

Stakeholder Comments on Draft StreamWISE Projects Weighting and Scoring Criteria

The following stakeholder comments were considered in finalizing the final Weighting and Scoring Criteria, and will be used to move forward with the completion of the technical analysis and project rankings. The final Weighting and Scoring Criteria are available on the StreamWISE website at www.zone7water.com/streamwise, or by calling Carol Mahoney at (925) 454-5064.

Stakeholder	Comment
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	Make the provision of flood control benefit a screening criteria rather than a scoring criteria for this phase of project selection (i.e. - if project does not provide flood control it is not considered at all); if there were projects that were being considered for their benefit as environmental mitigation they should be tied, in some way, to specific flood control improvements under consideration
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	Provide some definition of 'critical facilities' under A
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	Re-evaluate the scores under A to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o providing equal weight to residential and commercial property o remove distinction between commercial/industrial and commercial o ideally, it is suggested that any 'developed' property other than 'critical facilities' be weighted equally and that some other gradation be used to distinguish these if necessary (otherwise, consider only providing a score of 4 to developed properties and provide no score to 2 and 3)
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	Provide some definition or means of determining when a project is not 'constructible' (the continuum of scoring is very subjective)
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	Provide some definition or means of determining when a project is not 'permissible' (see not on subjectivity above)
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	The penalty for partnerships and phasing may be too steep; particularly for smaller projects (a small project that can be easily implemented and that has other ancillary benefits should not lose all points simply because it has a partner or cannot be phased)
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	J, G and N appear at odds with one another (under one criteria it appears as if projects are being rewarded for partnerships and then penalized under another); it may be possible to perform some consolidation among these three as well
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	F and K appear to overlap in some respect; K may not be required
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	As with others previously noted, O is very subjective
James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park	Suggests streamlining the number of categories and providing a higher level of definition between scores so that ambiguity is removed.

Stakeholder Comments on Draft StreamWISE Projects Weighting and Scoring Criteria

The following stakeholder comments were considered in finalizing the final Weighting and Scoring Criteria, and will be used to move forward with the completion of the technical analysis and project rankings. The final Weighting and Scoring Criteria are available on the StreamWISE website at www.zone7water.com/streamwise, or by calling Carol Mahoney at (925) 454-5064.

Stakeholder	Comment
Alameda County Water District	It is our understanding from Series 1, 2 and 3 meetings that Zone 7 embraces interagency partnerships and regional planning. With this understanding we feel that the scoring matrix could benefit from some clarity. Specifically the scoring on G and N. To the casual reader these terms seem to contradict each other and we believe the intent of Item G is misrepresented. We hope during the scoring process – particularly early on when the number of projects to score is vast – that a project with potentially strong interagency support is not inadvertently penalized with 0 out of 10 pts because it “requires partnerships.”
Alameda County Water District	Line Item C - “Implementation of projects benefit to other downstream projects” : Unclear as to whether this is limited to projects within the StreamWISE purview or if it is positively scored for projects that have benefits outside of Zone 7’s region
Alameda County Water District	Line Item K - "Project can be implemented with minimal institutional review and approvals" : This reads as if it should appear under “Implementability” rather than under “Other Issues”
Alameda County Water District	While we do not wish to edit or comment on Zone 7’s weighting and scoring, as a downstream agency we hope that we will be given an opportunity to comment on the individual projects to ensure that all opportunities for inter-agency cooperation are duly considered in the process.
East Bay Regional Parks	As presented in the Series 3 Meeting StreamWISE Project Update to the stakeholders on November 15, 2007, the 24 projects which will be evaluated further include close to ten projects which reference “Ancillary Projects” referencing public access on recreational regional trail corridors, extending the system of trails, and providing new linkages and connectivity between existing trails. Due to the prominence of the projects which can provide key trail development, such as gap closures and trail connectivity on a regional basis, it would be important to ensure that a reference to trails are included in the Primary Objective criteria, so the public understands that this popular component is included. An example would be in yellow “Objective D, Project provides environmental benefit and/or mitigation credit”. It would be appropriate to add trail development to the definition of an ‘environmental benefit’ as the inclusion of a trail and its use in turn reduces vehicle emissions and impacts on air quality.
East Bay Regional Parks	Under Other Issues criteria in green, re: “J-Provide ancillary benefits” it would be helpful to add the word trails as an example in parenthesis such as (i.e. recreational and non-motorized transportation trails).
East Bay Regional Parks	Under M and N, it would be helpful to have a reference to trails and/or a clear definition of what potential ancillary projects are, although it’s clearer on the website List of Key Projects Recommended for Further Analysis and Potential Near-Term Implementation.
East Bay Regional Parks	It would help the reader understand the trail components of a project if the trail-related terminology was consistent between projects for simplicity.

Stakeholder Comments on Draft StreamWISE Projects Weighting and Scoring Criteria

The following stakeholder comments were considered in finalizing the final Weighting and Scoring Criteria, and will be used to move forward with the completion of the technical analysis and project rankings. The final Weighting and Scoring Criteria are available on the StreamWISE website at www.zone7water.com/streamwise, or by calling Carol Mahoney at (925) 454-5064.

Stakeholder	Comment
City of Livermore	We agree that projects meeting the "Primary Objectives" such as protecting critical facilities should be rated highest with "Implementability" rated next highest and then "Other Issues".
City of Livermore	Under "Implementability" and under "Other Issues" the City would like to see more credit given to a project that has multiple partners who are coordinated, hold an agreement or other mechanism that allows for funding and implementation of a project than those with multiple partners who are not yet coordinated.
City of Livermore	We would like to see more credit given to a project that has land dedicated for the project through an agreement or other means even if the land needed for the project is held by multiple owners