



Criteria and Evaluation Guidance

Applications will be grouped into the following four types: Water Conservation, Reuse, Above Ground Storage, and Storage Other than Above Ground. Proposals will be evaluated according to two sets of criteria of equal value as follows:

Set A: Criteria common to and applied to all applications. (Maximum of 50 points)

These criteria will be used to evaluate applicant readiness to proceed, community involvement, and the ability to accomplish the stated goal.

Set B: Criteria unique to each of the four types. (Maximum of 50 points)

These criteria will include statutory “priority” values and some criteria uniquely suited to each type.

Set A: Common Criteria - Criteria Common to all Applications

Maximum Points	Criteria	Evaluation Guidance
<p><u>25 Points</u> Four Scoring Categories</p>	<p>Readiness and Ability to Execute</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant clearly describes how and on what schedule the feasibility study will be performed. The description will include: identification of key personnel and associated tasks, timelines for tasks to be accomplished, and identification and specific role(s) of entities that have a part in completing the study. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation Schedule [See Question 5b pg. 2]: The applicant’s projected implementation schedule and how quickly the applicant would be able to begin the study if funding is awarded. The more quickly the applicant can begin the feasibility study the higher the score. Organization [See Question 5c pg. 2]: How well the applicant has organized the feasibility study in terms of schedule or timelines, key tasks, and the resources necessary to perform the key tasks. A well-organized feasibility study will receive the highest score; a poorly-organized feasibility study will receive the lowest score.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant demonstrates that no government approval and/or permits are needed to conduct the feasibility study. If the applicant has determined that government approval and/or permits are necessary to conduct the feasibility study, the applicant demonstrates that they have obtained or are in the process of obtaining necessary permits and/or government approval to conduct the feasibility study. • Applicant demonstrates the capability to accomplish the study with available or anticipated human resources. 	<p>3) <u>Permits/Government Approval</u> [See Question 7 pg. 3]: Whether or not the applicant undertook a thorough review of the permits and/or government approval that may be needed to conduct the feasibility study. If the thorough review reveals that no government approval and/or permits are necessary to conduct the feasibility study then the applicant will receive the highest score. If the thorough review reveals that there is a need for government approval and/or permits to conduct the feasibility study then the applicant will be given a higher score if the approval and/or permits have already been obtained or are in the process of being obtained and lowest score if no action has been undertaken to obtain the needed permits and/or government approval.</p> <p>4) <u>Human Resources</u> [See Question 10 pg. 3]: The professional qualifications and/or experience of the person (s) that will be performing key tasks of the feasibility study. Evaluators will take the type of entity applying and the size and scope of the feasibility study into account.</p> <p>Professional experience does include practical experience. Applicants that will engage very highly qualified and/or experienced persons to conduct the study will receive the highest score.</p>
<p><u>15 Points</u> Two Scoring Categories</p>	<p>Feasibility Study Achieves Goal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant clearly articulates how the study will bring the entity closer to an established or stated goal. The established or stated goal must be based on evaluating the feasibility of developing a water conservation, reuse or storage project. • Applicant describes the technical aspects of the study and explains why the technical approaches are appropriate for the feasibility study and accomplishing the goal of the study. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <p>1) <u>Goal</u> [See Question 1 pg. 2]: A presentation that clearly connects the feasibility study to the achievement of an established or stated goal. The goal must be based on evaluating the feasibility of developing a water conservation, reuse or storage project. Applicants that present a clearly articulated statement of their goal and can show that conducting the feasibility study will allow them to achieve that goal will receive the highest score. The applicant will get a lower score if they do not establish a clear connection between the feasibility study and their</p>

		<p>goal, fail to articulate a goal that is based on evaluating the feasibility of developing a water conservation, reuse or storage project, and/or propose a feasibility study that will have moderate or little effect on achieving the goal.</p> <p>2) Technical Aspects [See Question 4 pg. 2]: A technical process and/or methodology that is clearly appropriate for the feasibility study is important to getting results and conclusions that are meaningful and defensible. Applicants that describe technical approach(s) that they intend to utilize in their feasibility study that are clearly appropriate for getting meaningful and defensible results and conclusions will receive the highest score.</p>
<p><u>10 Points</u> One Scoring Category – two parts</p>	<p>Local, Regional, State Involvement, Interest and/or Commitment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking into account the type of entity that is applying and the size and scope of the study, the applicant describes an appropriate level of involvement, interest and/or commitment in the study by outside entities and explains how the feasibility study and/or associated project will benefit/impact these entities. • Applicant provides letters of support from appropriate entities, taking into account the type of entity that is applying and the size and scope of the study. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <p>1a) Level of Interest [See Question 8 pg. 3]: A level of involvement, interest and/or commitment in the feasibility study from outside entities that shows that the feasibility study and the project associated with the feasibility study are important in a community (local, regional, state, or district) sense. The importance can be current and/or long-term. Applicants that can show a strong level of involvement, interest, and/or commitment that is appropriate for the entity applying and the size and scope of the feasibility study and provide a clear and convincing explanation of the benefit of the feasibility study and associated project to outside entities will receive the highest score.</p> <p>1b) Letters of Support [See Question 8 pg. 3]: Evaluators will take into account the entity that is applying and the size and scope of the feasibility study and score accordingly. For studies of substantial size and scope, it would be expected that there would involvement, interest and/or commitment from a variety of outside entities.</p>

Set B: Unique Criteria – Criteria Unique to Each of the Four Project Types

SB 1069/Administrative Rule Requirement to be eligible for funding: for a project feasibility study that is associated with a proposed storage project that would impound surface water on a perennial stream, divert water from a stream that supports sensitive, threatened or endangered fish or divert more than 500 acre-feet of surface water annually, the proposed project feasibility study must contain the following elements:

1. Analyses of by-pass, optimum peak, flushing and other ecological flows of the affected stream and the impact of the storage project on those flows;
2. Comparative analyses of alternative means of supplying water, including but not limited to the costs and benefits of conservation and efficiency alternatives and the extent to which long-term water supply needs may be met using those alternatives;
3. Analyses of environmental harm or impacts from the proposed storage project;
4. Evaluation of the need for and feasibility of using stored water to augment in-stream flows to conserve, maintain and enhance aquatic life, fish life and any other ecological values, and
5. For a proposed storage project that is for municipal use, analysis of local and regional water demand and the proposed storage project's relationship to existing and planned water supply projects.

Application Form Requirements: The application form requires all applicants to identify the project associated with the feasibility study as a water conservation, reuse, above-ground storage or storage other than above-ground project. In addition, the application form requires those applicants that identify the project associated with the feasibility study as a storage project (above-ground or other than above-ground) to answer yes or no to the following questions:

- Will the project divert greater than 500 acre-feet of surface water annually?
- Will the project impound surface water on a perennial stream?
- Will the project divert water from a stream that supports sensitive, threatened or endangered species?

Set B: Unique Criteria – Water Conservation or Reuse

Maximum Points	Criteria	Evaluation Guidance <i>Presentation is important; please provide thorough and clear responses to application questions and other requests for information</i>
<p><u>10 Points</u> One Scoring Category</p>	<p>SB 1069 Priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant clearly demonstrates that the associated project has been identified by the Department in a statewide water assessment and inventory. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Preference Points [See Question 1 pg. 4]: Whether or not the applicant provided information that clearly demonstrates that the project associated with the feasibility study has been identified by the Department in a statewide water assessment and inventory. Applicant must contact the Department’s Grant Specialist at (503) 986-0869 to be included on the assessment and inventory. Applicants that meet this information standard will receive full value; those that do not will receive a score of zero (0).
<p><u>20 Points</u> Four Scoring Categories</p>	<p>Addresses Water Supply Need(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant clearly demonstrates that the project associated with the feasibility study is intended to meet an important and/or critical local, regional, or statewide water supply need(s). Areas of water supply need may include, but are not limited to: economic, environmental, agricultural, livestock, municipal, electric generation, industrial, manufacturing, water quality protection, and augmentation of source water resources (surface or ground). Applicant describes to what extent the project associated with the feasibility study will meet the identified water supply need. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reliance on Solid Water Availability and Need(s) Data/Analysis [Question 2 pg. 2]: Applicant is graded on the level to which the stated water supply need is: (1) backed by evidence that water is available to meet the need(s) & (2) supported by convincing argument/data that corroborates the need for water. The information (data and/or analysis) and the quality of the information the applicant uses to present the case that an important or critical water supply need exists will help to determine the score received. The more substantial and adequate the data and/or analysis, the higher the score. Proportion of Water Supply Need(s) the Associated Project is Intended to Meet [See Question 3 pg. 2]: Another factor affecting the score is the percentage of water supply need the project associated with the feasibility study is intended to meet. The higher the percentage of water supply need met, the higher the score.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant clearly describes how the associated project will (a) mitigate the need to develop new water supplies and/or (b) use water more efficiently. • Applicant provides documentation and/or examples of the success of similar or comparable water conservation/reuse projects. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) <u>Mitigate/Efficiency</u> [See Question 2 pg. 4]: Applicant will be graded on explanation provided to demonstrate how the associated project will (a) mitigate the need to develop new water supplies and/or (b) use water more efficiently. The better the explanation provided, the higher the score. 4) <u>Record of Success</u> [See Question 2 pg. 4]: Documentation and/or examples of similar or comparable projects that have been successful in reducing demand or in using water more efficiently. The more significant the record of success for other similar or comparable projects, the higher the score.
<p><u>20 Points</u> Three Scoring Category</p>	<p>Addresses Source Water Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides data and information relevant for gaging the potential impacts of the project associated with the feasibility study on the project’s source(s) of water supply, and water bodies and water right holders downstream of associated and/or affected return flows. • Applicant provides a comprehensive review of the local, state, and/or federal permitting requirements and issues posed by the implementation of the project associated with the feasibility study. • Applicant provides a comprehensive analysis of property ownership including ownership status of implementation area. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>Project and Source Water Data</u> [See Question 6 pg. 3]: Data and information on the project and the project’s source(s) of water supply such as: the location of the proposed project including a map, the name(s) and location(s) of source water, water availability, proposed purposes and uses of stored water, environmental flow needs and water quality requirements of source water bodies downstream of associated return flows, and reliance on return flows by downstream water rights holders. The more substantial and adequate the data and information is for gaging the potential source water impacts, the higher the score. 2) <u>Anticipates Local, State, and/or Federal Project Permitting Requirements and Issues</u> [See Question 3a pg. 4]: A review of anticipated permits and issues related to the implementation of the project associated with the feasibility study. The more comprehensive and adequate the review, the higher the score. If no permits are required with adequate explanation the applicant receives full points. 3) <u>Property Ownership Analysis</u> [See Question 3b pg. 4]: A review of property ownership status of the implementation area associated with the feasibility study. The more comprehensive and adequate the review, the higher the score.

Set B: Unique Criteria – Above-Ground Storage

Maximum Points	Criteria	Evaluation Guidance <i>Presentation is important; please provide thorough and clear responses to application questions and other requests for information</i>
<p><u>10 Points</u> One Scoring Category</p>	<p>SB 1069 Priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant provides the information necessary to determine that the feasibility study should be prioritized as required by SB 1069 (Chapter 13, 2008 Laws)—information that the project associated with the feasibility study includes provisions for using stored water to augment instream flows to conserve, maintain and enhance aquatic life, fish life or other ecological values. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Preference Points [See Question 1 pg. 5]: Whether or not the applicant provided information that clearly shows that the project associated with the feasibility study includes provisions for using stored water to augment instream flows to conserve, maintain and enhance aquatic life, fish life or other ecological values. Applicants that meet this information standard will receive full value; those that do not will receive a score of zero (0).
<p><u>20 Points</u> Three Scoring Categories</p>	<p>Addresses Water Supply Need(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant clearly demonstrates that the project associated with the feasibility study is intended to meet an important and/or critical local, regional, or statewide water supply need(s). Areas of water supply need may include, but are not limited to: economic, environmental, agricultural, livestock, municipal, electric generation, industrial, manufacturing, water quality protection, and augmentation of source water resources (surface or ground). Applicant describes to what extent the project associated with the feasibility study will meet the identified water supply need. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reliance on Solid Water Availability and Need(s) Data/Analysis [Question 2 pg. 2]: Applicant is graded on the level to which the stated water supply need is: (1) backed by evidence that water is available to meet the need(s) & (2) supported by convincing argument/data that corroborates the need for water. The information (data and/or analysis) and the quality of the information the applicant uses to present the case that an important or critical water supply need exists will help to determine the score received. The more substantial and adequate the data and/or analysis, the higher the score. Proportion of Water Supply Need(s) the Associated Project is Intended to Meet [See Question 3 pg. 2]: Another factor affecting the score is the percentage of water supply need the project associated with the feasibility study is intended to meet. The higher the percentage of water supply need met, the higher the score.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant demonstrates an appropriate plan to address the required elements of the storage Project. 	<p>3) Required Elements [a-e pg. 5]: Information provided in a-e should demonstrate an understanding of the elements with an appropriate plan to incorporate those elements into the study. The better the understanding demonstrated with an associated appropriate plan to address the elements results in a higher score. Storage projects that are not subject to a-e receive full points.</p>
<p><u>20 Points</u> Three Scoring Categories</p>	<p>Addresses Source Water Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides data and information relevant for gaging the potential impacts of the project associated with the feasibility study on the project’s source(s) of water supply, and water bodies and water right holders downstream of associated and/or affected return flows. • Applicant provides a comprehensive review of the local, state, and/or federal permitting requirements and issues posed by the implementation of the project associated with the feasibility study. • Applicant provides a comprehensive analysis of property ownership including ownership status of implementation area. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Project and Source Water Data [See Question 6 pg. 3]: Data and information on the project and the project’s source(s) of water supply such as: the location of the proposed project including a map, the name(s) and location(s) of source water, water availability, proposed purposes and uses of stored water, environmental flow needs and water quality requirements of source water bodies downstream of associated return flows, and reliance on return flows by downstream water rights holders. The more substantial and adequate the data and information is for gaging the potential source water impacts, the higher the score. 2) Anticipates Local, State, and/or Federal Project Permitting Requirements and Issues [See Question 2a pg. 5]: A review of anticipated permits and issues related to the implementation of the project associated with the feasibility study. The more comprehensive and adequate the review, the higher the score. If no permits are required with adequate explanation the applicant receives full points. 3) Property Ownership Analysis [See Question 2b pg. 5]: A review of property ownership status of the implementation area associated with the feasibility study. The more comprehensive and adequate the review, the higher the score.

Set B: Unique Criteria – Storage Other Than Above-Ground [Including Aquifer Storage and Recovery]

Maximum Points	Criteria	Evaluation Guidance <i>Presentation is important; please provide thorough and clear responses to application questions and other requests for information</i>
<p><u>10 Points</u> One Scoring Category</p>	<p>SB 1069 Priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant clearly demonstrates that the associated project has been identified by the Department in a statewide water assessment and inventory. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Preference Points [See Question 1 pg. 7]: Whether or not the applicant provided information that clearly demonstrates that the project associated with the feasibility study has been identified by the Department in a statewide water assessment and inventory. Applicant must contact the Department’s Grant Specialist at (503) 986-0869 to be included on the assessment and inventory. Applicants that meet this information standard will receive full value; those that do not will receive a score of zero (0).
<p><u>20 Points</u> Three Scoring Categories</p>	<p>Addresses Water Supply Need(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant clearly demonstrates that the project associated with the feasibility study is intended to meet an important and/or critical local, regional, or statewide water supply need(s). Areas of water supply need may include, but are not limited to: economic, environmental, agricultural, livestock, municipal, electric generation, industrial, manufacturing, water quality protection, and augmentation of source water resources (surface or ground). Applicant describes to what extent the project associated with the feasibility study will meet the identified water supply need. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reliance on Solid Water Availability and Need(s) Data/Analysis [Question 2 pg. 2]: Applicant is graded on the level to which the stated water supply need is: (1) backed by evidence that water is available to meet the need(s) & (2) supported by convincing argument/data that corroborates the need for water. The information (data and/or analysis) and the quality of the information the applicant uses to present the case that an important or critical water supply need exists will help to determine the score received. The more substantial and adequate the data and/or analysis, the higher the score. Proportion of Water Supply Need(s) the Associated Project is Intended to Meet [See Question 3 pg. 2]: Another factor affecting the score is the percentage of water supply need the project associated with the feasibility study is intended to meet. The higher the percentage of water supply need met, the higher the score.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant demonstrates an appropriate plan to address the required elements of the storage project. 	<p>3) Required Elements [a-e pg. 6]: Information provided in a-e should demonstrate an understanding of the elements with an appropriate plan to incorporate those elements into the study. The better the understanding demonstrated with an associated appropriate plan to address the elements results in a higher score. Storage projects that are not subject to a-e receive full points.</p>
<p><u>20 Points</u> Three Scoring Categories</p>	<p>Addresses source water impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides data and information relevant for gaging the potential impacts of the project associated with the feasibility study on the project’s source(s) of water supply, and water bodies and water right holders downstream of associated and/or affected return flows. • Applicant provides a comprehensive review of the local, state, and/or federal permitting requirements and issues posed by the implementation of the project associated with the feasibility study. • Applicant provides a comprehensive analysis of property ownership including ownership status of implementation area. 	<p>Evaluators of this criteria will be considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Project and Source Water Data [See Question 6 pg. 3]: Data and information on the project and the project’s source(s) of water supply such as: the location of the proposed project including a map, the name(s) and location(s) of source water, water availability, proposed purposes and uses of stored water, environmental flow needs and water quality requirements of source water bodies downstream of associated return flows, and reliance on return flows by downstream water rights holders. The more substantial and adequate the data and information is for gaging the potential source water impacts, the higher the score. 2) Anticipates Local, State, and/or Federal Project Permitting Requirements and Issues [See Question 2a pg. 6]: A review of anticipated permits and issues related to the implementation of the project associated with the feasibility study. The more comprehensive and adequate the review, the higher the score. If no permits are required with adequate explanation the applicant receives full points. 3) Property Ownership Analysis [See Question 2b pg. 6]: A review of property ownership status of the implementation area associated with the feasibility study. The more comprehensive and adequate the review, the higher the score.