



Shared Criteria Candidates for Kansas Water Plan Implementation – More work will be needed to develop these concepts (or others that may be suggested) into usable metrics.

These 6 criteria below are included in the bracket for a prioritization exercise.

Criterion Description: Why this may be helpful to consider in prioritizing investments.	Potential Metrics: How it could be measured/applied.
Cost-Effectiveness: Local Consult (LC) participants wanted the State to have a sustainable long-term investment strategy and measuring how cost-effective strategies allows for making decisions that maximize the value of investments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived or calculated benefit of the strategy divided by the total cost.
Economic Impact: LC participants identified clean, secure, accessible water as an economic necessity. It's important to account for positive or negative economic impact an investment or policy change may have on a region or the state.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forecasting changes in income, GDP or employment to create an economic score.
Number of Guiding Principles Impacted: LC participants asked for more “stackable programs,” which include investments that serve more than one guiding principle. This would emphasize getting more bang for our buck by prioritizing investments that serve more than one principle.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points based on the number of how many guiding principles the strategy significantly impacts.
Regional Partnership/Impact: This would incentivize communities and conservation districts working together to address more needs efficiently by prioritizing investments that strengthen regional resiliency by connecting water sources, addressing needs in multiple communities or providing more resources through partnerships.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points based on the number of communities or conservation districts served by an investment.
Resiliency: This would prioritize investments that will help the state withstand droughts, floods, or other threats and secure its water sources for future generations of Kansans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points based on the expected life cycle of the investment.
Stakeholder Input: LC participants emphasized that local input needed to play a role in decision-making. It's helpful to have the people most impacted by decision have a role in shaping it. This would prioritize investments based on stakeholder support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points for strategies identified as regional priorities at Local Consult, or Regional Advisory Committee (RAC input).

How were these 6 determined? These respond to input we received from summer Local Consult participants and the Kansas Water Authority. However, they are meant to be a starting point, not necessarily the top choices for your region. You have the opportunity to add choices to your group’s bracket, which could result in your group’s top choice. Options you may want to add to your bracket are provided on page 2, or you can write in a new criterion too.

Please note that these factors are considered before shared criteria would be applied, which is why they are not included in the bracket:

- Human Health/Safety needs are addressed.
- Federal/state requirements (compliance) met
- Funding obligations (bills) are met/paid
- Must serve Water Plan Guiding Principles

Below are options you may want to add to your bracket, or you can suggest others.

Criterion Description: Why this may be helpful to consider in prioritizing investments.	Potential Metrics: How it could be measured/applied.
<p>Community Demographics: Some communities have less resources available to address their water needs. This would give extra consideration for investments that serve disadvantage communities, which could mean those with smaller populations or those with lower socioeconomic statuses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points awarded for communities with populations below a certain number or those identified as disadvantaged communities as established by federal guidelines.
<p>Environmental Impact: This would prioritize investments based on their ability to prevent or to address environmental impacts such as water, air or soil pollution and those that address watershed and ecosystem health, and wildlife/habitat needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forecasting changes in ecosystem health, impaired surface/groundwater, carbon emissions or soil pollution.
<p>Geographic Balance: The Kansas Water Authority includes geographic balance as part of its budget recommendation guidelines. This could ensure that throughout the 10-year water plan program, water improvements/investments will occur in every region of the state.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing minimum investment levels to be received for each region throughout the 10-year program.
<p>Leverage Federal Funds: LC participants encouraged developing a funding strategy that was not too reliant on State funds only. This criterion would prioritize strategies or actions that can be paired with or unlock more federal funding to address more needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points awarded for the federal funding contribution.
<p>Limited Assistance Elsewhere: One of the advantages of a statewide program is it can account for service gaps at the local or federal level. This would consider addressing water needs or investing in areas which have no dedicated local or federal resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points awarded for investments where no existing resources are available.
<p>Local Contribution: Braiding local, state and federal funding can increase the amount of water needs addressed. Additionally, there are some issues that can be improved through changes in behavior. This would prioritize investment areas where local governments are able to contribute funds, resources or make meaningful changes to conserve water or improve water quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points applied for local funding contribution.
<p>Measurable Impact on Principle Progress: This would prioritize investments based on the amount of measurable progress can be achieve on a principle(s).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metrics tailored to each principle to determine whether it's a high, medium or low impact. More points given to "high impact" projects.
<p>Population Impacted: This would prioritize investments based on the number of Kansans who would benefit from them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points based on size of population served.
<p>Public-Private-Partnership: This would prioritize investments or strategies that leverage private sector or nonprofit contributions (financial/resources/actions.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points applied for the private sector or nonprofit contribution.