

Topic: **Authority Board Agenda Item 3-2** 2018 Feb 26

Subject: **Proposition 1 WSIP Application**

Requested Action:

No action requested. Informational item.

Detailed Description/Background:

Staff to provide an update on the ongoing activities in support of the Sites Project's Proposition 1 WSIP application.

Prior Authority Board Action:

None.

Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:

None.

Staff Contact:

Jim Watson

Notes:

Attachments:

Attachment A - WSIP Scoring Overview

Final Preparer: Watson Phase: 1 Status: Date: 2018 Feb 26 Sites Authority Board Staff Report Checker: Spesert Informational Ref/File #: 12.221-210.018 Caveat: QA/QC:

Version:

Page: 1 of

Application Scoring Criteria:

Co	mponent	<u>Score</u>	<u>Sites</u>
	Eligibility	Pass/Fail	Pass
	Public Benefit Ratio	33	May 3
	Return on Public <u>Public Benefits</u> Investment Funding Request		
	Relative environmental Value	27	Jun 29 *
	Ecosystem (CA DFW): 303 questions		
	Water Quality (SWRCB) 129 questions		
	Resiliency	25	Jun 29 *
	"Ability of a project to provide public benefits by accounting for flexibili and integration into the State water system and response to sources of	•	
	Implementation Risk	15	Jun 29 *
	✓ Technical Feasibility		
	√ Financial Feasibility		
	✓ Economic Feasibility		
	✓ Environmental Feasibility		
	NOTE: A score > 7 is required to be eligible for early funding to complete the EIR/S and acquire permits.		
* I	Initial scores available on May 25 Maximum	: 100	TBD

Initial scores available on May 25

maximum:

Application Scoring Criteria & Preliminary Scores:

<u>Co</u>	mponent	<u>Score</u>	Sites			
	Eligibility			Pass/Fail	Pass	
	Public Benefit Ratio			33	May 3	
	Return on Public = <u>Public Benefits</u> Investment Funding Request				0.4	
	Ecosystem (1)	Physical (CDFW)	Economics	\$3,176.3	\$ 420.8	
	Anadromous Fish	Insufficiently supported Alt. Cost (Sh		asta Raise) Insufficient		
	 Oroville Coldwater Pool 	No supporting information	Value reduced			
	 Food for Fish (Cache Slough) 	Insufficiently supported	Method accepted			
	✓ Water for Refuges	No adjustment	Value reduced			
	Flood (3)	Physical (DWR)	Economics	\$ 138.0	\$ 44.6	
	✓ Damage reduction (local)	Reduced (5 ft to 3 ft)	Benefit reduce	ed		
	Recreation (5)	Physical (DWR)	Economics	\$ 192.0	\$ 197.2	
	✓ Damage reduction (local)	No adjustment	Method accep	oted (value incre	eased)	
	Non-monetized Benefits	Water Commissione	rs	+ 4	TBD	
	☐ Water Quality (2) & Emergence					
	Operational flexibility					
	☐ State's operational control & r					
			Maximum	33	\$ 662 6	

Maximum:

33

\$ 662.6

Page 410

Application Scoring Criteria & Preliminary Scores:

Component					<u>Score</u>	<u>Sites</u>	
	Eligibility					Pass/Fail	Pass
	Public Benefit	Ratio				33	May 3
		Return on Pub Investment	olic =	Public Benefits Funding Requ	_		0.4
	Is based on cost allocation						
	Non-Public Be	<u>nefits</u>	Physica	al (DWR)	Econom	ics	
	✓ Agricultural Wa	ater Supply		verify allocation south of Delta ts	Method &	Benefit accepte	ed
	✓ Municipal & In-	dustrial		verify allocation south of Delta ts	Method &	Benefit accepte	ed
	✓ Hydropower				Method &	Benefit accepte	ed
	 Recaptured wa 	ter	Unable to	substantiate	"Recomme	ends removal"	

Maximum:

33

662.6