

DWR Sustainable Groundwater Management (SGM) Grant Program
SGMA Implementation Round 1

These are draft guidelines with a public comment period that ends 11/29/21 for SGMA Implementation Round 1. This is a non-competitive funding opportunity for all critically over drafted subbasins with approximately \$7.6 Million per subbasin.

Funding can be used for:

- Activities and/or tasks that consist of the development of groundwater recharge projects with surface water, stormwater, recycled water, and other conjunctive use projects;
- Projects that prevent or clean up contamination of groundwater that serve as a source of drinking water (Public Resources Code § 80146(a));
- Projects and programs that support water supply reliability, water conservation, and water use efficiency and water banking, exchange, and reclamation;
- Revisions, updates, and/or modifications to a GSP or Alternative.

Minimum of \$3.7 million must go to:

- Geophysical investigation(s) of groundwater basins to identify recharge potential (e.g., AEM surveys);
- 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.

Additional requirements:

- 1/31/22 noon deadline to submit funding plan in DWR template.
- Only 1 application per subbasin, letter of support needed from each GSA in the basin.
- Must comply with Delta Plan
- **Authorizing resolution needed from applicant.

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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i> 	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	2	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"> <i>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.</i> 	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	3	Does the proposal demonstrate the goals, objectives, and needs of the proposed Project or Component and how the proposed Project or Component meet those?	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	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</i> 	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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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?	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 – Fully addressed 1 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 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?	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

Agenda Item 4 - SGMA Implementation Round 1 Grant Opportunity

General	8	Did the applicant contact the California Conservation Corp (CCC) to obtain their service for the Project or Component and provide the emailed response from the CCC within the backup documentation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain points, a full response from the CCC must be required. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 – Contacted the CCC and using their services 1 – Contacted the CCC, included response from CCC, but not using their services 0 – Did not contact the CCC or does not demonstrate they were contacted
Scope of Work	9	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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 – Fully addressed 2 – Mostly addressed 1 – Marginally addressed 0 – Not addressed
Budget	10	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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	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	11	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 – 9 for Multiple Component Applications				
(b) Total Score for Questions 10 and 11				
Total Points Overall Project:				
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED:				\$

- Depending on the COD Basin, the applicants should develop a project review committee that are responsible for completing a self-evaluation for a project using the scoring criteria outlined in Table 7. The project review committee should include a representative for each entity within a GSA, a representative from each GSA within the basin if there are multiple GSAs, a representative from each entity within an approved Alternative, and/or another method where all interested parties have an equal vote.
- The project review committee can either develop one consensus scoring self-evaluation for each project; complete an independent scoring criterion and then use the average as the final score; have one entity that is not related to the project to conduct an independent review of another entities project and have that one score as the final; or another un-biased review process predetermined by the GSA(s) or entities with an approved Alternative. The scoring criteria Excel table is provided on the SGM Grant Program’s website at, www.water.ca.gov/sgmgrants. This scoring criteria should be used as it is and cannot be edited in any way. Any applications who have edited the scoring criteria will be thrown out and not awarded any grant funds.
- Once the final score(s) is obtained for each project, the projects should be ranked based upon the scoring criteria and listed highest to lowest.
- If the project review committee determine that a lower scoring projects should be higher on the list due to available funding, accessibility to the site, already completed environmental/permitting/design, then the project review committee must be responsible for fully documenting and justifying why a lower ranking project was included within the Spending Plan versus a higher ranking project.

DRAFT -- FY23 Budget Estimate

11/2/2021

DRAFT SLDMWA SGMA Coordination Committee Budget	
Fiscal Year 2023	
Legal	
Outside Counsel* - <i>placeholder to be refined</i>	\$ 14,400
Other Professional Services	
GSP Implementation Contracts	
Coordinated Annual Report Activities (Common Chapter, Water Level Contouring)	\$ 30,000
DMS Hosting, Augmentation and Support	\$ 10,000
Staff Augmentation Support (Provost & Pritchard)	\$ 26,151
Proposition 68 Grant Administration	
Component 1 (Grant Administration)**	\$ 10,000
Placeholder - Response to DWR Comments	\$ 10,000
Placeholder - DWR SGM Implementation Round 1 Grant	TBD - SPA
<i>Contracts Subtotal</i>	\$ 86,151
Other	
In-house Salary and Benefits	
Executive Director	\$ 2,341
General Counsel	\$ 4,137
Water Policy Director	\$ 4,057
Water Resources Program Manager	\$ 43,561
SCADA Engineer	\$ -
Accountant	\$ 4,142
Hydrotech 3	\$ -
Other Professional Services	\$ -
License & Continuing Education	\$ 500
Conferences & Training	\$ 10,000
Travel/Mileage	\$ 10,000
Group Meetings	\$ 1,000
Office Space	\$ 500
Telephone	\$ 2,500
Equipment and Tools	\$ 8,350
Vehicle	\$ -
Software	\$ 7,349
<i>Total Direct Expenditures</i>	\$ 198,988
<i>Administrative Expenditures</i>	\$ -

TOTAL EXPENDITURES **\$ 198,988**

Notes:

1 - Unrestricted. Requires Management Committee Action/Approval for use. Regular Reporting on Status of Funds.

2 - Unrestricted. Pertinent use includes grant applications, engineering support, and litigation reserve.

* - Cost not to exceed without Committee authorization

//* - Cost to be allocated by beneficiary.

FY22 SGMA Coordination Committee Budget - for comparison purposes

SLDMWA SGMA Coordination Committee Budget	
Fiscal Year 2022	
<u>Legal</u>	
Outside Counsel*	\$ 4,000
<u>Other Professional Services</u>	
GSP Implementation Contracts	
Coordinated Annual Report Activities (Common Chapter, Water Level Contouring)	\$ 10,500
DMS Hosting, Augmentation and Support	\$ 14,943
Staff Augmentation Support (Provost & Pritchard)	\$ 19,941
Proposition 68 Grant Administration	
Component 1 (Grant Administration)**	\$ 30,000
Component 2 (Technical Assistance)***	\$ 45,000
Component 11 (Subsidence Characterization)****	\$ 85,000
<i>Contracts Subtotal</i>	\$ 205,384
<u>Other</u>	
In-house Salary and Benefits	
Executive Director	\$ 1,980
General Counsel	\$ 3,116
Water Policy Director	\$ 2,955
Water Resources Program Manager	\$ 34,571
SCADA Engineer	\$ -
Accountant	\$ 3,690
Hydrotech 3	\$ -
Other Professional Services	\$ -
License & Continuing Education	\$ -
Conferences & Training	\$ -
Travel/Mileage	\$ 2,000
Group Meetings	\$ 1,000
Office Space	\$ 500
Telephone	\$ 500
Equipment and Tools	\$ 1,000
Vehicle	\$ -
Software	\$ -
<i>Total Direct Expenditures</i>	\$ 260,695
<i>Administrative Expenditures</i>	\$ -
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 260,695

Notes:

1 - Unrestricted. Requires Management Committee Action/Approval for use. Regular Reporting on Status of Funds.

2 - Unrestricted. Pertinent use includes grant applications, engineering support, and litigation reserve.

* - Cost not to exceed without Committee authorization

/*/**** - Cost to be allocated by beneficiary.