

# American, Bear, and Cosumnes Watersheds Resilience Plan

## Project Screening & Prioritization Scoring Matrix

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 to 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 to 21 points)

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

### B. Ecological Capacity Drivers Addressed (0 to 6 points)

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

### C. Socioeconomic Capacity Drivers Addressed (0 to 9 points)

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

### D. Built Infrastructure Capacity Drivers Addressed (0 to 15 points)

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

### E. Implementation Readiness & Feasibility (0 to 12 points)

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

### F. Funding Alignment & Equity (0 to 12 points)

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

### G. Alignment with Adaptation Actions (0 to 9 points)

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

**H. Community & Institutional Support (0 to 15 points)**

Metric	Score (0 to 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 to 99
Medium priority	60 to 79
Lower priority	40 to 59
Not competitive at this time	Less than 40