

**Appendix F**  
**Project Evaluation Scoring Sheet**

DRAFT



**RWA Watersheds Climate Resilience Plan  
Project Screening & Prioritization Scoring Matrix**

<b>Project Title:</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>

Standard Scoring Scale	Score
Does not address the criterion	0
Indirect, minor, or uncertain contribution	1
Clear, moderate contribution	2
Strong, direct, and well-documented contribution	3

**How to Use**

- Each criterion is scored 0–3 based on documented evidence.
- Criteria can be weighted depending on funding source or decision context.
- Scores support comparative prioritization, not permanent ranking.

**A. Climate Hazard Sensitivity Drivers Addressed (0–21 points)**

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
A1. Warming & extreme heat	0	Reduces heat exposure for people, ecosystems, or infrastructure
A2. Snowpack loss & declining water availability	0	Improves reliability under reduced snowpack/runoff
A3. Shift from snow to rain & runoff timing	0	Increases flexibility under altered timing
A4. Increased water demand	0	Reduces demand or diversifies supply
A5. Intense storms & flashier hydrographs	0	Reduces flood risk or improves storm response
A6. More frequent/severe droughts	0	Improves drought preparedness or recovery
A7. Increased wildfire risk	0	Reduces fire risk or post-fire watershed impacts
<b>Subtotal A:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 21

**B. Ecological Capacity Drivers Addressed (0–6 points)**

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
B1. Forest health	0	Improves resilience, reduces fire severity, supports hydrology
B2. Habitat & ecosystem function	0	Restores connectivity, flow, temperature, or biodiversity
<b>Subtotal B:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 6

**C. Socioeconomic Capacity Drivers Addressed (0–9 points)**

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
C1. Community & economic resilience	0	Protects essential services, livelihoods, or public health
C2. Upper watershed agricultural vulnerability	0	Improves water reliability or adaptive capacity
C3. Land use & development pressures	0	Reduces climate exposure tied to growth patterns
<b>Subtotal C:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 9

**D. Built Infrastructure Capacity Drivers Addressed (0–15 points)**

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
D1. Aging & fragile infrastructure	0	Reduces failure risk or improves reliability
D2. Folsom Reservoir operational constraints	0	Improves operational flexibility
D3. Limited reservoir storage capacity	0	Adds storage or functional substitutes
D4. Reservoir operational tradeoffs	0	Reduces flood/supply/ecosystem conflicts
D5. Levee system fragility	0	Improves flood protection or levee performance
<b>Subtotal D:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 15

**E. Implementation Readiness & Feasibility (0–12 points)**

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
E1. Technical feasibility	0	Proven or low-risk approach
E2. Permitting & regulatory readiness	0	Path identified; minimal barriers
E3. Institutional capacity	0	Lead agency and partners identified
E4. Schedule readiness	0	Can advance in near- or mid-term
<b>Subtotal E:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 12

**F. Funding Alignment & Equity (0–12 points)**

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
F1. Alignment with climate funding priorities	0	Matches state/federal criteria
F2. Equity & vulnerable community benefit	0	Benefits high-vulnerability areas
F3. Multi-benefit outcomes	0	Addresses multiple objectives
F4. Cost-effectiveness & scalability	0	Efficient and expandable
<b>Subtotal F:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 12

**G. Alignment with Adaptation Actions (0–9 points)**

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
G1. Direct linkage to adaptation actions	0	Explicitly implements one or more adopted adaptation actions
G2. Strength of strategic fit	0	Core project purpose advances adaptation intent (not incidental)
G3. Multi-action integration	0	Advances multiple adaptation actions or cross-sector strategies
<b>Subtotal G:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 9

### H. Community & Institutional Support (0–15 points)

Metric	Score (0–3)	Scoring Guidance
H1. Community support or benefit recognition		Clear local benefit; support expressed or anticipated
H2. Stakeholder engagement readiness		Engagement plan identified; key stakeholders engaged
H3. Multi-agency coordination		Requires and supports coordination across agencies/jurisdictions
H4. Partnership readiness		Partners identified; roles understood
H5. Leverages existing programs or investments	0	Builds on ongoing initiatives, infrastructure, or operations
<b>Subtotal H:</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 15

### TOTAL SCORE SUMMARY

Category	Points	
A. Climate Hazard Sensitivity	0	/ 21
B. Ecological Capacity	0	/ 6
C. Socioeconomic Capacity	0	/ 9
D. Built Infrastructure Capacity	0	/ 15
E. Implementation Readiness	0	/ 12
F. Funding Alignment & Equity	0	/ 12
G. Adaptation Action Alignment	0	/ 9
H. Community & Institutional Support	0	/ 15
<b>TOTAL Score</b>	<b>0</b>	/ 99

### Criteria Relative Weights

Category	Weights	
A. Climate Hazard Sensitivity	1	
B. Ecological Capacity	1	
C. Socioeconomic Capacity	1	
D. Built Infrastructure Capacity	1	
E. Implementation Readiness	1	
F. Funding Alignment & Equity	1	
G. Adaptation Action Alignment	1	
H. Community & Institutional Support	1	
<b>TOTAL Weights</b>	<b>8</b>	

<b>TOTAL Weighted Score</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Priority Tier</b>	Not competitive at this time	

### Priority Tiers

Priority Classification	Total Score
High priority	80–99
Medium priority	60–79
Lower priority	40–59
Not competitive at this time	< 40