

SGMA Implementation Grant Overview

Anticipated Solicitation Period: October – December 2022

Grant amounts: \$1 million - \$20 million

Total potentially available: \$204.5 (\$17m of that for San Joaquin only). Grant mgr suggests ranking our requests.

Match Requirement: None for Disadvantaged Communities

Anticipated Grant Period: Summer 2023 to 2027

Eligible Project Types:

1. **Recharge/Conjunctive Use** - Development of groundwater recharge projects with surface water, stormwater, recycled water, and other conjunctive use projects.
2. **Contamination Clean-up** - Projects that prevent or clean up contamination of groundwater that serve as a source of drinking water (Public Resources Code § 80146(a)).
3. **Water use Efficiency/Supply Reliability** - Projects and programs that support water supply reliability, water conservation, and water use efficiency and water banking, exchange, and reclamation.
4. **Recharge/Floodplain/Habitat investigation** - Geophysical investigation(s) of groundwater basins to identify recharge potential; early implementation of existing regional flood management plans that incorporate groundwater recharge; or projects that would complement efforts of a local GSP, that provide for floodplain expansion to benefit groundwater recharge or habitat.
5. **Revisions, updates, and/or modifications to a GSP** - The Project or Component must fill known data gaps and address comments received from DWR after its review of a submitted GSP, if received. If the applicant has not received comments from DWR on their GSP, the Project or Component must be consistent with SGMA regulations and GSP requirements.

Eligible projects can include planning and implementation for projects included in the GSP.

Must demonstrate that the projects contribute to addressing the risks in the region to water supply and water infrastructure arising from climate change.

Important notes on using grant funds for private-owner projects (e.g., irrigation efficiency improvements):

- **Access/Operation & Maintenance Requirements** - In general, anything on private property must come with a lien on the property, an access agreement, or an easement for the Grantee to provide O&M on whatever the state/grant funds for a minimum of 15 years. Irrigation normally does not have a 15-year lifespan and would require the landowner or the Grantee to replace/repair if it breaks down during that timeframe. Which is also why the Grantee must maintain access to the property.
- **Public benefit** - It cannot be just a private landowner benefitting from the activity. We would have to demonstrate in the application that by private ranchers improving their irrigation the rest of the basin is benefitting.




Grant Program Manager offered to review proposed project list to help strengthen, so *time is of the essence.*

Scoring/Evaluation Criteria Notes – The scoring tables are on the following pages.

- Each component will be scored separately; then an average taken. So, one weak component can hurt.
- Be clear about quantifiable benefits. Outreach/engagement. Small water systems, domestic well owners, human right to water (7 out of the 30 points).

Evaluation/Scoring Criteria

Please note that the review questions outlined in Table 7 may be reworded, combined, or separated. SGM Grant Program staff may make clarifying or editorial changes to the scoring criteria following approval. SGM Grant Program staff may also make changes to Table 7 depending upon language outlined in future appropriations and legislative requirements. **Table 7 is subject to change depending on the final preparations of the review questionnaire.** No substantive changes will be made to the evaluation criteria and scoring scheme.

TABLE 7 – APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA				
Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance
General 	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 – Fully addressed 3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 – Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 – Marginally addressed 0 – Not addressed
General Implementation Only 	2- Imp	Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4- At least three quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents, 3 – Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents, 2 – Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supporting documents, 1 – One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents, 0 – Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified,
General Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 – Fully addressed 3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 – Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 – Marginally addressed 0 – Not addressed
General 	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 – Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project or Component 2 – Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 – Marginally addressed 0 – Not addressed
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 – Provided and all necessary information provided 1 – Provided but missing some information 0 – Not provided

General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • <i>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3- Project benefits an SDAC(s) • 2- Project benefits Underrepresented Community • 1 – Project partially benefits either • 0 – Project does not benefit either
★ General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board’s SAFER Program?	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – Fully addressed • 2 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear • 1 – Marginally addressed • 0 – Not addressed
★ General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 – Fully addressed • 3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear • 2 – Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear • 1 – Marginally addressed • 0 – Not addressed
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • <i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – Fully addressed • 2 – Mostly addressed • 1 – Marginally addressed • 0 – Not addressed
Budget	9	Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include costs expended on projects before grant agreement date. • <i>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible • 2 – Budget is consistent and feasible • 1 – Budget is consistent but not feasible • 0 – Not consistent and feasible
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 – Consistent and feasible • 0 – Not consistent and feasible
		Total Range of Possible Points	0-30	
		(a) Average of Questions 1 – 8 for Multiple Component Applications		
		(b) Total Score for Questions 9 and 10		
		Total Points Overall Project:		
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED:		\$