

Appendix I - Disadvantaged Communities Scoring Tiers

DATE: January 22, 2013

TO: Merced Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Regional Advisory Committee

FROM: Patti Dossetti, Bill Spriggs, & Gene Barrera

SUBJECT: Alternative Disadvantaged Communities Scoring Tiers for IRWM Plan Ranking

BACKGROUND:

As discussed in the Regional Advisory Committee meeting October 23, 2012, we volunteered to examine the matter of the proposed Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) scoring tiers for use in priority ranking in the Merced Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP).

The intent of the DAC score is to give weight to projects benefitting the Merced IRWM's more disadvantaged communities. The Regional Advisory Committee has determined that the DAC score will represent 9.61% of a project's total in the local ranking process.

DISCUSSION:

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) definition of a DAC is a community with an annual Median Household Income (MHI) that is less than 80 percent of California's MHI; the 80 percent figure is \$48,706. DWR also advises that determining a community's MHI should be based on 5-year American Community Survey data.

The American Community Survey's ability to accurately reflect the economic characteristics of the Merced IRWM's communities is debatable.

Therefore, we examined other methods that are both defensible and replicable in future years when ranking projects from the Merced IRWM area.

At the November 27 meeting of the Regional Advisory Committee, we presented the following potential alternatives by which to weight our projects for DAC benefit:

- A. Unemployment Rate averaged over 5 years, reported in the 2006-2010 American Community Survey
- B. Unemployment Rate in 2011, reported by the CA Employment Development Department
- C. Median Household Income reported in the 2005-2010 American Community Survey, analyzed by Geographic Information Systems staff and utilizing block-group level data
- D. Combine Alternatives A, B and C
- E. No Action
- F. Some other method, as proposed by the Regional Advisory Committee

We were directed by the Regional Advisory Committee to undertake Alternative D. The outcome of this analysis is presented on the last page of this document.

Page 2
Alternative DAC Scoring Tiers for IRWM Plan Ranking
January 22, 2013

We appreciate the Regional Advisory Committee's willingness to review our efforts to assure that our region's Disadvantaged Communities are accurately identified in our Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.

Utilizing multiple data sets that reflect our region's economic characteristics has strengthened our conclusions. If there are questions regarding our analysis, we can arrange a meeting to describe our methodology in more detail.

We would especially like to acknowledge Merced County Association of Governments for their Geographic Information Systems analysis, and even providing maps showing the locations of our most disadvantaged neighborhoods within each community. We will make these maps available for posting on the Merced IRWMP web site.

SUGGESTED ACTION:

1. Adopt the proposed Disadvantaged Scoring Tier method which combines unemployment and median household income data
2. Take no action

Page 3
Alternative DAC Scoring Tiers for IRWM Plan Ranking
January 22, 2013

Area	Original	Alternative A		Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D	Proposed DAC Scoring Tier
	Median Household Income Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey	Unemployment Rate Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey	Rank	Unemployment Rate 2011 Source: CA Employment Dev Dept	Rank	Median Household Income Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey * GIS Analysis by Block Group	Rank	Rank Average	
Planada	\$35,880	19.4%	1	39.3%	1	\$31,137	1	1	100 points
Winton	\$29,586	18.2%	2	26.2%	3	\$35,370	2	2.3	
Le Grand	\$35,694	14.6%	5	29.3%	2	\$35,417	3	3.3	
El Nido	\$29,115	19.4%	1	Not Reported	-	\$46,420	8	4.5	
Livingston	\$46,198	17.5%	3	21.0%	4	\$46,791	9	5.3	75 points
Merced	\$36,269	13.1%	6	18.1%	6	\$40,110	4	5.3	
Atwater	\$42,226	14.7%	4	18.6%	5	\$46,263	7	5.3	
Franklin	\$52,748	12.0%	7	Not Reported	-	\$42,370	5	6	50 points
Snelling	\$13,899	10.3%	8	Not Reported	-	\$45,081	6	7	
Stevinson	\$110,284	4.9%	9	Not Reported	-	\$49,018	10	9	

** Geographic Information System Analysis performed by Natalia Austin of MCAG and Gene Barrera of UC Merced's Dept of Planning, Design & Construction*