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.				N/A; Planning project that does not identify any
Equitable cost sharing	>450/af.  Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	Not applicable with this project.	0	project yield.
	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.	U		0	
	Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the				
	costs borne by new users.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly				
4. Promote Economic	equal proportions.  Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	0		1	
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.				
	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.				This is a planning component of overall master plans to support economic activity.
Readiness to Proceed Category		i.			to support economic activity.
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		4	
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.				
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop. 2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.				
Technical Feasibility of Project	1. Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	2		2	
	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				
	The project is not well documented, and has recommissance, and/or leasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.      The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility.				
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.		Drainage Study Report, Rancho Mira Vista Hydrology		
	O. The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.		Study, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for the Alamo River		Project is planning study only.
3. Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	2		2	,,,
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.     There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete				
ļ	environmental documentation.	]		l	

Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project

38

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.		Exempt.		Exempt
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0		2	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.				
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		Not applicable with this project.		Ministerial
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1	Not applicable with this project.	1	Ministerial
5. r unung	Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to	-			
	maintenance and operations.				
	<ol> <li>Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no</li> </ol>				
	defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance and				
	operations.				Funding outside of rate payers is needed.
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C	riteria				
1. Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?	U		U	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
2. Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		0	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.				
Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder				
3. Frovides regional benefits	group?	0		0	
	1= Yes				
	0= No		Single stakeholder group.		
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Limited to stormwater management in DAC area.
<ol><li>Statewide Priorities</li></ol>	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Limited to stormwater management in DAC area.
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	0		1	
	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		Project could help the region adapt to climate change		
	the effects of climate change.		if it included water storage planning.		Minimal support.
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
contribution i roject	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1			
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	0		0	
	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
	The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer: Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project
39
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer -
IRWMP Goals		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and				
Effect to agricultural users of	sustainable supply to meet current and future demands  Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	1			1
water.		0		2	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				Project protects DAC area from stormwater and has
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.     Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.		Not applicable or discussed in the project submittal		the potential to improve quality of drain water of
Improve Water Supply.	Does the project provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply that contributes to the		form.		tributary to the Salton Sea.
	regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	1		1	
	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.				Volume of stormwater is not identified as a source of supply to meet demands; the stormwater contribute
	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.				to drain flows that flow into the Salton Sea.
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?	0		0	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.      The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for				
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.  O. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado.				
	River Supply.				
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?	0		0	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.  O. Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet				
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				
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?	0		0	
water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.		Only during flooding. Unsure if there would be		The Project Information indicates no change in the
	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.		opportunity to re-apportion flood water from the detention basin. How would retained water be apportioned for use, if possible?		poins of delivery from source end use; it does describe a change in timing and quality of stormwater delivered to the drain.
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	0	The state of the s	1	
Management Strategies.	Integrates five or more RMS.				Project protects DAC area from stormwater, has the
	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.				potential to improve quality of drain water of tributary to the Salton Sea, and will improve timing of
7. Plan Consistency.	Less than three RMS.  Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,				urban runoff.
,	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	2		1	_
	Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.      Section 1. Consistency of the CP of				
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.     United or no consistency with existing plan.				Project concepts cleary identified; specific projects
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	1		1	not listed in GP.
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to	1		1	-
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.				
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>		Only during flooding. Unsure if there would be other		
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have		opportunity by this project to sustain and protect groundwater otherwise. There could be opportunity		
	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.		to provide a source of water in the detention basin.		
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.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	0		0	
	Denerities:  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.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide				Project does not change the beneficial use of source water; it does change the timing of drain flows and
	economic benefits.				has the potential to impove drain water quality.
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?	1		0	
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	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		There is opportunity for bringing the community into		
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.		compliance by treating the water prior to discharge into the Alamo River.		
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	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		2	
	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.				

Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project
39
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria	Davious	Bouleway	Davious	Paviawas
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	505.0	Comments	505.0	Comments
	rivers.  O. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				
Comply with Total Maximum	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board			_	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	2		2	
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				Ths project is focused on improving stormwater
C. D			There is opportunity to meet both of these options.		timing and quality of drain water.
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	1		1	-
	water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.  Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0		0	
	Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project				-
	impacts.				
	<ol> <li>Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.</li> </ol>				The improvements to habitat are identified as only potential improvements; they are not clearly
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.				identified in the Project Information.
2. Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	1		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.				
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
		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		2	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	O Decises and discount of the control of the contro				The second of this contract is the second of
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				The purpose of this project is to protect a DAC area from stormwater.
Strategic Considerations for IRWN		1	I		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.	0		1	
	2. Then degree of stakeholder support and low potential for connicts within imperial region.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	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?	0		0	
	4. < \$150/af.				This project does not have a yield of water supply
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.				component; based on the information found in the Project Information, a rough estimate is that it may
	2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.		Not applicable.		cost a rate payer over \$200 per year over a 20-year period to pay for the improvements
Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	not applicable.		period to pay for the improvements
		0		0	_
	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.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly				Project does not add a new water yield; it does
1.0000015	equal proportions.		Not discussed on the project submittal form.		require a rate payer to pay for stormwater facilities.
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?	1		1	
• •	,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.				
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue		There is potential for economic benefits in the		
	generation. Limited documentation.  O. Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue		construction of the project as well as facilitating infill development and removing barriers to planned		Project protects a DAC area and allows for economic
	generation. No solid documentation.		growth.		development to be allowed in this area.
Readiness to Proceed Category  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		4	
	Immediate, < 1 Year.     Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.				
	2. Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.				
Technical Feasibility of Project	Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the				Contruction could happen in 1-3 years.
	project?	2		2	
	<ol><li>The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.</li></ol>				
	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				
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.				
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.				
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0		0	
5. Environmental compilative	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	U		U	
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete				
	environmental documentation.	J			

Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project

39

Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.				
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1		0	
	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.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		0	
	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	I	Financial plan appears to consist of Prop 84 or 1E		
	operations.		funds.		
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C			<u> </u>		<u> </u>
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?	1		1	
	1= Yes				Water quality iimprovement to drain and flood
	0= No				protection of DAC
Involves multiple participants and stakeholders	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		0	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	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		0	
	1= Yes		1		1
	0= No				
4. State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project involve flood protection of DAC area.
<ol><li>Statewide Priorities</li></ol>	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				1
	0= No				Project involve flood protection of DAC area.
6. Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability	1		1	
	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				Ability to control timing of stormwater flows would
	the effects of climate change.		There is potential for climate change		be improved
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
·	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.				
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1			
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	0		0	
	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.				

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer: Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project 40 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
IRWMP Goals		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Water Supply Goal	Diversify the regional water supply portfolio to ensure a long-term, verifiable, reliable, and				
Effect to agricultural users of	sustainable supply to meet current and future demands  Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	ı			I
water.		0		1	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				Project is a Sewer Master Plan/Map update; since
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.     Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.				this is a planning project, it does not implement or
Improve Water Supply.	Does the project provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply that contributes to the		Not discussed on project submittal form.		change any water uses
	regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	0		0	
	5. >50,000 acre feet.				
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet. 3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.		Project does not provide a firm supply. There is		
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.		opportunity for the project to identify areas where conservation measures can be taken by identifying		Project is a Sewer Master Plan/Map update; since this is a planning project, it does not implement or
	0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		infrastructure conditions.		change any water uses
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?	0		0	
	2. The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado				
Conserves Colorado River	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	0		0	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	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		The project does not provide conservation measures,		
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial		however there is opportunity to identify areas of infrastructure where conservation could apply.		
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?	0		0	
water.	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	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.				
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	0		0	
munugement strutegies.	2. Integrates five or more RMS.				
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     Less than three RMS.		This project includes opportunities for pollution		
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	2	prevention and conveyance improvement.	1	
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?     Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.	-		-	
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.				
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		General Plan		
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	
	Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.  1. May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent				
	or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.				
	0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have				
Water Quality Goal	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.  Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the		Not discussed on project submittal form.		
	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	0		0	
	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				
	Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				Project is a planning project, focused on sewer master plan/map update. Future identified and
	O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.		Not applicable with this project.		implemented projects may make use of poor quality water or have a benefical use.
Support DACs- Wastewater.	Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;		rece applicable with this project.		nace, or have a perferical use.
	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend Colorado River supplies?	1		1	
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				This project helps with a planning step towards
	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.		This project could identify where the existing infrastructure is out of compliance and could create		compliance requirements, however, it is not an implementation or construction of facilities that would produce recycled water or reuse opportunities
2.6			an economy of scale if infrastructure is updated.		to extend CO River supply.
Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	1		0	
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.		There may be opportunity to assist in creation of an economic boost if existing infrastructure conditions		
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		are poor and require fixing, however the project itself does not provide that.		
4. Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	2		1	
1	2. Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	l		l	

Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project
40
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	rivers.		Project could benefit water quality by identifying		It is a planning step towards potential benefit of
Comply with Total Maximum	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.  Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board		areas of aging or sub-par infrastructure.		water quality of drains or rivers.
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	0		0	
	2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				
	10. Does not help meet established finibles and does not implement stormwater bivers.		Not applicable with this project.		
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	0		1	
	<ol><li>Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing water quality.</li></ol>				
	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.		Not applicable with this project.		
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?			0	
		0		0	
	<ol><li>Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.</li></ol>				
	Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other				
	project impacts.  O. Project does not increase or improve habitat.	4			
Integrated Design Elements	Project does not increase or improve habitat.  Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements.	_	Not applicable with this project.		
,-0	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.	4			
Flood Drotoction and Stormwater	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.  Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and legal flood protection and		Not applicable with this project.		
Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
· ·					
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?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				
	o. Project could increase economic damages of result in potential impacts to life of property.				
Strategic Considerations for IRWN			I		T
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.	0		1	
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for connicts within imperial kegion.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within				
	Imperial Region.  O. Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.	_			
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
	4. < \$150/af.				
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.				Since this is a planning project only for a sewer
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.	_			master plan/map udate, it is roughly estimated to
Equitable cost sharing	1. >450/af.  Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?		Not applicable with this project.		cost each household \$43.57.
5. Equitable cost sharing	bo the entities that receive the senejits pay for the costs of producing those senejits.	0		0	
	2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
	<ol> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the</li> </ol>				
	costs borne by new users.				
	Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.		Not discussed on project submittal form.		No new water supply created, this is a planning effort to help maintain complince with sewer requirements
4. Promote Economic	Does the project provide measurable economic benefits to Imperial Region in terms of net				
Development	economic activity, job creation, and revenue generation to IID, Imperial County and Cities?	0		1	
	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.		The project itself does not, however it could identify		
	Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.		projects based on infrastructure conditions that could provide a contribution to economic activity.		Project helps plan for future sewer improvements.
Readiness to Proceed Category					
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		4	
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.				
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.	1			
	Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.     Long-term, >6 Years to develop.	<u></u>			
2. Technical Feasibility of Project	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	0		2	
	project?  3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies				
	and completed engineering designs.	4			
	2. The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.				
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility	1			
	studies and has not been designed.		Not applicable with this project. The project would be		
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.		an update of an existing document and therefore requires no new technical feasibility documentation.		
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0		2	
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.				
	There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete environmental documentation.				
	erm ormenta documentation.	_		•	I and the second

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project 40 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Citteria		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	O. There are no studies as a smalleted assistance and decrease telling.	30016	Not applicable with this project. Exempt.	Julie	Exempt
1. Permitting	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.      Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	0	Not applicable with this project. Exempt.	2	Exempt
i. Permitting	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.	U			
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.     The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	<u> </u>				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.		Not applicable with this project.		Ministerial
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		1	
	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				Project Information incidates funding sourse is
	operations.		Project hopes to obtain Prop 84/1E funds.		limited to DAC rate payers.
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C			T		T
Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?				
	1= Yes 0= No				
2					
<ol><li>Involves multiple participants and stakeholders</li></ol>	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		0	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
2. Danidas sasianal basafita	0. Projects involves one stakeholder.				
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	0		0	
	group? 1= Yes				
	0= No		Single stakeholder group (City of Holtville)		
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1	Single stakeholder group (city or nottville)	1	
4. State Frogram Freierences		1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project involves sewer master plan for DAC.
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project involves sewer master plan for DAC.
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		1	
	1. Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the		There is potential for this project to support an		
	effects of climate change.		adaptation to climate change by highlighting areas of		
	0. Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to		infrastructure that could be updated to be more		
	the effects of climate change.		efficient.		Minimal help or affect in adapting to climate chang
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project		•			
	1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.				
3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Support to Renewable Energy	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?	0		0	
support to Kellewable Ellergy	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in				
	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.				

Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363
41
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer: Imperial IRWMP Project I	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo  Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
IRWMP Goals	Proof the standard of the same and the same at the sam			1	
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	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?				
water.		2		1	
	No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.	_			
2 1	Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.				Project protects DAC area from stormwater.
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, and/or				
	industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural supplies.	0		1	Volume of stormwater is not identified as a recycled
	5. >50.000 acre feet.				source of supply to meet demands; the stormwater i presenity a nuisance within the community nad the
	4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.				drainage infrastruture would safely convey it thru th
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.				community. The discharge point of the stormwater
	2. 5001 to 10,000 acre feet.				not identified in the Project Information. This project would reduce the cost of vector control and ensure
	O to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		Not applicable to this project.		revenue is not lost from missing school attendance.
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?	0		0	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for				
	storage or use of Colorado River supply.	_			
	The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.				
I. Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	0		0	
	Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly				-
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	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				
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a current				
substitution for Colorado River	use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0		0	
Water.					The Project Information indicates no change in the
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				poins of delivery from source end use; it does
	<ol><li>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.</li></ol>				describe a change in how stormwater would be
5. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	_			handled within the community.
Management Strategies.		0		1	
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.	_			Project protects DAC area from stormwater, will
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     O. Less than three RMS.				reduce vector control costs, and will improve road walking paths and safety of kids to get to school.
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,				waiking paths and safety of kids to get to school.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?	1		2	
	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.				
	O. Limited or no consistency with existing plan.				Project concepts cleary identified.
B. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	
	2. Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to				1
	prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.	_			
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>				
	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				
Match Water Quality to use.	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.  Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic				
4,	benefits?	1		0	
	<ol><li>Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.</li></ol>				
	Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water	_			Project does not change the beneficial use of source
	not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.				water; it would provide an improvement to the loca
	<ol> <li>Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide economic benefits.</li> </ol>		Project could provide economic benefits.		economy by lowering vector control costs and increasing school attendance.
2. Support DACs- Wastewater.	Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;		Project could provide economic benefits.		increasing school attenuance.
	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend	0		0	
	Colorado River supplies?  2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and				
	provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	Brings community into compliance with requirements; does not create economies of scale;				
	or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.  O. 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.				
Support DACs, Drinking W-+	Would the project cuppert DACs in meeting drinking water standards protection with				
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water	Would the project support DACs in meeting drinking water standards, protecting public health, or creating economies of scale?	0		0	
	2. Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of				
	scale.	4			
	1. Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.      Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.				
I. Effect on Existing Waterways		2		1	

Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363
41
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewed: Project Number: Project Reviewer:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	rivers.				
E. C. and a White table to a	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				
<ol><li>Comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)</li></ol>	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?	1		2	
, , ,	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	1 Improve a serial constitution of TADI and involve and the serial part of the serial constitution of				Based on the type of project, improvements to storm
	In Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.      Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.      Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.      Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.      Improves compliance with established TMDLs or implement stormwater BMPs.		Purpose of project is for flood/stormwater		drainage, this would implement a stormwater BMP
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.		management and has potential to improve compliance, although not necessarily stated.		although not discussed directly in the Project Information.
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1		1	
	2. Project would improve groundwater quality so that it can be used <u>or</u> would protect existing water quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality and would not protect existing water				
	quality.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant impacts to existing water quality.				
Environmental Protection and	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal  1. Environmental Enhancements	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.  Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?				
		0		0	
	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.				Improvements to habitat are not identified in the
Integrated Design Elements	Project does not increase or improve habitat.  Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements				Project Information.
2. Integrated Design Elements	into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
Fland Bushashian and Chamman	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.    Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.				
Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.				
4 Park and the control for an		ı	T		
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		2	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.				The purpose of this project is to protect a DAC area
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.				from stormwater, improve drainage system for stormwater, and reduce economic damage from
	o. Project could increase economic damages of result in potential impacts to life of property.				storm events.
Strategic Considerations for IRWN  1. Public Acceptance/Public			T		1
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.	2		1	-
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	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?	0		0	This project does not have a yield of water supply
	4. < \$150/af.				component; based on the information found in the
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.				Project Information, a rough estimate is that it may have a benefit cost ratio of 1.78. A statement is
	2. \$301 - \$450/af. 1. >450/af.		Not applicable to this project.		contained in the Project Information regarding costs; useful life of project is 50-years.
Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0	Not applicable to this project.		useful life of project is 50-years.
		Ü		0	
	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.  O. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly				Project does not add a new water yield; it does
	equal proportions.		Not applicable to this project.		require a rate payer to pay for stormwater facilities.
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?	1		1	
	2. Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.				
	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				Project protects a DAC area and helps economy of
	generation. No solid documentation.		Prevents economic damages to an area.		this area.
Readiness to Proceed Category  1. Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	l	T		
I. Timeliness	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?	3		3	
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.  3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.				
	Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.				
2. Technical Foodbillity of Pool of	Long-term, >6 Years to develop.  Pear the project hour technical documentation to evaluate the technical feacibility of the				Contruction could happen in 1-3 years.
Technical Feasibility of Project	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	2		2	
	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.		Design documentation was not provided. Project description; environmental questionnaire; benefit-		
	<ol> <li>The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.</li> </ol>		cost analysis report; and Seeley Area Drainage Master		
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.		Plan, all of which are a part of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) application submitted under		
2.5.1			FEMA'S DR-1911.		
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0		1	-
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.     There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete				
I	environmental documentation.				

Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363 Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo				
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.				
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	1		1	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.	_			
	The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.				
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		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				Request will be made for Prop 1Efunds to match
	operations.				potential FEMA funds.
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP C					
1. Provides multiple benefits	Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0		0	
	recreation, or other benefits?	U		U	
	1= Yes				Project provides stormwater protection to DAC
	0= No				community.
2. Involves multiple participants	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?				
and stakeholders		0		0	
	Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.				
		4			
	Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.				
	Projects involves one stakeholder.				
<ol><li>Provides regional benefits</li></ol>	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder	0		0	
	group?	Ů			
	1= Yes				
	0= No				
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	
	1= Yes				
	0= No				Project involves storm water protection of DAC area.
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	
	1= Yes	-			•
	0= No	1			Project involves storm water protection of DAC area.
Climate Change Adaption	Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability				Project involves storin water protection of DAC area.
o. Cimate Change Adaption	to the effects of climate change?	0		1	
	Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the				
	effects of climate change.				
	Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to	1			Ability to control timing of stormwater flows would
	the effects of climate change.				be improved
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?				be improved
Contribution- Project	boes the project affect greenhouse gus emissions in the region?	1		1	
Contribution- Project	The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other				
	projects.				
	The project contributes to GHG emissions; and does not support renewable energy.	1			
	o. The project contributes to one emissions, and does not support reflewable effergy.				
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions -	Does the project support expansion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region or State?				
Support to Renewable Energy	boos the project support expunsion of renewable energy portfolio for the Region of States	0		0	
Support to heliewable fileligy	The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in				1
	the Region or state.	4			
	0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.				
		1			

 Project Reviewed:
 Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently-Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea

 Project Number:
 46

 Project Reviewer:
 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewer:	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo					
Imperial IRWMP Project  Criteria	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria  Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Project 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		T			
<ol> <li>Effect to agricultural users of water.</li> </ol>	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	2		1	2	
	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.					
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.     Defined and identifiable negative impacts to agricultural water supplies.					The project, once operational, would require a supply or water; it is stated in the Project
2. Improve Water Supply.	Does the project provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply that contributes to the					Information this may be from IID irrigation water.
	regional goal of 50 to 100 thousand acre-feet per year for municipal, commercial, and/or industrial demands by 2025? This supply cannot withdraw from current agricultural	1		0	0	
	supplies.		-			
	5. >50,000 acre feet. 4. 25,001 to 50,000 acre feet.					
	3. 10,001 to 25,000 acre feet.					No water supply yield estimate provided in project
	5001 to 10,000 acre feet.     0 to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.					submital form; this project is more of a new use, reuse, or use of treated water that is reclaimed.
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?	0		0	0	
maintain Colorado River yielus.	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.					-
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.					The project is to make use of eviting water suppl
	0. The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado					The project is to make use of exiting water suppl, reuse, or reclaimed water; storage is accomplished
4. Conserves Colorado River	River Supply.  Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable					in the CO River System.
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	1		1	4	
	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	1				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.  O. Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet					
	requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial					The Project would conserve local water by reuse or
5. Support for in-lieu uses or	use.  Would the project provide a source of supply that could be used as a substitute for a					by making use of water the is from reclaimed supply
substitution for Colorado River Water.	current use of Colorado River supplies, and allow for reapportionment within the Imperial Region?	0		0	0	
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.					
	<ol> <li>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.</li> </ol>					See previous question comment.
6. Integrate Resource	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	2		2	4	
Management Strategies.	Integrates five or more RMS.					-
	Integrates 3-5 RMS.     Uses than three RMS.	-				
7. Plan Consistency.	Is the project consistent with City and County General Plan, State or Federal Land Use Plan,	1		1	2	
	UWMP, or existing Capital Facility Plan?     Greatest degree of consistency. Projects clearly identified in GP or other plan.	1	-	1	2	_
	Moderate degree of consistency. Project concepts identified in GP or other plan.					
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.					
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	0		1	1	
	<ol><li>Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft or has no impacts on such aquifers.</li></ol>					
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft or has impact on such aquifers.</li> </ol>					If project rlies on reuse or reclaimed water, may
	Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have					bennefit GW. If project uses water form exisitn IID  Irr water, then it may be a competing use and impac
Water Coults Coul	potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.					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.					
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	2		1	2	
	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.					
	Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.					
	Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide					Project is the end use of a poor quality water that has been treated/reclaimed and it would provide
2. Support DACs- Wastewater.	economic benefits.  Would the project support DACs in meeting wastewater disposal and permit requirements;					some level of economic benefit.
	create economies of scale; and provide recycled water and reuse opportunities to extend Colorado River supplies?	0		0	0	
	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.  O. Does not have any effect on community compliance with requirements; does not create	1				
	economies of scale; or provide recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.					Project is not directly making usf
3. Support DACs- Drinking Water		0		0	0	Project is not directly making use of wastewater.
	health, or creating economies of scale?  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.	+				
	Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.	4				
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.	2	-	2	4	-
	1. Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or	1				
	rivers.  0. Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.	1				
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?	0		0	0	
Duny LUdus (TIVIDES)	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>and</u> implement stormwater BMPs.					
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.	+				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.	1				
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1	Not provided on project submittal form.	1	2	
cocrec or improve	project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources:	1		1	2	

 Project Reviewed:
 Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently-Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea

 Project Number:
 46

 Project Reviewer:
 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

	Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo					
	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria	Davisoner	Parisman	Bardania	Decient	Barianas
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Project Score	Reviewer Comments
	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	1				
	quality.  O. Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant	-				Based on the Project information, it will make use of
	impacts to existing water quality.					a supply or reuse of reclaimed water.
Environmental Protection and Enhancement Goal	Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal, commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.					
	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	2		2	6	
	Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project	-	_			
	impacts.					
	<ol> <li>Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other project impacts.</li> </ol>					
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.					Project has potential to imoprove 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		1	2	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.					
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.					
	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.					
1. Dadinas impasta from	Would the against help to reduce account described and accept life and accept from	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?	1		1	2	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.		_		!	
	Projects would not reduce economic damages or protect life and property.					
	Project could increase economic damages or result in potential impacts to life or property.	1				Project stated purpose is primarily for growth of
Strategic Considerations for IRWM	I Plan Implementation					Microalgal, not flood retention.
1. Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	0		1	3	
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.					
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within	-				
	Imperial Region.					
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.      And a set of a stail of a set of the					
	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?  4. < \$150/af.	0	_	4	12	
	3. \$151 to \$300/af.	1				No cost per af of water yield provided in Project
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.					information. It is possible the project pays for the water it receives, therefore, a higher score was
Equitable cost sharing	1. >450/af.  Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?		Not applicable			given.
5. Equitable cost sharing	bo the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		1	2	
	2. All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.					
	<ol> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the</li> </ol>	-				Since all identified funding is for a development of
	costs borne by new users.  0. Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly	-				Microalgal site, and it is requested as a grant with some local cost share, some small effect on current
	equal proportions.		Not applicable			rate base.
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?	1		1	3	
					,	
	<ol><li>Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation.</li></ol>					
	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	1				Project information states potential for positive
Readiness to Proceed Category	generation. No solid documentation.					economic activity.
Timeliness	Does the project have the ability for Stakeholders to act quickly to implement a project or	4		2	4	
	program without the need for new agreements or additional funding?  4. Immediate, < 1 Year.	-	_		7	
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.					
	Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.     Long-term, >6 Years to develop.	-				Project sponsor is ready, funding is not in place; IID will offer in-kind services in support of the project.
	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the	1		2	8	
	project?  3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies	_				
	and completed engineering designs.					
	<ol><li>The project is partially documented, and has reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies, but incomplete or partial designs.</li></ol>					
	The project is not well documented, does not have reconnaissance, and/or feasibility studies and has not been designed.					
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.	-				Project is to advance a demonstration level site to a
					1	larger-scale.
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?  2. Existing studies and completed environmental documents.	2		1	2	
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.     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.	-				
	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?	2		1	1	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.     The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.	-				
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	1				
	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1		1	5	
	<ol><li>Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations.</li></ol>	1				
	<ol> <li>Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval;</li> </ol>	1				
	no defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.  O. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance	1				Statement of a local cost match and proposed
	and operations.		Seeking Prop 84/1E funds			budget, but no documented funding source.
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Cri 1. Provides multiple benefits	riteria  Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation,	0		1	-	
	recreation, or other benefits?	U		1	5	
	1= Yes	4				
	O= No					
Involves multiple participants	Q= No Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	2	
	Does the project include multiple stakeholders and participants?	0		1	2	
Involves multiple participants		0		1	2	

 Project Reviewed:
 Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently-Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea

 Project Number:
 46

 Project Reviewer:
 Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Reviewer:	Wielissa Cansadie/sam Schaeffer Combo					
Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria					
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Project	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Score	Comments
3. Provides regional benefits	Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?	1		1	4	
	1= Yes 0= No					
State Program Preferences	Does the project support meet the state preferences?	1		1	2	
	1= Yes 0= No					
5. Statewide Priorities	Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?	1		1	2	
	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?	0		1	2	
	<ol> <li>Project would help the region adapt to climate change and reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.</li> </ol>					
	<ol> <li>Project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.</li> </ol>					
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project	Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?	1		1	1	
	<ol> <li>The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.</li> </ol>					
	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?	0		1	2	
	<ol> <li>The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.</li> </ol>					Harvested algae biomass can be used to produce
	0. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.					biogas for electricity and biofuel for vehicles or to run generators.

Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

47
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	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				
Effect to agricultural users of water.	Does the project have an effect to water supplies historically available to agriculture?	1		1	
	2. No impacts and clearly defined benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	Some impacts and no benefits to agricultural water supplies.				
	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?	0		0	
	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.				
	O to 5000 acre feet; yield or limited ability to firmly define.		Project does not create new supply.		
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?	0		0	
	The project would provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.				
	The project could be integrated with other projects or strategies, or altered to provide for storage or use of Colorado River supply.     The project is not, does not, and could not include aspects of storage or use of Colorado River Supply.	_			
Conserves Colorado River	Would the project implement water conservation measures that demonstrate reasonable				
Supplies.	beneficial use and maintain consistency with established industry standards, state, and federal requirements?	0		0	
	2. Implements water conservation measures that surpass requirements and strongly				
	demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.				
	<ol> <li>Implements water conservation measures that meet requirements and partially demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial use.</li> </ol>				
	O. Does not implement water conservation measures, or measures do not meet requirements; does not demonstrate or support documentation of reasonable and beneficial				
5. Support for in-lieu uses or substitution for Colorado River Water.	USE.  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?	0		0	Drinking water service area(s) interconnection project.
	Projects would provide a source of supply and allow for reapportionment.				
	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.				
Integrate Resource     Management Strategies.	Will the project apply or integrate Resource Management Strategies?	1		1	
	2. Integrates five or more RMS.		Project claims Conveyance Improvement, Urban Water Use Efficiency, Drinking Water Treatment, and Land Use Management. This project does not		
	1. Integrates 3-5 RMS.		actively treat water, instead it is intended to connect treatment facilities		
	Less than three RMS.		where water is already treated.		
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?	0		1	
	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.				
	Limited or no consistency with existing plan.		Not listed on the project submittal form.		
8. Groundwater Rights.	Will the project protect correlative groundwater rights or optimize the use of groundwater?	1		1	
	<ol><li>Sustains and protects use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); clearly helps to prevent or address overdraft.</li></ol>				
	<ol> <li>May sustain and protect use of overlying groundwater users (pumpers); does not prevent or address overdraft.</li> </ol>				
	0. Would not sustain or protect groundwater use of overlying users (pumpers); or could have potentially significant impact by causing overdraft.				

Project Reviewed: Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility 47
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
Criteria	Question/Performance inleasures	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
Water Quality Goal	Protect water quality for beneficial use consistent with regional community interests and the	30010	Comments	Jeore	Comments
	RWQCB Basin Plan through cooperation with stakeholders, local, and state agencies.				
Match Water Quality to use.	Would the project make beneficial use of poor quality water and provide economic benefits?	0		0	
	Project would make beneficial use of poor quality source water not otherwise used and				
	provide economic benefits.				
	Project would treat water quality to make beneficial use of poor quality water source				
	water not otherwise used and provide economic benefits.  O. Project would not make beneficial use of poor quality water source water or provide				
	economic benefits.				
<ol><li>Support DACs- Wastewater.</li></ol>	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	0		0	
	Colorado River supplies?  2. Brings community into compliance with requirements; creates economies of scale; and				
	provides recycled water to extend the Colorado River supply.				
	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	1		2	
	health, or creating economies of scale?	1			
	<ol><li>Assists DACs to meet standards, address public health threats, and create economies of scale.</li></ol>				
	Assists DACs to meet standards, does not create economies of scale.				
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Drinking water standards are already met or not met by existing facitilies. A		
	0: Does not assist DACs to meet drinking water standards or create economies of scale.		short term economy would be created by project construction. The		
Effect on Existing Waterways	Could the project affect the water quality of drains or rivers?	1	interconnection is intended for	1	Interconnection of drinking water systems and provides drought protection.
4. Effect off Existing Waterways	Project could benefit water quality of drains or rivers.	1		1	
	Project would not provide benefit or have negative impacts on water quality of drains or				
	rivers.				
	Project could have impacts on water quality of drains or rivers.				
5. Comply with Total Maximum	Would the project help the region comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board	0		0	
Daily Loads (TMDLs)	Requirements or implement to stormwater BMPs?  2. Improves compliance with established TMDLs and implement stormwater BMPs.				
	2. Improves compliance with established TWDLS <u>and</u> Implement stormwater blvirs.				
	Improves compliance with established TMDLs <u>or</u> implement stormwater BMPs.				
	Does not help meet established TMDLs and does not implement stormwater BMPs.				
					Poject is specific to meeting the needs of drinking water for DAC area.
6. Preserve or Improve	Would the project preserve or improve quality of groundwater resources?	1		1	
	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.				
	Project would not improve groundwater quality or could have potentially significant				
Environmental Protection and	impacts to existing water quality.  Protect and enhance aquatic ecosystems and wildlife habitat consistent with municipal,				
Enhancement Goal	commercial, industrial, and agricultural land uses.				
Environmental Enhancements	Would the project increase or improve habitat or support mitigation of other impacts?	0		0	
		Ü			
	<ol><li>Project increases or improves habitat and could support mitigation of other project impacts.</li></ol>				
	Project increases or improves habitat, but cannot be used to support mitigation of other				
	project impacts.				
	Project does not increase or improve habitat.				
Integrated Design Elements	Does the project integrate environmental, open space, parks, or other recreational elements into the design to achieve multiple benefits?	0		0	
	Integrates multiple design elements to provide multiple benefits.				
	Does not integrate multiple design elements or provide multiple benefits.				
I		1			

Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility
47
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number:

Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project I	Evaluation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Reviewer Score	Reviewer Comments
Flood Protection and Stormwater Management Goal	Protect life and property from flooding and develop regional and local flood protection and stormwater management strategies.	Score	Comments	Score	Comments
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?	1		1	
	Project would reduce economic damages, protect life and property.				
	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.		Unclear of economic damage reduction. Project is intended to mitigate risk and promote public safety during water treatment plant shutdowns.		
Strategic Considerations for IRWM	1 Plan Implementation		j		
1. Public Acceptance/Public	Will the project be able to gain public support from the rate paying population?	1		2	
	2. High degree of stakeholder support and low potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Moderate degree of stakeholder support and moderate potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
	Limited or no stakeholder support and potential for conflicts within Imperial Region.				
Cost Effectiveness	Is the cost per acre foot of yield competitive with the other projects in the Region?	0		0	
	4. < \$150/af. 3. \$151 to \$300/af.	1			
		4			This project does not produce additional water supply, it is to interconnect
	2. \$301 - \$450/af.	1			potable drinking water service areas. The cost per acre-foot of yield is not
0.5 2.11	1. >450/af.		Not provided.		provided.
3. Equitable cost sharing	Do the entities that receive the benefits pay for the costs of producing those benefits?	0		1	
	All costs for new water would be paid for by new users; no effects on current rate base.				
	<ol> <li>Cost would likely be shared between new and existing rate payers; with at least 75% of the costs borne by new users.</li> </ol>				
	Costs for new water and programs distributed to new and existing rate payers in roughly equal proportions.		Not provided.		Uncertain who will have ability to pay for costs.
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?	1		1	
	Greatest potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Clear documentation.				
	Moderate potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. Limited documentation.		Conceivably there are short term economic benefits to the region during		
	Limited or no potential for contributing to economic activity, creating jobs, revenue generation. No solid documentation.		project construction and the possibility of one or two long term positions for monitoring connections and managing flows.		
Readiness to Proceed Category		1			
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?	2		2	
	4. Immediate, < 1 Year.				
	3. Near Term, 1 to 3 Years to develop.				
	Mid-term, 3 to 6 Years to develop.     Long-term, >6 Years to develop.				Length of time to develop is based on the Project Information.
2. Technical Feasibility of Project	Does the project have technical documentation to evaluate the technical feasibility of the project?	0		2	the to develop is discalled the more than the control of the contr
	3. The project has detailed documentation, including reconnaissance, and feasibility studies and completed engineering designs.				
	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.	1			
	The project is conceptually defined, but has potential to help meet goals and objectives.				Project has reconnaissance level engineering as it is a fairly standard task to
Environmental Compliance	Does the project have environmental documentation and clearance?	0	As provided on form.	0	interconnect drinking water systems.
	Existing studies and completed environmental documents.  There are composition studies as plant to complete studies as clear plant to complete.  There are composition studies as plant to complete studies as clear plant to complete.	1			
	<ol> <li>There are some existing studies or plans to complete studies; a clear plan to complete environmental documentation.</li> </ol>				
A Description	There are no studies or completed environmental documentation.	0			
4. Permitting	Does the project have permits or a plan to obtain permits?  2. The permits have been obtained or are in the process.	0		1	
	The permits have been obtained or are in the process.     The permit requirements are known and there is a plan and schedule in place.	1			Permitting an interconnection between existing drinking water distribution
	The permit requirements are not known and there is no plan or schedule.	1	As provided on form.		systems is a known etity; a plan and schedule would easily follow once funded
5. Funding	Are the project funding sources well defined?	1	AS provided on forth.	0	nanceu
	2. Financial plan and commitments are well defined; clear resource commitments to maintenance and operations.				
	Financial plan under development; requires rate payer and/or funding agency approval; no defined resource commitments to maintenance and operations.	]			
•		-	•		•

Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility
47
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed: Project Number:

Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project E	valuation and Ranking Criteria				
Criteria	Question/Performance Measures	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer	Reviewer
		Score	Comments	Score	Comments
	0. No financial plan and commitments established; no resources defined for maintenance				
	and operations.		Seeking Prop 84 or Prop 1E funds.		

Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility
47
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Project Reviewer:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria Question/Performance Measures Comments

Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility
47
Melissa Cansdale/Sam Schaeffer Combo Project Reviewed:

Project Number:

Imperial IRWMP Project Evaluation and Ranking Criteria  Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria  1. Provides multiple benefits  1. Provides multiple penefits  2. Involves multiple participants  2. Involves multiple participants  2. Involves multiple participants  2. Project involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.  3. Provides regional benefits  3. Provides regional benefits  3. Provides regional benefits  4. State Program Preferences  On No  4. State Program Preferences  On No  5. Statewide Priorities  Ones the project support meet the state preferences?  1. Involves support meet the state wide priorities?  1. Involves support meet the statewide priorities?  2. Involves support meet the statewide priorities?  3. Project support meet the statewide priorities?  4. State Program Preferences  One, ortical water supply needs of DAC volves support meet the statewide priorities?  1. Involves support meet the statewide priorities?  2. Involves support meet the statewide change on reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  0. Project support suppo	
Other CDWR Statewide IRWMP Criteria  1. Provides multiple benefits 2. Involves multiple penefits 3. Provides regional benefits 4. Provides regional benefits 3. Provides regional benefits 4. Provides regional benefits 5. Provides regional benefits 6. Climate Change Adaption 6. Climate Change Adaption 6. Climate Change Adaption 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 7. Greenho	
Other CDWR Statewide IRWIND Criteria  1. Provides multiple benefits  Does the project provide or range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, recreation, or other benefits?  1 = Yes  2. Involves multiple participants and 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. 2. Provides regional benefits  Obes the project provide tengible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stokeholder group?  3. Provides regional benefits  Obes the project provide tengible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stokeholder group?  4. State Program Preferences  Does the project support meet the state preferences?  1	ver
1. Provides multiple benefits   Does the project provide a range of supply, water quality, flood, ecosystem, conservation, conservation, or other benefits?   1	ents
recreation, or other benefits?    1	
2 Yes	
2. Irvolves multiple participants and stakeholders  2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.  1. Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.  2. Projects involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.  3. Provides regional benefits  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?  19 - Yes  Oes No  4. State Program Preferences  Does the project support meet the state preferences?  1 1 2 - Yes  Oes No  5. Statewide Priorities  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1 1 - Yes  One, critical water supply needs of DAC vo  One, addresses the safe drinking water or defects of climate change.  One, addresses the safe drinking water or defects of climate change.  One, addresses the safe drinking water or defects of climate change.  One of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.  Or project would not help the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change.	
and stakeholders    2. Projects involves four or more participants through agreements and funding.   2. Project involves two to four participants through agreements and funding.   0. Projects involves one stakeholder.   0. Project involves one stakehol	
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 1 2- Yes  0- NO  5. Statewide Priorities  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1 1- Yes  0- NO  Cone, critical water supply needs of DAC violate project support meet the statewide priorities?  1 1- Yes  0- NO  Cone, addresses the safe drinking water no one, addresses the safe drinking water no one of the effects of climate change.  7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution-Project  Does the project affect greenhouse gas emissions in the region?  1	
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   1   1   1   1   1    1   1   2   Yes 0 = No  S. Statewide Priorities  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1   1   1   1   1    1   1   2   1   Yes 0 = No  Cone, critical water supply needs of DAC vortical wat	
3. Provides regional benefits  Does the project provide tangible regional benefits or only to a single or limited stakeholder group?  1 = Yes	
stakeholder group?  1 = Yes 0 = No  4. State Program Preferences  Does the project support meet the state preferences?  1   1   1   2   Yes 0 = No  5. Statewide Priorities  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1   1   2   Yes 0 = No  6. Climate Change Adaption  Would the project support the region adapt to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change?  1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	
Company   Comp	
4. State Program Preferences  Does the project support meet the state preferences?  1  1 - Yes  0 - No  5. Statewide Priorities  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1 - Yes  0 - No  Colimate 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.  7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1 - One, critical water supply needs of DAC v  One, addresses the safe drinking water n  one, addresses the safe drin	
1 = Yes 0 = No Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1 1 1 2 - Yes 0 = No Cone, critical water supply needs of DAC v 1 2 - Yes 0 = No Cone, addresses the safe drinking water n 0 noe, addresses the safe drinking water n 1 noe, addresses the safe drinking water n 0 noe, addresses the safe drinking water n 1 noe, addresses the safe drinking water n 2 noe, addresses the safe drinking water n 3	as
One, critical water supply needs of DAC v  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1	
5. Statewide Priorities  Does the project support meet the statewide priorities?  1  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  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1  1	
1 = Yes	ithin region
One, addresses the safe drinking water n  One, addresses the safe drinking water n  Would the project support the region adaption to climate change or reduce the vulnerability to the effects of climate change?  1. Project would not 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	
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	
vulnerability to the effects of climate change?   0   0	eeds of a small DAC
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 effects of climate change.  7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Contribution- Project  1	
Contribution- Project 1	
1. The project does not significantly contribute to the GHG emissions relative to other projects.	
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?	
The project provides clear and tangible support to the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.	
O. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.  O. The project does not support the expansion of renewable energy in the Region or state.	

,'6'!J

)

10 14 20 24 28 31 35 39	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F3,\$B\$1,F3,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F4,\$B\$1,F4,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F5,\$B\$1,F5,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F6,\$B\$1,F6,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F7,\$B\$1,F7,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F8,\$B\$1,F8,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F8,\$B\$1,F8,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F9,\$B\$1,F9,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F10,\$B\$1,F10,\$C\$1) =CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F11,\$B\$1,F11,\$C\$1)
46	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F14,\$B\$1,F14,\$C\$1)
50	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F15,\$B\$1,F15,\$C\$1)
54	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F16,\$B\$1,F16,\$C\$1)
58	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F17,\$B\$1,F17,\$C\$1)
62	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F18,\$B\$1,F18,\$C\$1)
66	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F19,\$B\$1,F19,\$C\$1)
71	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F20,\$B\$1,F20,\$C\$1)
74	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F23,\$B\$1,F23,\$C\$1)
78	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F24,\$B\$1,F24,\$C\$1)
82	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F25,\$B\$1,F25,\$C\$1)
85	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F28,\$B\$1,F28,\$C\$1)
90	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F29,\$B\$1,F29,\$C\$1)
92	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F30,\$B\$1,F30,\$C\$1)
94	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F33,\$B\$1,F33,\$C\$1)
98	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F34,\$B\$1,F34,\$C\$1)
103	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F35,\$B\$1,F35,\$C\$1)
107	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F36,\$B\$1,F36,\$C\$1)
111	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F37,\$B\$1,F37,\$C\$1)
113	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F40,\$B\$1,F40,\$C\$1)
118	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F41,\$B\$1,F41,\$C\$1)
123	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F42,\$B\$1,F42,\$C\$1)
127	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F43,\$B\$1,F43,\$C\$1)
131	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F44,\$B\$1,F44,\$C\$1)
135	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F45,\$B\$1,F45,\$C\$1)

137	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F48,\$B\$1,F48,\$C\$1)
140	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F49,\$B\$1,F49,\$C\$1)
144	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F50,\$B\$1,F50,\$C\$1)
147	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F51,\$B\$1,F51,\$C\$1)
150	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F52,\$B\$1,F52,\$C\$1)
153	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F53,\$B\$1,F53,\$C\$1)
156	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F54,\$B\$1,F54,\$C\$1)
159	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F55,\$B\$1,F55,\$C\$1)
163	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F56,\$B\$1,F56,\$C\$1)
164	=CONCATENATE(\$A\$1,F57,\$B\$1,F57,\$C\$1)

- =AVERAGE('6'!G10,'6'!J10)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G14,'6'!J14)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G20,'6'!J20)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G24,'6'!J24)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G28,'6'!J28)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G31,'6'!J31)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G35,'6'!J35)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G39,'6'!J39)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G44,'6'!J44)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G46,'6'!J46)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G50,'6'!J50)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G54,'6'!J54)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G58,'6'!J58)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G62,'6'!J62)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G66,'6'!J66)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G71,'6'!J71)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G74,'6'!J74)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G78,'6'!J78)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G82,'6'!J82)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G85,'6'!J85)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G90,'6'!J90)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G92,'6'!J92)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G94,'6'!J94)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G98,'6'!J98)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G103,'6'!J103)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G107,'6'!J107)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G111,'6'!J111)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G113,'6'!J113)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G118,'6'!J118)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G123,'6'!J123)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G127,'6'!J127)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G131,'6'!J131)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G135,'6'!J135)

- =AVERAGE('6'!G137,'6'!J137)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G140,'6'!J140)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G144,'6'!J144)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G147,'6'!J147)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G150,'6'!J150)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G153,'6'!J153)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G156,'6'!J156)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G159,'6'!J159)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G163,'6'!J163)
- =AVERAGE('6'!G164,'6'!J164)

Project No.	<u>Title</u>
1	HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment
2	Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)
6	New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project
7	East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)
8	City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project
9	City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project
12	City of Brawley Water Meter Project
13	Keystone Water Reclamation Facility
14	IID Systems Conservation and Improvements Projects for IWSP
15	Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture :
18	Ave 72, Martinez Canyon Groundwater Storage Project
19	Ave. 62, Thomas Levy Recharge Site.
20	East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project
21	Painted Canyon Groundwater Storage Project
32	Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG
34	Holtville Water Distribution System Project
35	Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project
36	Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project
37	Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project
38	Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project
39	Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project
40	Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project
41	Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363
4.6	Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently-Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea Water
46	Quality and Regional Air Quality
47	Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility District

Project Number	Title	Sponsor	Revised Readiness Score 1	Revised Readiness Score 2	Revised Readiness Score 3	Revised Readiness Score 4	Revised Readiness Score 5	Revised Readiness Score 6	Revised Readiness Score 7	Revised Readiness Score 8	Revised Readiness Score 9	Revised Readiness Score 10	Revised Readiness Score 11	Revised Readiness Score 12	Revised Readiness Score 13	Revised Readiness Score 14
6	New River Bioremediation and Wildlife Habitat Restoration and Process Evaluation Project	San Diego State University Research Foundation														
9	City of Brawley Reclaim Water Project	City of Brawley														
12	City of Brawley Water Meter Project	City of Brawley														
13	Keystone Water Reclamation Facility	City of Imperial														
18	Ave 72, Martinez Canyon Groundwater Storage Project	Imperial Irrigation District														
19	Ave. 62, Thomas Levy Recharge Site.	Imperial Irrigation District														
20	East Mesa Groundwater Storage Project	Imperial Irrigation District														
21	Painted Canyon Groundwater Storage Project	Imperial Irrigation District														
34	Holtville Water Distribution System Project	City of Holtville														
35	Holtville Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project	City of Holtville														
36	Holtville Wastewater Collection System Project	City of Holtville														
46	Large-Scale Microalgal Cultivation on Recently-Exposed Playa Lands for Improving Salton Sea Water Quality and Regional Air Quality	Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California San Diego (UCSD)														
1	HPUD WWTP Upgrade to Tertiary Treatment	Heber Public Utility District														
8	City of Brawley Raw Water Storage Project	City of Brawley														
10	Regional Wastewater Treatment and Recycled Water Project	City of Brawley and City of Imperial														
14	IID Systems Conservation and Improvements Projects for IWSP	Imperial Irrigation District														
32	Water distribution storage tanks, 2 each 5MG	City of El Centro														

Project Number	Title	Sponsor	Revised Readiness Score 1	Revised Readiness Score 2	Revised Readiness Score 3	Revised Readiness Score 4	Revised Readiness Score 5	Revised Readiness Score 6	Revised Readiness Score 7	Revised Readiness Score 8	Revised Readiness Score 9	Revised Readiness Score 10	Revised Readiness Score 11	Revised Readiness Score 12	Revised Readiness Score 13	Revised Readiness Score 14
41	Drainage Improvements in the Township of Seeley; County Project No. 5363	Imperial County Public Works														
2	Keystone Desalination with IID Drainwater/Alamo River Source (50 KAFY)	Imperial Irrigation District														
7	East Brawley 25 KAFY Desalination with Well Field and Groundwater Recharge (Desal 12)	Imperial Irrigation District														
15	Spearheading with Spirulina: An Sustainable Approach to Desert Acquaculture:	Southern Low Desert Resource Conservation and Development Council														
37	Holtville UV Transmittance Water Treatment System Project	City of Holtville														
38	Holtville Stormwater Master Plan Project	City of Holtville														
39	Holtville Stormwater Conveyance System and Detention Basin Project	City of Holtville														
40	Holtville Sewer Master Plan/Map Update Project	City of Holtville														
49	Holtville Water Master Plan/Map Update Project	City of Holtville														
42	Phased Underrun Storage and Agricultural Wastewater Reclamation Project	Imperial Irrigation District														
44	Microalgal Cultivation for Improved Yields, Economic Value and Water Use Efficiency on Agricultural lands in the Imperial Valley, CA	Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California San Diego (UCSD)														
45	Macroalgae Solutions for the Imperial Valley and Salton Sea Region	The Gas Technology Institute (GTI)														
48	Integrated Microalgae Cultivation Process for Improving Water Quality in Imperial Valley Drainage Canals	Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California San Diego (UCSD)														
33	Poe Colonia Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade	County of Imperial														
47	Interconnection projects between City of El Centro, City of Imperial and the Heber Utility District	City of El Centro														