

## CHAPTER 9.0 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS

### 9.1 Introduction

The projects included in the Upper Feather River (UFR) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan are intended to implement the Plan and achieve Plan objectives. All projects must undergo a thorough review process before they can be formally included in the IRWM Plan. The Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines require that certain factors be used in the review process. These factors include:

- ◆ How the project contributes to Plan objectives
- ◆ How the project is related to resource management strategies (RMS) selected for use in the Plan
- ◆ Technical feasibility of the project
- ◆ Specific benefits to disadvantaged communities (DAC) and their water issues, including whether a project helps address critical water supply or water quality needs of a DAC
- ◆ Special benefits to critical water issues for Native American tribal communities
- ◆ Environmental justice (EJ) considerations
- ◆ Project costs and financing
- ◆ Economic feasibility, including water quality and water supply benefits and other expected benefits and costs
- ◆ Project status
- ◆ Strategic considerations for Plan implementation
- ◆ Contribution of the project in adapting to the effects of climate change in the region:
  - Include potential effects of climate change on the region and consider if adaptations to the water management system are necessary (Proposition 1)
  - Consider the contribution of the project to adapting to identified system vulnerabilities to climate change effects on the region (Proposition 1)
  - Consider changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality, and variability of runoff and recharge (Proposition 1)
  - Consider the effects of sea level rise on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures (Proposition 1)
- ◆ Contribution of the project in reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as compared to project alternatives:
  - Consider the contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives (Proposition 1)
  - Consider a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over the 20-year planning horizon (Proposition 1)
  - Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions (Proposition 1)
- ◆ Whether the project proponent has adopted (or has committed to adopting) the IRWM Plan

With each new project solicitation for the IRWM Plan, the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) will meet to review the implementation projects for eligibility. The RWMG will 1) ensure that projects meet 'minimum standards' (Table 9-1) for inclusion in the Plan, 2) seek opportunities for integration, and 3) determine whether they meet the IRWM Plan objectives, as well as the objectives and priorities of the IRWM Grant Program. The result of this process will be a vetted project list, approved by the RWMG. All

projects on the implementation project list have been reviewed and are considered by the RWMG as eligible for IRWM grant funds.

The following sections describe the project review process, per the Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program requirements outlined above.

## 9.2 Project Development

### 9.2.1 Project Submission

- ◆ Project sponsor/proponent information
- ◆ Location description
- ◆ Partners
- ◆ Stakeholder involvement
- ◆ Regional objectives met
- ◆ Program preferences met
- ◆ Statewide priorities met
- ◆ RMS used
- ◆ Status
- ◆ Costs and funding
- ◆ Addressing needs of DACs, EJ, climate change
- ◆ Data management

### 9.2.2 Targeted Communities: Project Development Process

#### 9.2.2.1 Tribal

The Tribal Advisory Committee (TAC) members were active partners in the development of potential projects and held numerous meetings of targeted discussions, presentations by staff, and development of Tribal projects. The Project Team's Tribal Outreach staff met and communicated with Tribal members on numerous occasions to support and encourage development of Tribal projects. Four projects were ultimately developed and submitted to the RWMG for consideration. A theme that emerged during discussions with the TAC was integration of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) with implementation projects throughout the region. The TAC actively identified potential integration of TEK into all implementation project submittals (Table 9-2) and has offered to coordinate with those identified project proponents as they further develop their projects for funding opportunities.

#### 9.2.2.2 Disadvantaged Communities

Addressing critical water supply needs of disadvantaged communities (DACs) was an objective of the project development process, and was addressed primarily through the Municipal Services Workgroup. Within the Municipal Services Workgroup, water supply managers throughout the region identified projects that could address critical supply issues. Additionally, even if a DAC was not actively involved in the Municipal Services Workgroup, its community service district or municipal representative was personally contacted by staff to help the DAC identify projects for consideration in the Plan. An outcome of these efforts included identification of projects addressing aging infrastructure, water quality, wastewater, and additional water storage for DACs throughout the region.

### 9.2.3 Integration Process

The IRWM Guidelines specifically require that integration be considered during project review. Integration was interpreted to mean an intentional review of projects to determine opportunities for coordination in order to develop complementary projects that generate multiple benefits and/or meet multiple Plan objectives. This was not meant to preclude the inclusion of single stand-alone projects, but rather to ensure that the importance of achieving multiple and quantifiable implementation objectives and benefits is held as a Plan standard.

Project integration included several specific and intentional considerations or standards:

1. **Geographic:** Under this standard the integrative principle is geographic location. Projects would be looked at based on their location within the watershed, for instance, Sierra Valley. This principle might result in the integration of multiple projects of different types, all of which benefit a geographical area.
2. **Project Type:** Early on in the conceptual project process it became clear that there were definite 'types' of projects such as community infrastructure, meadow restoration, fuel and fire reduction, and irrigation efficiency. Using this principle, all projects that address a particular issue could be looked at as a group and opportunities to aggregate, merge, or identify compatible projects were evaluated. This project type option might generate a set of water tank installation or repair projects or a set of water distribution system improvement projects. The projects might generate similar benefits in multiple locations. For example, the regional thinning project (Appendix 9-3), in which a region-wide forest fuels reduction effort would result in multiple benefits throughout the region, includes decreased wildland fire potential, increased groundwater infiltration benefits, and increased biomass sources for alternative energy production.
3. **Plan Goals/Objectives:** Under this standard the integrative principle focuses on aggregating or organizing projects by the goal/objective they most closely align with. This offers an opportunity to identify projects that meet multiple goals or objectives, as well as multiple projects that address a specific goal/objective. At some point, project sponsors may wish to aggregate projects that, for instance, address wet-meadow restoration to meet objectives on sediment reduction and habitat improvement.

After much deliberation, the RWMG determined that all three types of integration should be considered during its efforts to develop a coherent and high-value set of projects for Plan inclusion, without any single principle taking precedence. As a result, an additional decision was made to include projects in the Plan in two distinct ways: 1) via a listing of individual projects and 2), via creation of project 'suites' or 'bundles.' In this way, project sponsors maintained their own distinct project descriptions and outcomes, and were also able to work with other sponsors to develop aggregations of projects that yielded multiple benefits and met multiple Plan objectives (Chapter 5 *Goals and Objectives*; Table 5-6).

The integration process then advanced to the next stage. A half-day integration workshop held on August 21, 2015 focused on bringing the workgroups and stakeholders together to present and discuss project submittals and integration opportunities. Feedback from the workshop was presented to the RWMG at its September 23, 2015 meeting; staff was asked to further develop integration opportunities. Building on the workshop and RWMG discussions, staff evaluated all of the Step 2 PIFs to further identify opportunities for integration, which were noted with key words that could be easily sorted depending on future funding opportunity.

### 9.3 Project Review Process

- ◆ Procedures for submitting a project to the RWMG
- ◆ Procedures for reviewing projects considered for inclusion into the IRWM Plan
- ◆ Procedures for displaying the list(s) of selected projects
- ◆ How the project contributes to the IRWM Plan objectives
- ◆ How the project is related to resource management strategies selected for use in the IRWM Plan
- ◆ Technical feasibility of the project
- ◆ Specific benefits to DAC and Tribal water issues
- ◆ Environmental justice considerations
- ◆ Project costs and financing
- ◆ Climate change analysis
- ◆ Greenhouse gas emissions analysis

#### 9.3.1 Project Review Factors

Table 9-1 Upper Feather River IRWM Plan implementation project review criterion

Topic	Approach in evaluation process
<b>Technical feasibility</b>	Technical feasibility is a review factor in project screening. All projects were evaluated for technical feasibility in early project screening; all projects submitted were technically feasible.
<b>Benefits critical water issues to DACs</b>	Benefit to DACs is included as a project review factor, as part of assessing the project's ability to address additional IRWM guideline review factors. There are many opportunities for projects to benefit DACs.
<b>Benefits critical water issues to Native American tribal communities</b>	Benefit to Native American tribal communities is included as a project review factor, as part of assessing the project's ability to address statewide priorities. However, no critical water supply issues were identified by the TAC during this initial "Call for Projects". A future proposal may include something benefiting tribal communities; for example, enhancement of habitat suitable for plants that may be used for cultural purposes.
<b>Environmental justice considerations</b>	Environmental justice considerations are included as a project review factor, as part of assessing the project's ability to address additional IRWM Guidelines review factors.
<b>Project costs and financing</b>	Project costs and financing are included as implementation considerations.
<b>Economic feasibility</b>	Economic feasibility is included as an implementation consideration.
<b>Project status</b>	Project status is included as an implementation consideration.
<b>Strategic considerations for IRWM Plan implementation</b>	Strategic considerations were considered during project screening. Strategic considerations for combining or modifying local projects into collaborative regional projects were considered during an integration workshop (August 2015); the workgroup coordinators further identified

Topic	Approach in evaluation process
	opportunities for modifications and integration, and initiated discussions directly with the project proposer(s). If project modifications were agreeable, the project was modified. This occurred during the final phase of project evaluation.
<b>Project adaptations for climate change</b>	Climate change adaptation is included as a project review factor, in assessing the project's ability to address regional objectives and statewide priorities. Climate change is also its own standard in the IRWM Plan.
<b>Greenhouse gases</b>	An initial assessment of project generation and impact of GHG is included as a project review factor (see project GHG analyses in Appendix 9-2)
<b>Plan adoption</b>	Whether or not the project sponsor had signed the MOU for the IRWM Plan Update was a review factor in determining whether a project was included in the Plan.
<b>Reduce reliance on Delta</b>	Not applicable. The UFR Region is a headwaters watershed and has no reliance on the Delta.

### 9.3.2 Project Review Steps

1. **Perform initial screening of projects for inclusion** – Projects were screened for their relevance to water management and technical feasibility before being included in the IRWM Plan. No projects were eliminated at this step.
2. **Review benefits claimed by each project** – Text entries were required in the project submission form to justify why certain benefits were claimed, in particular for those related to the regional objectives and resource management strategies. The workgroup coordinators reviewed these explanations to verify that the project proposers understood the intent and that their benefit claims seemed reasonable before those benefits were accounted for in the evaluation of projects.
3. **Project integration and coordination** – Opportunities were sought to combine, evaluate, expand, and/or modify projects to achieve multiple benefits, expand local benefits on a regional scale, and/or enhance projects to address more regional objectives. For example, two similar projects that are geographically adjacent could be combined into a single effort to maximize implementation efficiency, or a project could be modified to include more comprehensive DAC benefits and outreach.

### 9.3.3 Ranking and Scoring

Over the course of several meetings, the RWMG determined it did not want to conduct an overall project prioritization or ranking process so as to encourage and focus on collaboration and integration within the region. In so doing, the RWMG determined that collaboration and integration are critical to maximizing benefits to the watershed through strategically aligning opportunities, particularly in the face of limited financial resources. Further, in supporting collaboration over competition among project proponents it reduced conflict and actively demonstrated the benefits of a multi-strategy approach.

With integration and collaboration as overriding principles for long-term stewardship, prioritizing implementation projects was deemed counterproductive. The RWMG determined at every opportunity to emphasize collaboration, and not competition, for limited resources, both in financial and human capital. The RWMG determined that when a grant opportunity arises, the RWMG might choose to first score

projects using a general scoring criteria (Appendix 4). Projects that scored higher would then be further ranked, against a group of similar project types (e.g., restoration, irrigation efficiency). The highest scoring projects for that funding source would then be considered for integrative opportunities that best fit the grant/source.

### 9.3.4 Documenting the Projects

To be considered in the IRWM Plan, a two-step process was initiated. Project proponents first submitted conceptual projects for an initial vetting and secondly, submitted a project application for consideration. The UFR IRWM website contains information about the project submittal process, how projects will be evaluated, and instructions for how to submit. Select information about the projects is included in an online GIS-linked searchable database on the website. The project submission form was developed in accordance with DWR's IRWM Guidelines, with the purpose of collecting information needed to comply with the specified project review process. The requested information included:

To get an initial list of projects, the RWMG held a formal "Call for Projects" from April 7 through June 1, 2015 (Appendix 9-1). Two public project solicitation meetings were held, on May 5, 2015 in Chester and on May 6, 2015 in Portola, California (Appendix 9-1). The RWMG met to discuss the conceptual projects on June 15, 2015, and provided initial feedback to project proponents to consider in their development of the Step 2 Project Information Forms (PIF) (Appendix 9-2). The deadline for submittal of the Step 2 PIFs was August 3, 2015. A total of 81 projects from 29 different proponents were gathered during this period, 79 of which were included for this Plan analysis. Additional calls for projects will occur as needed and in response to future IRWM implementation funding opportunities. This flexibility is encouraged since packages of projects are more likely to result in integrated and multi-objective approaches.

The DWR IRWM Plan Guidelines require a process or processes to select projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan. The selection process(es) must include the following components:

The RWMG's process to collect, review, and maintain the region's list of projects that addressed all the requirements set forth in the IRWM Guidelines was presented and ultimately accepted at a series of public workgroup and RWMG meetings, held March through September 2015.

According to IRWM Guidelines, certain review factors must be considered in the project review process, and when selecting projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan (Table 9-1). A description of how each factor was considered in the project evaluation process is provided.

After Step 2 project information forms were received and review criteria developed, the process for reviewing projects and programs within the UFR Region involved the following sequential steps:

For the purposes of this IRWM Plan Update, an initial list of projects was submitted and reviewed. The reviewed projects, listed by sponsoring agency/organization, are summarized in Table 9-2 and can be viewed on the UFR IRWM website. Full details about these projects may be found in Appendix 9-3. Note that the numbering of the projects in Table 9-2 bears no relationship to rank or priority; instead, the numbers relate to a project's order in the database. Projects in the table below are sorted by type of project: Agricultural Land Stewardship (ALS); Floodplains, Meadows, Waterbodies (FMW); Municipal Services (MS); Tribal Advisory Committee (TAC); and Uplands Forest (UF).

As stated previously, this is an initial list of projects. With the IRWM website and planning framework established, projects may be added, removed, or updated at any time. Equipped with a 'living' process, project proponents and stakeholders now have a venue to collaborate and integrate their projects. Getting a project on the list is important, even if there isn't an imminent funding opportunity. From time to time, the RWMG and its members may feel it necessary to have another formal call-for-projects to refresh their list or to prepare for a new funding opportunity. Although funding is important, it is not the sole purpose for watershed planning. Proper integrated planning should be ongoing, open, transparent, and collaborative. For instance, a number of additional and ongoing planning efforts within the UFR Region provide excellent opportunities for regional integration and stakeholder involvement.

**Table 9-2 Implementation Projects for the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan**

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget (\$)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
<b>Feather River Resource Conservation District</b>	ALS-1:Taylorville Mill Race Dam resurfacing	150,000			
<b>Feather River Resource Conservation District</b>	ALS-2: Water quality and infrastructure upgrades on working lands	1,567,500			X
<b>Feather River and Sierra Valley Resource Conservation Districts</b>	ALS-3: Enhanced management of livestock grazing	1,500,000			X
<b>Plumas and Sierra County Agricultural Commissioner</b>	ALS-4: Invasive weed management	450,000		X	X
<b>Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District</b>	ALS-6: Sierra Valley agricultural water diversion efficiency and improvements	150,000			
<b>Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District</b>	ALS-7: Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District Resource Management Plan	155,000	X		X
<b>Feather River Resource Conservation District</b>	ALS-8: Upper Feather River weather monitoring infrastructure	380,200			X



Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget (\$)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
<b>University California Cooperative Extension</b>	ALS-9: Soil health assessment	580,000-800,000			X
<b>Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District</b>	ALS-10: Sierra Valley Groundwater Sustainability Plan	572,000	X		
<b>Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District</b>	ALS-11: Cold Stream Ag & Fire Storage Impoundment	300,000	X		
<b>Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District/University California Cooperative Extension</b>	ALS-12: Alfalfa alternative	130,000			X
<b>Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District/Sierra Watershed Habitat Conservation Foundation</b>	ALS-13: Little Last Chance Lake	265,000		X	
<b>Lake Almanor Watershed Group</b>	FMW-2: Water quality monitoring program for Lake Almanor and its tributaries	120,000		X	
<b>Mountain Meadows Conservancy</b>	FMW-4: Wildlife enhancement project	238,062		X	
<b>Mountain Meadows Conservancy</b>	FMW-5: Upper Feather River Interpretive and Education Sites	60,500			
<b>Natural Resources Conservation District</b>	FMW-6: Watershed monitoring program	40,000			
<b>County of Plumas</b>	FMW-8: Spanish Creek restoration	1,250,000			



Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget (\$)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
<b>Plumas County Unified School District</b>	FMW-9: Watershed education	48,000	X		
<b>Lake Almanor Watershed Group/Sierra Institute</b>	FMW-10: Lake Almanor Basin stewardship and outreach program	142,224	X	X	
<b>Lake Almanor Watershed Group/Sierra Institute</b>	FMW-11: Lake Almanor Basin water quality improvement plan	510,000	X		
<b>US Forest Service</b>	FMW-14: Folchi Meadow project	300,000			
<b>Trout Unlimited</b>	FMW-15: Fish habitat assessment/restoration, public awareness/education	180,000		X	X
<b>Trout Unlimited</b>	FMW-16: Fish distribution modeling in relation to climate change	166,500		X	X
<b>WM Beaty and Associates</b>	FMW-18: Mountain Meadows livestock fencing	174,600	X		
<b>Trout Unlimited</b>	FMW-19: Debris dam survey, inventory and characterization	97,000			
<b>City of Portola</b>	MS-1: Wastewater system infrastructure improvements	1,424,522	X		X
<b>City of Portola</b>	MS-2: Turner Springs improvement	403,000	X		
<b>East Quincy Services District</b>	MS-4: Water tank project	630,000	X		

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget (\$)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
<b>Feather River Canyon Community Services District</b>	MS-6: Old Mill Ranch	500,000	X		
<b>Gold Mountain Community Services District</b>	MS-7: High elevation water tank and well	2,030,150	X		
<b>Gold Mountain Community Services District</b>	MS-8: Water reclamation facility	1,758,000	X		
<b>Grizzly Lake Community Services District</b>	MS-9: Crocker water service meters	1,500,000	X		
<b>Grizzly Lake Community Services District</b>	MS-10: Crocker Welch ground tank repair	200,000	X		
<b>Grizzly Lake Community Services District</b>	MS-11: Delleker water meters	1,500,000	X		
<b>Grizzly Lake Community Services District</b>	MS-12: Delleker water tank rehabilitation	200,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-13: Groundwater monitoring	40,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-15: Chandler Road bridge erosion	897,000			
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-16: Humbug Valley Road bridge erosion	408,000			
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-17: Road 311 culvert improvement	251,000			
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-18: Road 318 culvert improvement	251,000	X		

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget (\$)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-19: North Valley Road bridge erosion	670,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-20: Mill Creek erosion	835,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-21: Smith Creek erosion	105,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-22: Wapaunsie Creek erosion	427,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-23: Stampfli Land bridge erosion	432,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-24: Walker Ranch Community Services District infrastructure improvements	100,000	X		
<b>County of Plumas</b>	MS-25: Humbug Valley Road 307 culvert improvement	728,000			
<b>Plumas-Eureka Community Services District</b>	MS-26: Municipal well No. 3	1,050,000			
<b>Plumas-Eureka Community Services District</b>	MS-27: Treated wastewater reuse	N/A	X		
<b>Plumas-Eureka Community Services District</b>	MS-28: Water meter installation	989,205			
<b>Plumas-Eureka Community Services District</b>	MS-29: Water storage tank replacement	531,750			
<b>Plumas-Eureka Community Services District</b>	MS-30: Wastewater treatment plant No. 6 upgrade	N/A			

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget (\$)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
<b>Plumas-Eureka Community Services District</b>	MS-31: Wastewater treatment plant No. 7 lift station replacement	N/A			
<b>Quincy Community Services District</b>	MS-32: Water system improvements	589,000	X		
<b>County of Sierra</b>	MS-33: Sierra County road improvements	495,000			
<b>Sierraville Public Utilities District</b>	MS-35: Alternative water storage analysis and development	660,000	X		
<b>Westwood Community Services District</b>	MS-36: Water storage project	750,000	X		
<b>Lake Almanor Watershed Group/Sierra Institute</b>	MS-37: Almanor Basin solid and wastewater treatment plant	135,000	X	X	
<b>Sierraville Public Utilities District</b>	MS-38: Leak detection and repair	155,500	X		
<b>Sierraville Public Utilities District</b>	MS-39: Meter replacement	194,000	X		
<b>Sierraville Public Utilities District</b>	MS-40: Pumphouse improvement	243,400	X		
<b>Sierraville Public Utilities District</b>	MS-41: Tank replacement project	630,000	X		
<b>East Quincy Services District</b>	MS-42: Automatic meter reading project	666,679	X		
<b>East Quincy Services District</b>	MS-43: Replace copper service lines project	1,107,685	X		
<b>Maidu Summit Consortium</b>	TAC-2: Big Springs vegetation management	400,000		X	

Sponsoring Agency/Proponent	Project Number/Title	Estimated Budget (\$)	Benefits a Disadvantaged Community	Tribal Integration (TEK)	Regional Project
<b>Maidu Summit Consortium</b>	TAC-3: Mud Creek habitat recovery	450,000		X	
<b>Maidu Summit Consortium</b>	TAC-5: Indian Jim River Resource Center	350,000	X	X	
<b>Maidu Summit Consortium</b>	TAC-6: Tradition Ecological Knowledge	200,000		X	X
<b>University of California, Cal Poly</b>	UF-1: Marian Meadow	55,000		X	
<b>Collins Pine Company</b>	UF-2: Rock Creek meadow restoration	180,000		X	
<b>US Forest Service</b>	UF-6: Round Valley/Keddie hand thin	189,000	X		
<b>US Forest Service</b>	UF-7: US Forest Service road improvements	1,000,000			X
<b>WM Beaty and Associates</b>	UF-8: Goodrich Creek biomass	715,600		X	
<b>WM Beaty and Associates</b>	UF-10: Greenville Creek biomass	345,630		X	
<b>WM Beaty and Associates</b>	UF-11: Mountain Meadows Creek biomass	435,230		X	
<b>Soper Company</b>	UF-12: Upper Feather River cooperative regional thinning	50,400-52,920		X	X
<b>County of Plumas</b>	UF-13: Upper Feather River cooperative LiDAR and GIS support program	3,000,000-4,000,000		X	X

## 9.4 Project Selection for Funding Opportunities

Whenever an IRWM Grant solicitation is announced, the RWMG must decide which projects to put forward in a grant application package on behalf of the UFR Region. Only a limited number of projects can be submitted in any one round. To make this decision, the RWMG will review the implementation project list and select:

- ◆ Only those projects that are ready to proceed.
- ◆ Only those projects whose project proponents have adopted, or have expressed a commitment to adopt, the IRWM Plan (the Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 IRWM Program Guidelines stipulate that each project proponent named in an IRWM Grant application must adopt the IRWM Plan).
- ◆ Only those projects for which project proponents are able to provide certainty of landowner support. With the resulting list of “eligible projects” from which to select for that IRWM Grant solicitation round, the RWMG will then take into consideration the following factors:
  - How well a project scored in the project ranking (to be performed with each grant solicitation)
  - Economic effects of the project
  - How well a project addresses IRWM Program preferences (Plan objectives, statewide priorities, RMS, etc.)
  - Project costs relative to the amount of IRWM funding available in that round
  - How well the various projects can be integrated to address regional needs and provide the most benefit to the region
  - The desired outcome is an application package comprising several projects that, together, will help implement the Plan objectives, will provide multiple and regional benefits for the UFR IRWM region, and will be most competitive on a state level for IRWM (and other) grant funds

The RWMG has established a process for selecting projects for funding. It is anticipated that a wide variety of funding sources will be pursued in addition to those that may be available through Proposition 1 IRWM opportunities, or any subsequent bond issue. In fact, it is the uncertainty of bond-based funding that motivated the UFR to develop a process that specifically is not exclusively DWR-focused.

Projects included in the Plan may seek non-DWR funding independently of RWMG approval. However, any project that is included in the Plan and that is submitted for non-DWR funding will be encouraged to include a line item, where possible, to cover the cost of RWMG administration and integration of the project outcomes into the Plan.

It is the intent of the RWMG that the outcome of all projects that support Plan objectives (and by incorporation, resource management strategies), regardless of funding source or their inclusion in the Plan, be reported in annual Plan performance reviews, tracked for monitoring Plan implementation, and posted on the website. The RWMG may annually query all of its members about projects to track the region’s progress in meeting Plan objectives.

The selection process will proceed as follows:

1. The RWMG representative will track and research available funding options (Chapter 12 *Finance*), using a strategy developed by the RWMG. The strategy needs to include a consideration of the most appropriate funding source(s) for each project to ensure that projects with limited funding opportunities are given focused attention.

2. When a funding source is identified, the RWMG representative will review the guidelines for that funding entity and determine which of the existing projects are potentially both eligible for and competitive for that funding source.
3. Using the scoring strategy already developed (Appendix 9-4) and any additional scoring criteria identified in specific funding opportunities, the projects deemed consistent with the guidelines for the funding source will be ranked by the RWMG.
4. Based on the scoring results and an assessment of the overall compatibility and integration of the project(s), a recommendation will be made to the RWMG as to which projects should be bundled or included in the funding application. The RWMG will make the final determination as to inclusion in a grant proposal.
5. The RWMG and its representative will provide whatever support they can to the project sponsors as the application is readied for submittal. Unless base funding for IRWMs is established, it is expected that support will be limited to providing access to materials developed as part of the Plan process and that may support both project development and the assessment of the cost/benefit of individual projects. Should base funding be provided to IRWM regions, support may be expanded to in-kind labor for writing and reviewing the application, technical assistance in refining project descriptions or technical analysis as needed, and other similar activities.

## 9.5 Implementation and Updating Project Lists

The project list for 2016 IRWM Plan implementation projects is provided in Table 9-2; full submittals are included in Appendix 9-3. The IRWM Plan project list will evolve with each new project solicitation (anticipated to occur on an annual to bi-annual basis, contingent on the Proposition 1 IRWM Grant solicitation schedules). Appendix 9-3 will be updated whenever a new project list is generated. Updating this appendix will not entail formal re-adoption of the Plan, but just the approval (i.e., simple majority vote) of the RWMG. The project lists (and updates) will be announced to stakeholders via email, and will also be available for download on the UFR IRWM website at <http://featherriver.org/proposed-projects/>.



**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY**

DRAFT