

Proposed Evaluation Criteria Modifications – March 8, 2012

Criterion	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Revised Criterion
General	Suggest establishing separate categories of projects and ranking within each category instead of forcing unlike projects to compete	Discuss with RPC. Note that projects are not being compared to each other	To be discussed
Maximize Economic Feasibility	Should there be something here about need for state or federal funds vs. local agencies' ability to fund? Should include something on ability of project to proceed with local funding vs. need for state and federal funds, as well as the certainty of those funds in the planning horizon and what percentage of the cost would have to come from uncertain future funds.	Discuss with RPC. Note that current criterion responds to DWR requirements. This would require addition of a new criterion.	To be discussed
Address MAC Plan Update Goal	Change "Low" score from address one goal to address less than 2 goals	Accept change	High = Address 5 or more goals Medium = Address 2 to 4 goals Low = Address less than 2 goals
Integrate RMSs	Change "low" score from address 2 RMS's to Incorporate less than 3 RMSs	Accept change. Note that in order to pass part 1 screening, each project must address at least 2 RMSs.	High = Incorporate 6 or more RMSs Medium = Incorporate 3 to 5 RMSs Low = Incorporate less than 3 RMSs
Maximize DAC and Native American Benefits and Minimize EJ Impacts	Change Medium score to add "or provides targeted benefits to one or more DAC or NA community, but has EJ impacts."	Accept change	High = Provide targeted benefits to one or more DAC or NA community; does not have EJ impacts Medium = Incidentally benefits a DAC or NA community, may have EJ impacts; or provides targeted benefits to one or more DAC or NA community, but has EJ impacts. Low = Provide no DAC or Native American benefits; may have environmental justice impacts

Criterion	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Revised Criterion
Minimize Implementation Risk	<p>Add the word “documented” to high, medium, and low definitions.</p> <p>Revise medium definition to delete the sentence: Most projects will receive a score of Medium, unless documentation is provided to justify a Low or High score.</p>	<p>Discuss with RPC.</p> <p>Would suggest putting the responsibility for this documentation on the project proponent / opponent.</p>	To be discussed
Add criterion: Reasonable end-user cost	<p>High: Cost of project, resulting water or other benefits will be considered reasonable by the projected end user; cost of any project water is viable for projected uses.</p> <p>Medium: Questions exist as to whether the project, resulting water or other benefits will be considered reasonable by the projected end user; cost of any project water may not be viable for projected uses.</p> <p>Low: High likelihood that cost of project, resulting water or other benefits will not be considered reasonable by the projected end user or the cost of any project water is likely to be too high for projected uses.</p>	<p>Discuss with RPC.</p> <p>Note that this will be infeasible to assess at a planning level.</p>	To be discussed
Add criterion: Best project for the intended purpose	<p>High: Project is the best possible alternative to meet the stated need from a social, environmental and economic perspective.</p> <p>Medium: Other alternatives exist that may be preferable from a social, environmental and economic perspective.</p> <p>Low: Other alternatives clearly exist that will be better to meet the intended need from a social, environmental and economic perspective.</p>	<p>Discuss with RPC.</p> <p>Note that this will be infeasible to assess at a planning level and projects are not being compared to each other</p>	To be discussed