

# Overview of Grant and Current Status

## Grant Review:

- DWR Final Guidelines and PSP Issued on 12/17
- BWD is eligible applicant. WM is ineligible.
  - WM and other Interested Parties can propose component projects of the Grant application
- Pass thru funding from BWD to WM for WM's implementation of projects is allowed via agreement identifying Projects & Responsibilities
- Grant Submittal Deadline Extended to **February 18, 2022** (submit ASAP)
- DWR prefers submission of Spending Plan around **January 31, 2022** (in advance of Grant submission)
  - Spending Plan of \$10M is requested
- DWR expected approvals and issuance of funding Spring 2022
  - Agreements between BWD, WM and IPs will be required

# Overview of Grant and Current Status

## Current Efforts Underway:

- BWD, Dudek, Wylie Coordinating Project Descriptions from Local Eligible Organizations
  - **Tasks:** Review Project Ideas, Consolidate When Appropriate, Create Project Descriptions
  - **Local Organizations:** ABF, ABNHA, BVEF, Stewardship Council, Tubb Canyon, School District, UC Irvine
- BWD & WM Coordinating Project Descriptions + Scopes
  - **Goals / Tasks:** Avoid Duplication, Discuss Scope of Work, Assign Work to Most Qualified/Applicable to Responsibilities

# Current Projects Under Consideration/Development

<p>Monitoring and Reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater Production Monitoring</li> <li>• Groundwater Level Monitoring</li> <li>• Groundwater Quality Monitoring</li> <li>• Aquifer Tests</li> <li>• Surface Water Monitoring</li> <li>• Database Management</li> <li>• Reporting (DWR Annual Report, CASGEM, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p>Water Education Projects</p>	<p>Christmas Circle Soil Amendment + Irrigation Upgrade</p>	<p>Water Conservation / Audit Related Certification Program</p>	<p>Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands</p>
	<p>Turf Conversion at High School Football Field</p>	<p>Well Field Solar and Battery Installation</p>	<p>WWTP Monitoring Wells</p>	<p>Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI)</p>
	<p>GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring</p>	<p>*Turf Conversion/ Irrigation efficiency for golf courses/Ag</p>	<p>GDE Monitoring and Enhancement (Mesquite Forest Area)</p>	<p>Well Abandonment + Monitoring Well(s) Construction</p>

**\*Still unknown:** Can projects occurring on private property be included? Awaiting response from DWR.

# Overview of Grant and Current Status

## Upcoming Milestones:

- **Ongoing:** Continue with Development of Project Descriptions for Jan. 17 Submittal
- **01/11/22:** BWD Board Discuss Project Review Committee (PRC)
  - Identify Key Considerations and Explore Options:
    - Composition
    - Individual or Group Voting
    - Proponent Score Its Project(s)
    - Others?
- **01/11 - 01/17:** Special meetings may be required to finalize PRC process + composition
  - WM input requested on key considerations
- **01/17/22:** Deadline for Submission of IP Project Descriptions to Dudek
- **01/18/22:** Begin Orientation of PRC Members on or before Jan. 18

# Review Procedural Order of Operations

- **Call for projects** (currently underway)
- **Project Ranking Effort**
  - On **January 18, 2022**, the PRC will meet to discuss all the completed Project submittal
  - On or around **January 24, 2022**, the PRC will meet again to review the scoring and submit to the BWD Boards
- **Project Selection**
  - Projects that score and rank the highest in alignment with DWR's PSP and the Basin's needs and are most competitive and will be included in the Grant Application (up to \$10M)
- **Submission of Spending Plan** to DWR (goal of) **January 31** [Still unknown: estimated total of SP]
- **Grant Application Development**
- **Submission of Grant Application** to DWR by **February 18**

# PRC + Project Scoring and Ranking Criteria

- *Some* guidance on development of PRC provided in PSP, page 16
- Proposed PRC candidates should be qualified to objectively score projects
- PRC will conduct self-eval of projects using scoring criteria outlined in Table 7
- On **January 18** the PRC will meet to discuss all the completed Project submittals
- Evaluation criteria will be provided to each entity that has submitted a Project
- The PRC will discuss how to score and rank the Projects in accordance with the set of quantitative evaluation criteria
- The individual Project Ranking and Scoring forms **must be filled out** and **returned to BWD on January 21, 2022**
- On or around **January 24, 2022**, the PRC will meet again to review the scoring and prepare to submit to the BWD Boards
- **Soon after January 24**, BWD, WM, and all IPs will be informed of final project selection. Development of “official” grant application begins based on final project selection.

# Scoring Criteria: Table 7 in PSP

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria					
Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
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"> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	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 - Imp 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"> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.</li> </ul>	4	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign 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	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"> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</li> </ul>	3	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/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 benefiting areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</li> </ul>	3	3 - Projects 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	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	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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	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	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-