

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

1416 NINTH STREET, P.O. BOX 942836
SACRAMENTO, CA 94236-0001
(916) 653-5791



May 15, 2014

Mr. Bret Stewart
General Manager
County of Santa Barbara, Department of Public Works
123 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

Subject: Plan Review Process, Draft Results for the Santa Barbara County IRWM
Plan 2013

Dear Mr. Stewart:

Attached please find the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Draft Review of the Santa Barbara County IRWM. Based on the draft review, the IRWM Plan is consistent with the IRWM Planning Act and the related IRWM Plan Standards contained in the 2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines.

Pursuant to Appendix H of the Guidelines the public comment period for this review will begin on May 15, 2014. The Draft Review will be available for public comments for 30 calendar days on the following website: <http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/prp.cfm>.

We will inform you of any comments received. After the public comment period ends the link to the draft review will become inactive on the website. DWR will consider comments, and if necessary work with you on any resultant follow up action. DWR will finalize the review and send it to you prior to posting on our website. The final review cover letter will state the plan's applicability in satisfying existing grant agreement conditions and plan eligibility requirements for future IRWM grant solicitations.

The Draft Review consists of a summary of the overall review and an individual review form for each of the 16 Plan Standards. On the individual review forms locations in the plan are noted for applicable material. Although they may be found elsewhere in the plan, these are the locations of the requirements used to show sufficiency with a given standard.

If you have any questions, please contact Ted Daum at (916) 651-9264 or Theodore.Daum@water.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tracie L. Billington".

Tracie L. Billington, P.E. Chief
Financial Assistance Branch
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management

INTRODUCTION

IRWM planning regions must have an IRWM Plan that has been reviewed and deemed consistent with the 2012 IRWM Plan Standards by DWR for eligibility to receiving Round 3 Proposition 84 funding. This 2012 IRWM Plan Standards Review Form for DWR staff use provides a consistent means in determining whether the 2012 IRWM Guidelines are being addressed in the IRWM Plan. It is part of the Plan Review Process that will begin prior to Round 3 solicitation. The form is similar to a grant application review form in that there is a checklist for each of the 16 Plan Standards and narrative evaluations where required. However, the evaluation is pass/fail; there is no numeric scoring. Each Plan Standard is either sufficient or not based on its associated requirements. Each Standard consists of between one and fourteen requirements. A Yes or No is automatically calculated in each Plan Standard header based on the individual requirement evaluations. In general, a passing score of "C" (i.e. 70% of the requirements for a given Plan Standard) is required for a Standard to pass. Standards with only one or 2 requirements will need one or both of those requirements to pass. Standards with 3 requirements will need at least 2 of the requirements to pass. Standards with 4 or 5 requirements will need at least 3 to pass. Some plan elements are legislated requirements. Such plan elements must be met in order to be considered consistent with plan standards. A summary of the sufficiency of each Standard is automatically calculated on the Standards Summary worksheet. A "No" evaluation indicates that a Standard was not met due to insufficient requirements comprising the Standard. The evaluation for each Plan Standard and any associated insufficiencies is automatically compiled on the Standards Summary page. Additional reviewer comments may be added at the bottom of each standards work sheet.

Note: This review form is meant to be a tool used in conjunction with the 2012 IRWM Guidelines document to assist in the evaluation of IRWM plans. It is not designed to be a substitute for the Guidelines document itself. Reviewers must use the Guidelines in determining plan consistency.

DEFINITION OF TABLE HEADINGS

IRWM Plan Standard: As named in the November 2012 IRWM Prop 84 and 1E Guidelines.

Overall Standard Sufficient: This field is either "YES" or "NO" and is automatically calculated based on the "Sufficient" column described below. If all fields are "y", the overall standard is deemed sufficient. Any entry other than a "y" in the Sufficient column (i.e. "n", "?", not sure, more detail needed, etc.) results in a NO.

Plan Standard Requirements Which Must Be Addressed Fields with an asterisk * are required by legislation to be included in an IRWM Plan.

Requirement	Requirements are taken directly from the November 2012 Guidelines.
Included	Is the Guideline Requirement included in the IRWM Plan? The options are: y = yes, requirement is included in the IRWMP; or n = no, requirement is not included in the IRWMP. If only y or n then presence/absence of the requirement is sufficient for evaluation. If there is a "q" (qualitative) then add a brief narrative, similar to a Grant Application Review public evaluation or supporting information.
Plan Standard Source	
2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Page(s) in the Guidelines (November 2012) which pertain to the Requirement.
Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	The CWC or other regulations that pertain to the Requirement, if applicable . This is for reference purposes. The cell links to a weblink of the regulatory code.
Evidence of Sufficiency	
Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	The page(s) or sections in the IRWM Plan where information on the Requirement can be found. This can be specific paragraphs or entire chapters for more general requirements.
Brief Qualitative Evaluation Narrative	Supporting information for the Requirement if a "q" is in the Included column. This can be just a few sentences or a paragraph and can be taken directly from the IRWM Plan. Comments or supporting information may be entered regardless of whether required.
Sufficient	Is the Guidelines requirement sufficiently represented in the IRWM Plan (y/n).

2012 IRWM Plan Standards Review Form

Regional Acceptance Process Planning Region: Santa Barbara County
 Regional Water Management Group: Santa Barbara County Cooperating Partners
 IRWM Plan Title: Santa Barbara County IRWMP 2013

PLAN IS SUFFICIENT

IRWM Plan Standard	Overall Standard Sufficient	Requirement(s) Insufficient
Governance	Yes	
Region Description	Yes	
Objectives	Yes	
Resource Management Strategies	Yes	
Integration *	Yes	
Project Review Process	Yes	
Impact and Benefit	Yes	
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Yes	
Data Management	Yes	
Finance	Yes	
Technical Analysis	Yes	
Relation to Local Water Planning	Yes	
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	Yes	
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes	
Coordination	Yes	
Climate Change	Yes	

* If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per November 2012 Guidelines, p. 44.

Additional Comments:

While deemed consistent with the 2012 Guidelines Plan Standards, DWR recommends that the following be addressed in future IRWM Plan updates:

Governance: It is implied but not stated in the Plan that past public outreach and involvement efforts are part of a process that will be utilized in the future. We recommend stronger linkage that these previous activities are part of an ongoing public outreach and involvement process pursuant to the Memoranda of Understanding. **Region Description:** Future water quality conditions are not addressed. **Resource Management Strategies:** There is no documentation that two Regional Management Strategies - Crop idling for water transfers and Irrigated land retirement - were considered during development of the plan. **Data Management:** Section 8.4.15 describes the data management system and data. However, it is not apparent that these data are in a format compatible with the State databases. **Climate Change:** No data gaps and information needs were identified for climate change.

IRWM Plan Standard: Governance				Overall Standard Sufficient		Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Regulatory and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Document a governance structure to ensure updates to the IRWM Plan							
The name of the RWMG responsible for implementation of the IRWMP	y/n	y	18/35	CWC §10539	Sec. 2.2 & Appendix 2-A		y
A description of the IRWM governance structure	y/n	y	19/36		Sec. 2.2 & Fig. 2-1		y
A description of how the chosen form of governance addresses and ensures:							
Public outreach and involvement processes	y/n/q	y	19/36-37	§10540, §10541	Sec. 2.3 & 2.10	The RWMG has been successful in outreach and involvement of new stakeholders, DACs and others. However the plan is written in a way that is "reporting on what was done" to meet the new standards and future implementation. For example, "the methods of outreach included emails, phone calls, publically noticed meetings, . . ." (p. 2-9). It is implied but not stated in the Plan that these efforts are part of a process that will be utilized in the future. We recommend stronger linkage that these previous activities are part of an ongoing public outreach and involvement process pursuant to the Memoranda of Understanding.	y
Effective decision making	y/n/q	y	19/37		Sec. 2.2.3	The Steering Committee is the main decision making body in the IRWM structure and the Steering Committee acts as an open forum for the proposal and vetting of ideas. The decision making process is described including guiding principles for effective decisionmaking.	y
Balanced access and opportunity for participation in the IRWM process	y/n/q	y	19/37		Sec. 2.2 & 2.3	The IRWM Region has conducted broad outreach to diversify stakeholder participation. Cooperating partners and stakeholders have the ability to attend IRWM meetings and make comments on the plan and sections as well as projects and the project selection process. All meeting notes are available on the IRWM website. All cooperating partner and workgroup meetings are open to the public providing any public stakeholder the opportunity to participate in the development/implementation of the plan.	y
Effective communication – both internal and external to the IRWM region	y/n/q	y	19/37-38		Sec. 2.9 & 2.5	Informal and formal communication processes are used. Informal communications consist of e-mail, conversations or phone calls and serve to supplement and enhance formal communications. Formal communications consist of notices of intent published county wide, public notices, and Cooperating Partners, Steering Committee and Work Group Meeting Notices. Inter-regional coordination occurs through inter-regional conference calls and meetings.	y
Long term implementation of the IRWM Plan	y/n/q	y	19/38		Sec. 2.4 & 8.2	Formally, the MOU commits signatories to participate in, and make a financial and/or service oriented contribution toward, the ongoing process established pursuant to Prop 84. Also, creating a water-aware Region and demonstrating the value of IRWM planning and projects through education and outreach, the intent is for long-term support by all interested Cooperating Partners and the public. Section 8.2 states the plan will be implemented over a 25 year timeframe.	y
Coordination with neighboring IRWM efforts and State and federal agencies	y/n/q	y	19/38		Sec. 2.5	Inter-regional meetings and conference calls are held on an on-going basis with Kern County IRWM Region, San Luis Obispo County IRWM Region, and the Ventura County IRWM Region to discuss collaboration on potential projects in shared watersheds and groundwater basins, and how to share resources. The RWMG also coordinates with DWR, CCRWQCB, and the Los Padres National Forest.	y
The collaborative process(es) used to establish plan objectives	y/n/q	y	19/38		Sec. 2.6	The Cooperating Partners created a workgroup that conducted a series of seven public meetings over an eight month period to identify, define and prioritize regional issues; establish objectives to meet the issues; refine the objectives according to public comment; and establish targets and strategies to meet the objectives. A collaborative process will occur in future biennial reviews.	y
How interim changes and formal changes to the IRWM Plan will be performed	y/n/q	y	19/38		Sec. 2.2, 2.7 & 2.8	As provided in the MOU that establishes the governance structure, changes and updates to the IRWM Plan 2013 will be made in the future during the scheduled biennial reviews. The biennial reviews will be completed as appendices to the plan and serve as a resource for the next full and formal update to the IRWM Plan 2013.	y
Updating or amending the IRWM Plan	y/n/q	y	19/38		Sec. 2.2, 2.7 & 2.8	As provided in the MOU that establishes the governance structure, changes and updates to the IRWM Plan 2013 will be made in the future during the scheduled biennial reviews. The biennial reviews will be completed as appendices to the plan and serve as a resource for the next full and formal update to the IRWM Plan 2013.	y
Publish NOI to prepare/update the plan; adopt the plan in a public meeting	y/n/q	y	35		CWC §10543	Sec 2.9 & Appendix 2-E	A draft version of the "Notice of Intent to Adopt the IRWM Plan 2013" is included in Appendix 2-E. However, the final notice will not be published and the plan will not be adopted until it is approved by DWR. The NOI to adopt the plan in a public meeting should be published in late April or May 2014. It is estimated that the plan will be adopted by all Cooperating Partners in June 2014.

IRWM Plan Standard: Region Description					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
If applicable, describe and explain how the plan will help reduce dependence on the Delta supply regionally	y/n	y	20	--	Sec. 3.10, Table 3.15, & Appendix 1-B		y
Describe watersheds and water systems	y/n	y	19/39	PRC §75026.(b)(1) and CWP Update 2009	Sec. 3.4.2, 3.4.3, & 3.4.4		y
Describe internal boundaries	y/n	y	19/39	--	Sec. 3.2.2 & Fig. 3-1, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-9, 3-10 & 3-11		y
Describe water supplies and demands for minimum 20 year planning horizon	y/n	y	19/39	--	Sec. 3.8, 3.9 & Appendix 3-A		y
Describe water quality conditions	y/n	n	19/40	--	Sec. 3.11	Current conditions are discussed, however future water quality conditions are not addressed.	n
Describe social and cultural makeup, including specific information on DACs and tribal communities in the region and their water challenges.	y/n/q	y	19/40	--	Sec. 3.13 & 3.14, Table 3.17 & 4.2	The Region is socially and culturally diverse, and includes five disadvantaged communities engaged in the IRWM process. There is one tribal community in the Region and the RWMG has made multiple attempts to engage them in the process. However there has not yet been any participation from the tribe. The Region will continue communications with tribal entities and work to support and encourage their future participation. Section 3.13 provides an overview of the social and cultural make-up.	y
Describe major water related objectives and conflicts *	y/n/q	y	19/40	§10541. (e)(3)	Sec. 3.7.5, & 4.2, Table 3.9, 4.1, 4.2 & 4.3	Table 3.9 lists the current regional issues and conflicts identified during the planning process. Table 4.2 goes into more detail and lists watershed specific issues and conflicts. Section 4.2.6 describes the process for selecting objectives. Table 4.3 describes each objective and how it will respond to the issues and conflicts.	y
Explain how IRWM regional boundary was determined and why region is an appropriate area for IRWM planning.	y/n/q	y	19/40	--	Sec. 3.2 & Figure 3.1	The Region utilizes the Santa Barbara County jurisdictional boundary approved by DWR through the RAP to define the Region. The rationale is provided.	y
Describe neighboring and/or overlapping IRWM efforts	y/n	y	19/40	--	Sec. 3.15		y
Explain how opportunities are maximized (e.g. people at the table, natural features, infrastructure) for integration of water management activities	y/n	y	38	--	Sec. 3.2.3		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Objectives					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Narrative	y/n
Through the objectives or other areas of the plan, the 7 items on pg 41 of GL are addressed. *	y/n	y	20/40 - 41	§10540.(c)	Table 4.3		y
Describe the collaborative process and tools used to establish objectives: - How the objectives were developed - What information was considered (i.e., water management or local land use plans, etc.) - What groups were involved in the process - How the final decision was made and accepted by the IRWM effort	y/n	y	20/41	--	Sec 4.2		y
Identify quantitative or qualitative metrics and measureable objectives: Objectives must be measurable - there must be some metric the IRWM region can use to determine if the objective is being met as the IRWM Plan is implemented. Neither quantitative nor qualitative metrics are considered inherently better. *	y/n/q	y	20/41 - 42	10541.(e)	Sec 4.3 & Table 4.4	Section 4.3 describes the process for selecting metrics. Table 4.4 lists each objective and a set of measurable metrics (targets) to be used to provide a means to gage the Region's progress toward meeting the regional objectives for a 25-year horizon. Many of these metrics are quantitative.	y
Explain how objectives are prioritized or reason why the objectives are not prioritized	y/n/q	y	20/42-43	--	Sec. 4.2.6	The Objectives Workgroup and Steering Committee choose not to prioritize the regional objectives or targets. The regional leadership believes that each objective is equally important relative to the others and that prioritizing objectives is not practical given the diversity of stakeholders involved in the process and Region, the range of priorities of various stakeholders, and the diversity of the regional needs. There was also concern that prioritized objectives could reduce interest and participation in the IRWM planning process and project selection process by discouraging development of projects that did not include a top objective.	y
Reference specific overall goals for the region: RWMGs may choose to use goals as an additional layer for organizing and prioritizing objectives, or they may choose to not use the term at all.	y/n	y	43	--	Sec. 4.2.2		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Resource Management Strategies (RMS)					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Identify RMS incorporated in the IRWM Plan: Consider all California Water Plan (CWP) RMS criteria (29) listed in Table 3 from the CWP Update 2009 *	y/n	y	20/43	CWP Update 2009 Volume II; 10541(e)(1)	Sec. 5.2.1 & Tables 5.1 & 5.2	Table 5.1 lists the DWR RMS, notes whether or not the Region selected the RMS, and provides a discussion of why the RMS are or are not appropriate for the Region. Table 5.2 lists additional RMS specifically created for the Region. However, two RMS were not addressed: Crop idling for water transfers, and Irrigated land retirement.	y
Consideration of climate change effects on the IRWM region must be factored into RMS	y/n	y	20/43	--	Sec. 5.2, 5.2.3, & Table 5.4		y
Address which RMS will be implemented in achieving IRWM Plan Objectives	y/n	y	44	--	Table 5.3		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Integration					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Contains structure and processes for developing and fostering integration ¹ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder/institutional - Resource - Project implementation 	y/n/q	y	20/44 - 45	§10540.(g); §10541.(h)(2)	Section 6.2	The region enables diverse groups of stakeholders to participate on all levels of the IRWM planning effort. The Cooperating Partners' MOU enables stakeholders to participate in the process regardless of financial contribution (6.2.1). The region utilized several processes to encourage the combining of information, expertise, knowledge, or personnel assistance to leverage resources of all regional stakeholders involved in the IRWM process. The governance structure that includes the Cooperating Partners and the Steering Committee brings together multiple cities, agencies, and organizations in regular meetings (6.2.2). The Steering Committee Subcommittee looked to gain economies-of-scale from utilizing and combining resources such as personnel, funding, and equipment from small projects in the same sub-region into a larger project for the sub-region (6.2.3).	y

1. If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per November 2012 Guidelines, p. 44.

IRWM Plan Standard: Project Review Process					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Regulatory and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Process for projects included in IRWM plan must address 3 components: - procedures for submitting projects - procedures for reviewing projects - procedures for communicating lists of selected projects	y/n	y	20/45	§75028.(a)	Sections 6.3.1, 6.3.2 & 6.3.3		y
Does the project review process in the plan incorporate the following factors:							
How a project contributes to plan objectives	y/n	y	20		Table 6.3 & 7.2		y
How a project is related to Resource Management Strategies identified in the plan.	y/n	y	20		Table 6.1 criteria #4 & Sec. 6.3.2		y
The technical feasibility of a project.	y/n	y	20		Sec.6.3.1 Project Information Requested & Sec. 6.3.2 Project Review Factors		y
A projects specific benefits to a DAC water issue.	y/n	y	20		Sec 6.3.2 Project Review Factors, & Table 6.1 criteria #10		y
Environmental Justice considerations.	y/n	y	20		Sec 6.3.2 Project Review Factors, & Table 6.1 criteria #10		y
Project costs and financing	y/n	y	20		Sec 6.3.2 Project Review Factors, & Table 6.1 criteria #5, #8, #9		y
Address economic feasibility	y/n	y	21		Sec. 6.3.2 Prioritizing Projects-Step 5		y
Project status	y/n	y	21		Table 6.1 criteria #6		y
Strategic implementation of plan and project merit	y/n	y	21/48		Sec 6.3.2		y
Project's contribution to climate change adaptation	y/n	y	21		Sec 6.3.2 Project Review Factors, & Table 6.1 criteria #13		y
Contribution of project in reducing GHGs compared to project alternatives	y/n	y	21		Sec 6.3.2 Project Review Factors, & Table 6.1 criteria #14		y
Status of the Project Proponent's IRWM plan adoption	y/n	y	21	Sec 6.3.4		y	
Project's contribution to reducing dependence on Delta supply (for IRWM regions receiving water from the Delta).	y/n	y	21	Sec 6.3.2, & Table 6.1 criteria #12		y	

IRWM Plan Standard: Impact and Benefit					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Discuss potential impacts and benefits of plan implementation within IRWM region, between regions, with DAC/EJ concerns and Native American Tribal communities	y/n	y	21	--	Sec 7.2, 7.3 & Table 7.1		y
State when a more detailed project-specific impact and benefit analysis will occur (prior to any implementation activity)	y/n	y	49	--	Sec 7.5		y
Review and update the impacts and benefits section of the plan as part of the normal plan management activities	y/n	y	50	--	Sec 7.2.2, 8.3.6, 2.7, & 2.8		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Plan Performance and Monitoring					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Contain performance measures and monitoring methods to ensure that IRWM objectives are met *	y/n	y	21/53	PRC §75026.(a)	Sec. 8.3		y
Contain a methodology that the RWMG will use to oversee and evaluate implementation of projects.	y/n	y	21/53		Sec. 8.3 & Table 8.4		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

DRAFT

IRWM Plan Standard: Data Management					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Regulatory and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Describe data needs within the IRWM region	y/n	y	54	--	Sec 8.4.1 & 8.4.2		y
Describe typical data collection techniques	y/n	y	54	--	Sec 8.4.3		y
Describe stakeholder contributions of data to a data management system	y/n	y	54	--	Sec 8.4.6		y
Describe the entity responsible for maintaining data in the data management system	y/n	y	54	--	Sec. 8.4.11		y
Describe the QA/QC measures for data	y/n	y	54	--	Sec 8.4.12		y
Explain how data collected will be transferred or shared between members of the RWMG and other interested parties throughout the IRWM region, including local, State, and federal agencies *	y/n	y	54	--	Sec. 8.4.13 & 8.4.14		y
Explain how the Data Management System supports the RWMG's efforts to share collected data	y/n	y	54	--	Sec. 8.4.13 & 8.4.14		y
Outline how data saved in the data management system will be distributed and remain compatible with State databases including CEDEN, Water Data Library (WDL), CASGEM, California Environmental Information Catalog (CEIC), and the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES).	y/n	n	54	--	Sec. 8.4.15	Section 8.4.15 describes the data stored in the data management system. However, it is not apparent that these data are in a format compatible with the State databases. Therefore it does not meet this criterion.	n

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Finance				Overall Standard Sufficient		Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Include a programmatic level (i.e. general) plan for implementation and financing of identified projects and programs* including the following:	y/n	y	21	§10541.(e)(8)	Sec. 8.5		y
List known, as well as, possible funding sources, programs, and grant opportunities for the development and ongoing funding of the IRWM Plan.	y/n	y	21		Sec 8.5.1 & Table 8.5		y
List the funding mechanisms, including water enterprise funds, rate structures, and private financing options, for projects that implement the IRWM Plan.	y/n	y	21		Sec 8.5.2, 8.5.3, 8.5.4 & Table 8.6		y
An explanation of the certainty and longevity of known or potential funding for the IRWM Plan and projects that implement the Plan.	y/n	y	21		Table 8.5 & 8.6		y
An explanation of how operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for projects that implement the IRWM Plan would be covered and the certainty of operation and maintenance funding.	y/n	y	21		Sec 8.5 & Table 8.6		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Technical Analysis					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Document the data and technical analyses that were used in the development of the plan *	y/n	y	22	--	Sec 8.6 & Appendix 3		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

DRAFT

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Water Planning					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Identify a list of local water plans used in the IRWM plan	y/n	y	22		Table 8.9		y
Discuss how the plan relates to these other planning documents and programs	y/n	y	22	§10540.(b)	Table 8.9 & Section 8.7		y
Describe the dynamics between the IRWM plan and other planning documents	y/n	y	22		Table 8.10 & Section 8.7		y
Describe how the RWMG will coordinate its water mgmt planning activities	y/n	y	58		Sec 8.7, 8.8.2 & 8.8.8		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Land Use Planning					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Document current relationship between local land use planning, regional water issues, and water management objectives	y/n	y	22/59 - 62	--	Sections 8.8.2 through 8.8.8		y
Document future plans to further a collaborative, proactive relationship between land use planners and water managers	y/n	y	22/59 - 62	--	Sec 8.8.9		y

DRAFT

IRWM Plan Standard: Stakeholder Involvement					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Contain a public process that provides outreach and opportunity to participate in the IRWM plan *	y/n	y	22/63	§10541.(g)	Sec 2.3		y
Identify process to involve and facilitate stakeholders during development and implementation of plan regardless of ability to pay; include barriers to involvement *	y/n	y	64	§10541.(h) (2)	Sections 2.2.1, 2.2.3 & 2.3		y
Discuss involvement of DACs and tribal communities in the IRWM planning effort	y/n	y	23	--	Sec 2.3		y
Describe decision-making process and roles that stakeholders can occupy	y/n	y	23	--	Sec 2.2.3		y
Discuss how stakeholders are necessary to address objectives and RMS	y/n	n	23	--	Sec 2.3 & 2.6		y
Discuss how a collaborative process will engage a balance in interest groups	y/n	y	23	--	Sec 2.10		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Coordination					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency	Sufficient	
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Identify the process to coordinate water management projects and activities of participating local agencies and stakeholders to avoid conflicts and take advantage of efficiencies *	y/n	y	23/65	§10541.(e)(13)	Sec. 8.9.1		y
Identify neighboring IRWM efforts and ways to cooperate or coordinate, and a discussion of any ongoing water management conflicts with adjacent IRWM efforts	y/n	y	23/65	--	Sec. 3.15 & 8.9.2		y
Identify areas where a state agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of IRWM Plan components, processes, and projects, or where State or federal regulatory decisions are required before implementing the projects.	y/n	y	23	--	Sec. 8.9.2 & 8.9.3		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Climate Change				Overall Standard Sufficient		Yes	
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Evaluate IRWM region's vulnerabilities to climate change and potential adaptation responses based on vulnerabilities assessment in the DWR Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning *	y/n	y	23/66 - 73	Climate Change Handbook vulnerability assessment: http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/CCHandbook.cfm ; November 2012 Guidelines Legislative and Policy Context, p. 66 §10541.(e)(11)	Ch. 3.6.2; Tables 3.7, 5.4, & 8.10		y
Provide a process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives *	y/n	y	23/68		Ch. 6.3.1, Tables 6.1 & 7.2, Appendices 5-B & 5-C		y
Include a list of prioritized vulnerabilities based on the vulnerability assessment and the IRWM's decision making process.	y/n	y	23/66 - 73		Ch. 3.6.3; Tables 3.8 and 5.4		y
Contain a plan, program, or methodology for further data gathering and analysis of prioritized vulnerabilities	y/n	y	23/66 - 73		Section 3.6.4, p.61; section 8.3.7, p.11; section 8.4.1, p.13-14; section 8.9.2 (p.41) & 8.9.3 (p.42-3rd bullet point)	No data gaps and information needs were identified for climate change, though one element found in Ch. 8 could easily be integrated into Ch. 3.6.4 - the plan to coordinate with other regions to explore and collaborate on regional climate change concerns (as identified in Table 8.2). There are several existing climate change studies underway for Santa Barbara County supported by some of the same member agencies of the RWMG that could easily be highlighted in the Plan to link data gaps with some of the prioritized vulnerabilities for SLR and ecosystem habitats (example includes the Santa Barbara Area Coastal Vulnerability Assessment involving the Cities of Santa Barbara, Carpinteria, Goleta, and County of Santa Barbara and the associated studies to support this assessment).	n
Include climate change as part of the project review process	y/n	y	23/68		Sec 6.3.2, Table 6.1 & Appendices 5-B & 5-C		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

Regulatory Citation	Link	Notes
IRWM Prop 84 and 1E Guidelines	http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/docs/Guidelines/GL_2012_FINAL.pdf	DWR November 2012 Guidelines - Final
CWC §10539	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10532-10539	
CWC §10540, §10541	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10540-10543	
CWC §10543	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10540-10543	
PRC §75026, §75028, CWP Update 2009, and California Watershed Portal	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=prc&group=75001-76000&file=75020-75029.5	The Department of Water Resources shall give preference to proposals that satisfy the criteria specified in PRC §75026.(b)(1). §75028.(a) - the department shall defer to approved local project selection, and review projects only for consistency with the purposes of Section 75026.
	http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/cwpu2009/index.cfm	2009 California Water Plan Volumes I and II
	http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/watershedportal/Pages/Index.aspx	California Watershed Portal
§10541. (e)(3)	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10540-10543	