

NOTICE

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Monday, March 28, 2022 at 2:00 p.m.

**Board of Directors and Staff at the
Exeter Museum (upstairs)
125 S. B Street, Exeter, CA 93221**

COVID-19 Protocol – Via Remote Login is available at
Go to: www.Zoom.com and click “Join a Meeting” (top right)
Enter Meeting ID: 826 9549 4830 and then passcode 108685
Or call: 1-669-900-6833, then enter the Meeting ID and Passcode when prompted
If you have challenges getting on the remote meeting, text your name to 559-303-4150.

In accordance with the Governor’s Executive Orders (N-25-20 and N-29-20) the EKGSA Board of Director’s meeting can be held remotely. Individuals attending the physical meeting site are required to wear an appropriate facial barrier (face mask) and social distance (six feet apart). If members of the public have any problems connecting on the established electronic access, please contact the Lindmore Irrigation District office at 559-562-2534.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call by Secretary
2. Approve the Agenda
3. Pledge of Allegiance

ADOPTION OF ALTERNATIVE TELECONFERENCING REQUIREMENTS

Reconsideration and appropriate action regarding findings needed to utilize alternative teleconferencing requirements during a state of emergency pursuant to Government Code section 54953, as amended by Assembly Bill 361. The Board will be asked to determine that (a) the proclaimed state of emergency arising from COVID-19 continues to exist and (b) the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the Board members to meet safely in person.

4. Public Comment
5. **Minutes:** The Board will review and consider adopting the minutes provided by the Secretary from the February 28, 2022 Special Board meeting.
6. **Administration**
 - a. Accept County appointment to the EKGSA Board of Directors
 - b. Staffing Updates (Hagman)
 - c. **Prop 68: WCB-RCIS** – Update on status and activity (Hagman)
 - d. **Prop 68: Basin Planning Grant** – Update on status and activity (Hunter/Hagman)

- e. **Prop 68: Basin Implementation Grant (MKGSA Admin)** – Update and status on activity (Hagman)
- f. **Basin Implementation Grant (GKGSA Admin)** – Update (Hagman)
- g. **MALRP Grant (KDWCD Admin)** – Presentation on grant application (Hagman)

7. Groundwater Sustainability Plan Implementation:

- a. Technical Advisory Committee Report (Klinchuch, Hagman)
- b. Subbasin Report (Hagman): Annual Report, DMS, Modeling, Water Marketing (financial participation), Basin WaterDashboard, etc.
- c. GSP Implementation – Update to Board on Plan implementation (monitoring systems, projects, management actions)
 - Ad Hoc – LandIQ-ET (Hunter)
 - Monitoring Network (Hunter)
 - Stakeholder Input (Hunter)
 - Rules and Regulations Status (Hughes/Hagman)
 - Status and Work Progress on GSP “Incomplete” Designation (Klinchuch/Hagman)
 - Status of Projects/MA direction by Board (TAC/AC Role – Hagman)
- d. OTHER

8. Closed Session

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – POTENTIAL LITIGATION: [Government Code Section 54956.9 (d)(2)] - Number of Potential Cases: One

9. Schedule Next meeting – Next regularly scheduled meeting is April 25, 2022.

10. Adjournment



East Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency

MEMORANDUM TO THE BOARD

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Michael D. Hagman, Executive Director

DATE: March 24, 2022

SUBJECT: Staff Report for March 28 Special Board Meeting

6. ADMINISTRATION

b. WCB-RCIS Grant: We have received several comments back from the State regarding the document and are currently going through those mostly semantic issues and will be addressing the programmatic comments with the Steering Committee. The timeline for the completed document is mid to late September. All reporting and invoicing are on time.

c. Prop 68 Planning Grant: EKGSA is the administrator for this basin grant. We have completed (or nearly completed) two of the contemplated projects in the grant. Staff has submitted a modification to allow for replacement monitoring projects on Task #2 as well as an extension to the end of June. It appears to be moving forward and we expect to be fully complete on these new Task #2 projects by late May and reported fully by the end of June.

d. Prop 68 Implementation Grant: This grant is funding basin activities/projects. MKGSA is the applicator and grant recipient/sponsor. The two projects (LID-Mariposa Basin and LID-Lewis Creek Recharge) were approved because they were in the GSP and we could identify DAC benefits. Other projects in the EKGSA GSP did not identify significant DAC benefits. The two projects have 30% engineering work and budgets. Both projects have alternatives that can fit in the grant funding. EKGSA is reporting to MKGSA and keeping their administration of the grant on time.

e. Basin Implementation Grant: This grant's budget accompanies this document. The Grant is \$7.6 and has a couple million for EKGSA projects (was submitted on time, it is looking favorable for funding, GKGSA is the administrator of this grant).

f. MALRP (previously referred to as MBLRP): This grant is from Department of Conservation and could be as much as \$10m for the Kaweah Subbasin. It is being applied for by KDWCD and it is expected to be submitted on March 30. If awarded, the intent of the grant money would be to develop projects and programs that repurpose currently irrigated lands into multiple benefit properties (recharge facilities, habitat, solar farms, etc.). At the February meeting, the Board authorized support for the grant and signatory to an MOU with the other KSB GSAs and SRT (and any other partners that want to join) that will assist in management of those lands. Environmental Incentives is assisting the grant consultants regarding RCIS associated opportunities. Because we will soon have an RCIS, we are prepared to take on habitat projects. This helps us on the scoring in these grants.

7. GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION:

c. Rules and Regulations: At the February Board meeting, the Board directed staff to have the Proposed Allocation Rules and Regulations available to the public by March 11, 2022 close of business. Shortly after that Board meeting EKGSA staff sent out a notice to landowners that the Proposed Rules and Regulations (RnRs) will be available on the GSA website by March 11 COB and that the Board will consider adopting them at the April 25th regular board meeting. Those proposed RnRs will be attached with this document. We can have a discussion with Joe at the meeting. We are taking recommendations to the RnRs now and can have a discussion on them at the meeting too. You will consider accepting them at the April meeting.

**EAST KAWEAH GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

MINUTES FOR THE SPECIAL MEETING ON FEBRUARY 28, 2022

The East Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency (“EKGSA”) Board of Directors duly met for a Regular meeting on Monday, February 28, 2022, via video/phone conference and in person – COVID -19 protocol.

OPEN SESSION: Convened at 2:00 p.m. with a quorum.

1. **DIRECTORS PRESENT:** Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, George, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson

DIRECTORS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael Hagman, Executive Director; Chris Hunter, Program Manager; Joe Hughes, Legal Counsel; Matt Klinchuch, Consulting Engineer; Trilby Barton, Provost & Pritchard; Kathy Bennett, Senior Analyst; and various members of the committees and public.

2. **APPROVE THE AGENDA:** Motion to approve the agenda was made by Director George, seconded by Director Hornung, and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, George, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Director Micari reported that Rod Burkett stepped down from the director position that represents the “white areas”. Tulare County Board of Supervisors will be voting on his replacement Steve Milanesio, on March 1, 2022.

4. **MINUTES:** Motion to adopt and ratify the minutes provided by the Secretary from the January 24, 2022, Regular Board Meeting was made by Director Roberts, seconded by Director Micari, and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, George, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

5. ADMINISTRATION:

- a. Consider updating the EKGSA Logo. A new logo for the EKGSA was provided in the board packet and there was discussion on what was needed to make the change to it. A motion to approve going to the new logo was made, with the contingency that the already printed envelopes with the current logo be used up before printing more, by Director Micari, seconded by Director Watson, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, George, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

- b. Multi-Benefit Land Repurposing Program Memorandum of Understanding with the Kaweah Subbasin (KSB) GSAs and Sequoia Riverlands Trust (SRT): Executive Director reviewed the MOU with the board to determine if board members wanted to provide a grant support letter. The purpose of the program will be to use state funds to repurpose irrigated lands in the KSB to assist in achieving groundwater sustainability. It was noted that Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District will apply for about \$10 million in grant money to assist the KSB to develop programs to reduce irrigated land. The land will need to be managed by someone. SRT manages trust lands and will be able to assist in this effort. This MOU basically allows the GSAs to work with SRT in development of repurposed ground and for SRT to manage it. There was considerable discussion regarding the intent of the Program and the grant funding. A motion to approve the Executive Director to continue with the MOU and writing the grant support letter was made by Director Micari, seconded by Director Roberts, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson

NOES: George

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

- c. Appoint Representative on the Kaweah Subbasin Management Team Committee. The previous representative is no longer available and a motion to appoint Craig Hornung as the new representative was made by Director Peltzer, seconded by Director Buldo, and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, George, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

- d. Staffing updates: Executive Director provided an update on the staff engineer position.
- e. Payments: Senior Analyst provided the EKGSA check register. After some brief discussion on the payments, a motion to ratify payments made to meet the obligations of the EKGSA was made by Director George, seconded by Director Hornung, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, George, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Proposition 68 – WCB Grant (RCIS): Executive Director reported on the status of the RCIS effort. The December 31st invoice has been submitted for reimbursement and as noted previously, we have received confirmation that the RCIS is technically complete. It is expected to have final approval by Department of Fish and Wildlife by late September.

- f. Proposition 68 – Basin Planning Grant: The Program Manager provided an update on the administration and projects. Staff and Consultants are working on an amendment to the Grant. The Grant amendment proposed the replacement of the videoing of key basin wells, with three projects across the GSAs that improve the sub-basin monitoring network. Again, the SkyTem project and well metering Pilot Project have been completed.
- g. Proposition 68 – Update on Implementation Grant: Executive Director reminded the Board that this grant is awarded to the Mid Kaweah GSA and focuses on DAC benefits and reviewed the two projects that we had that qualified – Lewis Creek Re-charge and the Mariposa Basin connection to Lindmore ID.

6. GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION:

- a. Approve Notice of Exemption for EKGSA Monitoring Well Sites: The Executive Director reviewed the need for the Notice of Exemption and after discussion, a motion to approve the Notice of Exemption for EKGSA Monitoring Well Sites was made by Director Peltzer, seconded by Director Micari, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Buldo, Caudillo, Ferrara, George, Hornung, Micari, Milanesio, Peltzer, Roberts, Watson.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

- b. Technical Advisory Committee Efforts: Klinchuch reported on the most recent TAC meetings since the last Board meeting. TAC is focusing on the GSP deficiencies, ET calculations and reporting to landowners, and Projects and Management Actions.

- c. Subbasin Efforts: Klinchuch provided an update on the projects and coordination activities in the subbasin.

- d. GSP Implementation: Executive Director and Program Manager provided an update on Implementation.

- AdHoc – Land IQ - ET: Program Manager reviewed the Board’s recommendation to create an AdHoc committee to assist staff with review of ET data. The Committee has met twice, and he noted there will be recommendations to the board from their discussions.
- Monitoring Network: Executive Director reported on the monitoring network, noting there will be 6 – 12 cone analysis sites in the EKGSA.
- Rules and Regulations “Term Sheet”: Legal Counsel reviewed the process for approving the Rules and Regulations with a 30-day comment period. It will be posted on website by close of business on March 11, 2022, and a card mailer will go out to EKGSA landowners notifying them of the process and how to provide comments and where and when the public hearing will be held.
- Summary of deficiencies on the GSP “Incomplete Designation”: Hagman reported on the deficiencies and Klinchuch reviewed the process and schedule for addressing the determination.
- Stakeholder input: Program Manager reviewed the input from stakeholders that he has met with and noted their request for EKGSA to apply consistency while implementing policy to accomplish objectives.
- Status of Projects/MA direction by Board: Hagman noted that the TAC and AC have been given the assignment to develop a matrix and scoring of projects and management actions.

e. OTHER: Nothing to Report

7. **CLOSED SESSION:** Board went into closed session at 5:05 p.m. and after discussion, came out of closed session at 5:44 p.m. There was no reportable action.

8. **SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING:**

The Executive Director reported that the next regularly scheduled board meeting will be held on April 25, 2022, however the Executive Director will contact the Board members to set a special board of directors' meeting in March.

9. **ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Michael D. Hagman
Secretary, East Kaweah GSA

EKGSA RULES AND REGULATIONS

Article 1 General Provisions

1.1 Purpose

These Rules and Regulations are established by the Board of Directors of the East Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency in order to provide for the sustainable management of groundwater within the boundaries of the Agency.

1.2 Authority

A groundwater sustainability agency may adopt rules, regulations, ordinances, and resolutions for the purpose of this part, in compliance with any procedural requirements applicable to the adoption of a rule, regulation, ordinance, or resolution by the groundwater sustainability agency. (Division 6 Conservation, Development and Utilization of State Water Resources Part 2.74, Chapter 5, Section 10725.2.)

1.3 Groundwater Sustainability Plan

These Rules and Regulations are designed to implement the provisions of the EKGSA Groundwater Sustainability Plan, and may be amended at any time if necessary to achieve consistency with the groundwater sustainability plan and steps needed to achieve sustainability.

1.4 Definitions

Acre-Foot (AF)	An Acre-Foot of water is equivalent to one acre of ground covered one foot deep in water or 325,851 gallons.
Board	Board of Directors of EKGSA.
Consumptive Use	Water that leaves the land due to evaporation or transpiration.
EKGSA or Agency	East Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency.
Evapotranspiration	The process by which water is transferred from the land to the atmosphere by evaporation from the soil and other surfaces and by transpiration of plants. Evapotranspiration will be measured by utilizing satellite imagery and ground based truthing stations.
Landowner	A fee title owner of land within the EKGSA boundaries.

SGMA	The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, pursuant to Division 6 Conservation, Development and Utilization of State Water Resources Part 2.74, Chapter 5, Section 10720, et seq.
Water Year	“Water Year” means for any given year the 12-month period beginning October 1 and ending September 30, of the immediately following calendar year. The water year is designated by the calendar year in which it ends. For example, the year ending September 30, 2022 is the "2022" Water Year.

1.5 Effective Date and Changes

These Rules and Regulations shall become effective upon adoption and may be added to, amended and/or repealed at any time by resolution of the Board of Directors of the EKGSA and such additions, amendments, and/or repeals shall become effective upon their adoptions or as otherwise specified by the Board of Directors. However, adoption of these Rules and Regulations will not affect the effective date of any policies of the EKGSA existing as of the adoption date.

1.6 Actions Against EKGSA

Nothing contained in these Rules and Regulations shall constitute a waiver by the EKGSA or estop the EKGSA from asserting any defenses or immunities from liability as provided in law, including, but not limited to, those provided in Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code

1.7 Rights of Access

EKGSA staff and/or others authorized by the General Manager shall notify the owner of any land prior to entry thereon. Any such entry must be for the sole and exclusive purpose of conducting EKGSA business.

1.8 Severability

If any provision of these Rules and Regulations, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of these Rules and Regulations, and the application of its provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

**Article 2
Groundwater Monitoring**

2.1 Well Registration

a. All wells within the EKGSA must be registered with EKGSA no later than October 1, 2022. The owner or operator of a well shall register the well and provide, in full, the information required to complete a form to be provided by the Agency that will include the

following:

1. Name and contact information of the entity that installed the well.
2. Date well was drilled.
3. Documentation establishing that the well was permitted and installed correctly and according to permit.
4. Manufacturer and model of flow meter.
5. Installer and date of installation of flow meter.
6. Diameter of pipe and size of flow meter
7. Documentation establishing that flow meter was calibrated to manufacture specification including identity of calibrator.
8. Inspection records establishing compliance with manufacturer standards and requirements.
9. Picture of the flowmeter that shows it is installed correctly.
10. Identification of (i) type of crop(s), (ii) age of crop(s) (if perennial), (iii) single/double/triple crop(s) (if annual), and (iv) irrigation methodology (e.g., flood, drip, sprinkler) for the irrigated acres serviced by the water from the flow meter.
11. If there are multiple flowmeters on a parcel, Landowner must submit a map identifying the locations of the flowmeters and lands serviced through each flowmeter.

The Landowner shall allow EKGSA to physically inspect any flowmeter.

b. The name of the owner of each well, the parcel number on which the facility is located, along with the names of all operators for each extraction facility shall be reported to EKGSA Agency within 30 days upon any change of ownership.

c. A fee, in an amount to be determined by the Board, shall be paid to EKGSA for each well registered with EKGSA.

d. Failure to register within the timeframe provided herein shall result in an administrative penalty in an amount to be determined by the Board.

2.2 Groundwater Use Measurement

Groundwater extraction shall be measured using the evapotranspiration method. Crop evapotranspiration (ET) is estimated using remote sensing data from LandSAT satellites. The satellite data is entered into a model, which is used to estimate the ET rate and ET spatial distribution of an area in any given time period. When calibrated to land-based ET and/or climate stations and validated with crop surveys, the satellite-based model provides an estimate of crop ET (i.e., consumptive use).

Article 3 Groundwater Accounting

3.1 Authority

Division 6 Conservation, Development and Utilization of State Water Resources Part 2.74, Chapter 5, Section 10726.4, expressly authorizes a groundwater sustainability agency to establish accounting rules to allow unused groundwater extraction allocations to be carried over and transferred.

3.2 Online Water Accounting Dashboard

The EKGSA shall establish an online dashboard for owners to account for total water use within the EKGSA. Owners may allow operators access and control of their account(s).

3.3 Categories of Water

The online dashboard shall account for water through the following seven categories:

a. Surface Water Credits and Debits for Direct Delivery

As described in Section 3.6, an owner's account may be credited or debited with surface water.

b. Native Allocation

As described in Section 4.3, Native Allocation may be credited to an owner's account. Carryover and transfers as described in Section 4.03(c), may be credited and debited from an owner's account.

c. Tier 1 Penalty Allocation

As described in Section 4.3, the account of owners engaged in irrigation of lands actively used in agricultural production may be allocated an amount for groundwater used above Native Allocation, but below Tier 2. Carryover and transfers may be credited and debited from owner accounts in accordance with Section 4.3.

d. Tier 2 Penalty Allocation

As described in Section 4.3, the account of owners engaged in irrigation of lands actively used in agricultural production may be allocated an amount for groundwater used above Tier 1. Carryover and transfers may be credited and debited from owner accounts in accordance with Sections 4.3.

e. Groundwater Credits

As described in Section 4.3 and 6.2, an owner's account may be credited or debited with groundwater credits.

f. Recharge and Banking Credits and Debits

As described in Section 3.7, an owner's account may be credited or debited with groundwater recharge or banking activities. Transfers will be recognized by the GSA when authorized by the applicable surface water entity.

3.4 Priority of Use

Each owner with multiple categories of credits under these Rules and Regulations shall have the power to elect which of such credits are to be debited or transferred in connection with such consumption which will only be accounted for after all other available sources of water are exhausted. If the owner does not elect the priority of allocations to be debited, the default priority will follow in order of Section 3.3(a)-(f) above.

3.5 Net Groundwater Consumptive Use Reporting and Debiting

Within 30 days of the end of the prior month, the net groundwater consumptive use will be calculated and debited from the applicable account. In the event that a watercourse, including but not limited to canals, ditches, or riparian areas, is located within the boundaries of a parcel, the area of such watercourse shall not be evaluated for any consumed use of groundwater.

3.6 Surface Water Reporting

Any owner within the EKGSA utilizing surface water shall cause to be reported, from the applicable surface water entity, the diversion of surface water to direct irrigation.

3.7 Recharge and Banking Reporting

An owner within the EKGSA performing recharge or banking activities shall report, or cause to be reported, the diversion of surface water to underground storage to the EKGSA. Prior to crediting or debiting the owner's account, the EKGSA shall ensure the request is consistent with any applicable groundwater banking or recharge policy. The EKGSA acknowledges that several special districts, organized and existing under the laws of the State of California for the purpose of facilitating the beneficial use of the waters of the State, operate within EKGSA's boundaries. Several such districts have adopted and implemented groundwater banking and recharge policies in order to facilitate the underground storage and beneficial use of surface water. EKGSA shall honor the groundwater banking and recharge policies of all such entities within its jurisdictional boundaries. Recharge credits are subject to the following provisions:

- a. Groundwater credits at a 1:1 ratio can be accumulated from in lieu recharge by utilizing surface storage or foreign supplies or by moving surface storage to groundwater recharge.
- b. Groundwater recharge credits are provided at a 1:1 ratio (1 credit per net AF recharged after any leave behind and evaporation losses determined by EKGSA).
- c. To obtain groundwater credit resulting from recharge or a transfer, the receiver of the supply eligible for credit must supply sufficient documentation to EKGSA before the recipient receives credit from EKGSA and in no event later than 30 days following the end of the Water Year during which the recharge or transfer occurred. EKGSA shall determine what constitutes sufficient documentation.

Article 4 Groundwater Allocation

4.1 Purpose

Consistent with Division 6 Conservation, Development and Utilization of State Water Resources Part 2.74, Chapter 5, Section 10726, the purpose of this Article is to provide for the sustainable management of groundwater within the EKGSA jurisdictional area and Kaweah Subbasin, and to fulfill the legislative goals and policies of SGMA. Nothing in this Article shall be used to determine or alter water rights.

4.2 Determination of Allocation

Prior to October 1 of each year, or as soon thereafter as is possible, EKGSA will determine the allocations available for use within EKGSA's jurisdiction. The Executive Director shall thereafter cause each affected Landowner to be provided written notice of their allocation.

4.3 East Kaweah Management Area

a. Native Allocation

Each year, EKGSA shall establish a use allocation for each agricultural assessor's parcel within the EKGSA boundary. The allocation for each owner shall be calculated as follows:

1. EKGSA will determine the total inflow to all parcels over 2 acres within its boundaries. Total inflow will include components such as rainfall, natural infiltration from lakes and streams, and other natural inflows. EKGSA will then determine the amount of such total inflows available for allocation to Landowners and divide that amount by the total acreage of parcels greater than 2 acres within the GSA to establish a per acre allocation for each such parcel.

2. Each assessed parcel within EKGSA will receive a Native Allocation in the amount equal to the gross assessed parcel acreage multiplied by the per acre allocation established in Section 4.3(a)(1).

All allocations shall be made on an annual basis. For the 2022 Water Year, the per acre Native Allocation is .85 acre-feet/acre of measured Consumptive Use.

b. Tier 1 and Tier 2 Penalty Allocations

In addition to the Native Allocation, irrigated parcels as of January 31, 2020, which are identified as enrolled in the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, other regulatory programs that document historical irrigation use (i.e., Dairy General Order), or as identified by other certified crop map datasets will be allowed transitional pumping. This pumping shall be allocated as Tier 1 Penalty and Tier 2 Penalty Allocation. This transitional pumping will be permitted under the Rules and Regulations until eliminated. Once a parcel has been identified as an irrigated parcel, the parcel will remain in the transitional pumping program until the program expires. If a parcel is not identified as an irrigated parcel as of January 31, 2020, an owner may file a request to the EKGSA Executive Director to be included in the transitional program. For agricultural development of parcels after January 31, 2020, the owner may also file a request to the EKGSA General Manager to allow such lands to receive a Tier 1 and Tier 2 Penalty Allocation, which such allocation shall be prorated based on the date of development. EKGSA shall develop forms as needed to assist owners with the request.

Changes in the total irrigated acres will affect the Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 Penalty Allocation. To achieve consistency with the EKGSA GSP, the amount of Tier 1 and or Tier 2 Penalty Allocations may vary year to year.

For the 2022 Water Year, the Tier 1 Penalty Allocation is .3 acre-foot/acre of measured Consumptive Use, and the Tier 2 Penalty Allocation is .5 acre-feet/year of measured Consumptive Use.

c. Rainfall Credit

EKGSA will track monthly rainfall. Landowner accounts will be credited for 80% of actual rainfall in a given month. The credit will be applied during the following month and will be carried over until used. Any rainfall credit will be the first amount debited from a Landowner account.

Rainfall credits are not transferable.

d. Carryover and Transfer

1. Carryover.

If a Landowner uses less than his or her total allocation in a given Water Year, the difference between the allocation amount for that year and the amount of groundwater used

and/or transferred for that year shall be carried over to the next year. Unused allocation carried over from the previous Water Year shall be credited to the owner's account as a groundwater credit. Groundwater credits remain in an owner's account for a rotation of 5 years. Any credits unused after 5 years will be removed from a Landowner's ledger as of the first day of the sixth year after the credit is made. For purposes of the five-year rotation, carryover credits are treated on a "first in, last out" basis. The impact of the total quantity of water used in any five-year period shall be consistent with the provisions of the EKGSA GSP.

2. Transfer

There are no restrictions on groundwater transfers for the 2022 Water Year unless, in the determination of the Executive Director, the transfer produces an undesirable result. All transfers must be memorialized in writing, using a form to be provided by EKGSA and must be approved by EKGSA prior to the transfer becoming effective. All transferred water will be credited to the transferee's account as a groundwater credit. Transferred Tier 1 Penalty and Tier 2 Penalty water must be used within current Water Year and within EKGSA boundaries.

4.4 Community Management Areas

[to be determined]

4.5 Protest of Allocation and Extraction Limits

a. Within thirty (30) days of the date identified in the written notice to be provided under Section 4.2, an owner may protest the extraction allocations and extraction limits identified in the notification. The written protest must be submitted to the Executive Director at the EKGSA's office. The Executive Director shall investigate matters related to the protest, may consult with the EKGSA Technical group, and may present any relevant information, along with any recommendation, to the Board within sixty (60) days of receipt of the protest. The Board shall act on the written appeal and supporting documentation within one hundred and twenty (120) days of receipt of all relevant information.

b. Except for protests arising in the 2022 Water Year, no protest is allowed unless, for the Water Year in which a protest is made, the protestor was in full compliance with the provisions of Section 2.1 as of the first day of said Water Year.

4.6 Emergency Ordinances

Nothing in this Article shall prevent the EKGSA from, in the event of an emergency, from enacting emergency regulations or ordinances to prevent harm to Landowners within the EKGSA.

Article 5 Fees & Penalties

5.1 Penalty for Excess Use

For irrigated lands, every AF or portion thereof used beyond 1.65 of groundwater use (excluding all other sources of water), will be assessed a \$500 groundwater replacement fee. Such fee must be paid within 30 days of the issuance of invoice for such penalties is issued by the EKGSA

5.2 SGMA Penalties

Any Landowner, operator or other person who violates the provisions of these Rules and Regulations is subject to the criminal and civil sanctions set forth in SGMA.

5.3 Civil Remedies

Upon the failure of any person to comply with any provision of this Rules and Regulations, the EKGSA may petition the Superior Court for a temporary restraining order, preliminary or permanent injunction, or such other equitable relief as may be appropriate. The right to petition for injunctive relief is an additional right to those, which may be provided elsewhere in these Rules and Regulations or otherwise allowed by law. The EKGSA may petition the Superior Court to recover any sums due to the EKGSA.

5.4 Protest of Usage Measurement and Penalty Assessment

Except for protests arising in the 2022 Water Year, no protest is allowed unless, for the Water Year in which a protest is made, the protestor was in full compliance with the provisions of Section 2.1 as of the first day of said Water Year. The procedures for resolving a protest are as follows:

- a. All protests must be submitted in writing to the EKGSA General Manager no later than 30 days of receipt of billing.
- b. If the protest cannot be resolved within 60 days of receipt by the General Manager, the General Manager shall submit the protest to the Board of Directors, which shall issue a ruling on the protest.
- c. Landowners/Managing party of assessed acres can contest the Consumptive Use as defined by evapotranspiration.
- d. Any protest must include data of applied usage from instrumentation registered with EKGSA. Otherwise, the protest will be disallowed.
- e. Any protest must include the maintenance records of equipment upon which the protest is based. Otherwise, the protest will be disallowed.

f. If the protest is not resolved in favor of the protestor, the protestor must reimburse EKGSA for EKGSA's reasonable costs incurred in the protest.

Article 6

Surface Water Recharge in the Underground

6.1 Groundwater Recharge

Owners may use existing facilities to store surface water underground within the EKGSA boundaries. An owner who stores surface water pursuant to this Section may subsequently put such water to his or her own beneficial use within the EKGSA boundaries, or may transfer the water to another owner for use within the EKGSA boundaries. The use of stored water pursuant to this Section must be achieved utilizing on-farm activities. All water stored pursuant to this Section must be used within the EKGSA boundaries. Each owner who stores surface water pursuant to this Section shall provide accurate, verifiable records of the quantity and source of surface water stored for recharge, confirmed by the district or entity that supplied the surface water. The owner shall adhere to any rules promulgated by any district or entity supplying the surface water. Surface water stored and documented in compliance with the requirements of this Section shall be credited to the relevant owner's account as a surface water credit pursuant to section 3.7. Each owner shall be solely responsible for locating, purchasing, accessing, or otherwise acquiring surface water for the purposes of recharge pursuant to this Section. This policy applies to all non-districted lands and districted lands which choose to adhere to this Article VI.

ATTACHMENT A. SCORING CRITERIA**Ranking Methodology**

Project proponents from the three Kaweah Subbasin GSAs provided project information for projects wishing to receive funding. These summaries were provided in December 2021 and January 2022 for evaluation by the Kaweah Subbasin Technical Consultant for preliminary scoring based up DWR's Scoring Criteria Table provided by the Grant Manager. The preliminary scoring was reviewed by representatives of the Subbasin GSAs for discussing priority and funding. The overall goal of the Kaweah Subbasin is to leverage the current funding amount across a large number of projects to maximize the benefits of water recharged as well as filling data gaps through accomplishing various studies and technical efforts.

Review Panel Formation

The three Kaweah Subbasin GSAs established the Kaweah Subbasin Management Team as a committee with representatives from each of the GSAs to review and discuss Subbasin-wide efforts such as policies, grants, and groundwater management decisions. The Management Team regularly meets quarterly but can increase to a monthly cadence pending need. With the representation across the Kaweah Subbasin, the Management Team was chosen as the review committee for the purposes of the Scoring Criteria of this funding opportunity.

List of Review Panelists**East Kaweah GSA**

1. Mike Hagman, EKGSA Executive Director
2. Terry Peltzer, EKGSA Board Member
3. Vacant

Greater Kaweah GSA

1. Eric Osterling, GKGSA General Manager
2. Don Mills, GKGSA Chairman
3. Mark Larsen, Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District, Alternate

Mid-Kaweah GSA

1. Aaron Fukuda, MKGSA General Manager
2. Dave Martin, Tulare Irrigation District, MKGSA Board Chair
3. Steve Nelson, City of Visalia City Council, MKGSA Board Vice-Chair

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #2 Kaweah Subbasin GSP Determination Response

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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	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	4
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"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	N/A
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	4
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	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	3
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	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	3
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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	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	3
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		27
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ 200,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #3 Kaweah Subbasin GSP 2025 Update

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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	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	4
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"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	N/A
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	4
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	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	3
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	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	3
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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	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	3
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		27
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ 600,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #4 Kaweah Subbasin MODFLOW Model Update

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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	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	4
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"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	N/A
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	4
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	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	3
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	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	3
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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	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	3
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		27
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ 200,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #5 EKGSA Water Quality Study

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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	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	4
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"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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"> To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities. 	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	2
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	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	3
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	3
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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	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	2
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		26
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 200,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #6 MKGSA Water Quality Study

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	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	4
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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	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	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	3
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	3
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	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	2
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		26
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 200,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #7 KCWD Delta View Project - Phase 1

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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	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	4
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"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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"> To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities. 	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	2
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	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	3
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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	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	3
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		26
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	1,374,025

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #8 KDWCD Kaweah Oaks Preserve Flood-Recharge Project

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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	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	4
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"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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"> To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities. 	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	2
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	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	3
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	2
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	3
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"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	2
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"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	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	3
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		26
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	425,975

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #9 EKGSA Cottonwood Creek Recharge Project

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	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	4
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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	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	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	2
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	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	2
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 750,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #10 EID Yokohl Creek Recharge Project

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	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	4
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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	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	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	2
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	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	2
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 500,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #11 SJWD Vanderstelt Recharge Project

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	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	4
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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	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	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	1
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	2
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	2
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	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	3
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	400,000

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #12 LSID Upper Lewis Creek Recharge Project

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	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	4
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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	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	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	3
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	2
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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	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	3
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	0
Total Range of Possible Points			30		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 375,000	

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #13 Visalia Cameron Creek Linear Recharge Project

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	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	4
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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	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	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	1
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	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	3
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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	2,000,000

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Component #14 SBMWC Flood Capture Project

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	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	4
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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	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 supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4
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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	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	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	2
General	5	Does the project benefit an 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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	2
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	2
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	1
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	3
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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	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	3
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	0
Total Range of Possible Points			30		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 375,000	

Greater Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency
Grant Proposal Spending Plan
Table 1 – Spending Plan

Kaweah Subbasin:

Rank	Name	Estimated Score	COD SJV Component Requirement	Benefactors	Cost	Justification
1	Grant Administration	Not Scored	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	\$30,000	Not Applicable
2	Kaweah Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) Determination Response	27	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – All within the Kaweah Subbasin <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – All within the Kaweah Subbasin	Total Project Cost: \$250,000 Funding Requested: \$200,000	The GSP Determination requires re-evaluation for Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) for all GSAs across the Kaweah Subbasin. This effort scores well with the Scoring Criteria as it aligns with GSP goals, Subbasin Coordination, and benefits to the large percentage of URC/SDAC within the Kaweah Subbasin. This item made higher priority due to the timeline for which the response is needed.
3	Kaweah Subbasin GSP 2025 Update	27	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – All within the Kaweah Subbasin <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – All within the Kaweah Subbasin	Total Project Cost: \$750,000 Funding Requested: \$600,000	The GSP 2025 Update is a large effort that will require re-evaluation and update to the Kaweah Subbasin GSPs and Coordination Agreement between the three GSAs. This effort scores well with the Scoring Criteria as it directly deals with GSP goals, Subbasin Coordination, and benefits to the large percentage of URC/SDAC within the Kaweah Subbasin. This item made higher priority due the effort covering the entire Subbasin.
4	Kaweah Subbasin MODFLOW Model Update	27	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – All within the Kaweah Subbasin <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – All within the Kaweah Subbasin	Total Project Cost: \$250,000 Funding Requested: \$200,000	The MODFLOW Model Update is an effort to update the numeric model used during GSP development. With additional and new data and new capabilities needing to be incorporated, the updated model is aimed at being a better forecasting and management tool across the entire Kaweah Subbasin. This effort scores well with the Scoring Criteria as it will assist in decision making towards GSP goals, requires Subbasin Coordination, and benefits all beneficial users in the Subbasin, including URC and SDAC. This item made higher priority due to it covering the entire Subbasin.
5	EKGSA Water Quality Study	26	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – Many within EKGSA Boundary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – Many within EKGSA including Tooleville, Tonyville, Plainview, and Strathmore	Total Project Cost: \$200,000 Funding Requested: \$200,000	The EKGSA is looking to better understand water quality issues and movement across the GSA ahead of implementing a shallow well recharge program that allows for recharging water while protecting groundwater wells supplying water to communities and residents in the EKGSA. This is prioritized over other projects with the same score due to the broader benefits to URC/SDAC communities.

Greater Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Kaweah Subbasin:

Rank	Name	Estimated Score	COD SJV Component Requirement	Benefactors	Cost	Justification
6	MKGSA Water Quality Study	26	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – City of Tulare <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – Okieville and Waukena	Total Project Cost: \$200,000 Funding Requested: \$200,000	The MKGSA is looking to better understand water quality issues and movement across the GSA ahead of implementing a shallow well recharge program that allows for recharging water while protecting groundwater wells supplying water to communities and residents in the MKGSA. This is prioritized over other projects with the same score due to the broader benefits to URC/SDAC communities.
7	Kings County Water District (KCWD) Delta View Project Phase 1	26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – Eastern Kings County areas <input type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s)	Total Project Cost: \$1,824,025 Funding Requested: \$1,374,025	This is a priority project as it not only allows an increase in the ability to recharge flood and high-flow periods in a new basin in the western portion of the Subbasin, but it also reduces demand on groundwater which supports the goal of reaching groundwater sustainability. KCWD is intending to purchase the basin property with local funds.
8	Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District (KDWCD) Kaweah Oaks Preserve Flood-Recharge Project	26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input type="checkbox"/> URC(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – City of Farmersville	Total Project Cost: \$787,875 Funding Requested: \$425,975	KDWCD is seeking to develop more recharge capacity to capture flood and high-flow periods on the Kaweah River system. This location benefits the City of Farmersville and the Kaweah Oaks Preserve through recharge on the natural ground of the preserve.
9	EKGSA Cottonwood Creek Recharge Project	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – Areas along the Creek and indirectly to Ivanhoe <input type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s)	Total Project Cost: \$750,000 Funding Requested: \$750,000	This is a priority project to receive full funding as it allows an increase in the ability to recharge flood and high-flow periods from the Friant-Kern Canal into a larger portion of the EKGSA. Once groundwater recharge projects are in place along the Creek, expanded benefits through future phases can be accomplished to maximize project benefits and beneficiaries.
10	Exeter Irrigation District (EID) Yokohl Creek Recharge Project	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – Areas along the Creek, Lindcove, and Exeter <input type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s)	Total Project Cost: \$500,000 Funding Requested: \$500,000	This is a priority project to receive full funding as it allows an increase in the ability to recharge flood and high-flow periods from the Friant-Kern Canal into the EKGSA. groundwater recharge projects are in place along the Creek, expanded benefits through future phases can be accomplished to maximize project benefits.
11	St Johns Water District (SJWD) Vanderstelt Recharge Project	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – Indirectly to Patterson Tract (north of the project) and Goshen (down gradient) <input type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s)	Total Project Cost: \$4,200,000 Funding Requested: \$400,000	SJWD is seeking to develop more recharge capacity to capture flood and high-flow periods on the St. Johns River. Over time, the recharge will provide benefits to Patterson Tract, Goshen, and Visalia. SJWD is ready to provide cost share on the construction effort beyond the funding requested.

Greater Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Kaweah Subbasin:

Rank	Name	Estimated Score	COD SJV Component Requirement	Benefactors	Cost	Justification
12	Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District (LSID) Upper Lewis Creek Recharge Project	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – Areas along the Creek <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) - Tonyville	Total Project Cost: \$2,090,000 Funding Requested: \$375,000	LSID is seeking to develop more recharge capacity to capture flood and high-water periods from the Friant-Kern Canal and Kaweah River. Through different phases, LSID can accomplish benefits to the District and neighboring areas. LSID is intending to provide cost share on project phases where needed.
13	Visalia Cameron Creek Linear Recharge Project	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input type="checkbox"/> URC(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – Indirectly to Linnell Camp and Farmersville	Total Project Cost: \$2,208,000 Funding Requested: \$2,000,000	The City of Visalia aiming to partner with Tulare ID to provide more recharge capability in flood and high-flow periods in Cameron Creek, similar to a prior effort on Packwood Creek. Priority in funding is given to this project due to it being a linear project, future projects and phases can be built from this original effort. The City of Visalia is intending to provide cost share on the project for any unmet costs above the Funding Request.
14	Sentinel Butte Mutual Water Company (SBMWC) Flood Capture Project	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URC(s) – Indirectly to Ivanhoe (down gradient) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SDAC(s) – Indirectly to Woodlake	Total Project Cost: \$1,000,000 Funding Requested: \$375,000	SBMWC is one of the water purveyors in non-districted areas of the EKGSA. Funding is being provided to this project as it has the ability to better manage and control flood and high-water periods on the Kaweah River and then deliver in the area north of Woodlake or north/northeast of Ivanhoe
				Total Cost:	\$15,009,900	

Grant Proposal Summary Budget

TABLE 2 – GRANT PROPOSAL SUMMARY BUDGET

Budget Categories	Requested Grant Amount
Component 1: Grant Administration	\$0
Component 2: Kaweah Subbasin GSP Determination Response	\$200,000
Component 3: Kaweah Subbasin GSP 2025 Update	\$600,000
Component 4: Kaweah Subbasin MODFLOW Model Update	\$200,000
Component 5: East Kaweah Water Quality Study	\$200,000
Component 6: Mid-Kaweah Water Quality Study	\$200,000
Component 7: KCWD Delta View Project – Phase 1	\$1,374,025
Component 8: KDWCD Kaweah Oaks Preserve Flood-Recharge Project	\$425,975
Component 9: EKGSA Cottonwood Creek Recharge Project	\$750,000
Component 10: EID Yokohl Creek Recharge Project	\$500,000
Component 11: SJWD Vanderstelt Recharge Project	\$400,000
Component 12: LSID Upper Lewis Creek Recharge Project	\$375,000
Component 13: Visalia Cameron Creek Linear Recharge Project	\$2,000,000
Component 14: SBMWC Flood Capture Project	\$375,000
Grand Total <i>Sum rows (1) through (n) for each column</i>	\$7,600,000

Grant Proposal Summary Schedule

TABLE 3B – GRANT PROPOSAL SCHEDULE

Categories	Start Date	End Date
Component 1: Grant Agreement Administration	4/1/2022	6/30/2025
Component 2: Kaweah Subbasin GSP Determination Response	1/28/2022	7/27/2022
Component 3: Kaweah Subbasin GSP 2025 Update	1/1/2023	1/31/2025
Component 4: Kaweah Subbasin MODFLOW Model Update	10/1/2022	12/31/2024
Component 5: East Kaweah Water Quality Study	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 6: Mid-Kaweah Water Quality Study	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 7: KCWD Delta View Project – Phase 1	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 8: KDWCD Kaweah Oaks Preserve Flood-Recharge Project	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 9: EKGSA Cottonwood Creek Recharge Project	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 10: EID Yokohl Creek Recharge Project	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 11: SJWD Vanderstelt Recharge Project	4/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 12: LSID Upper Lewis Creek Recharge Project	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 13: Visalia Cameron Creek Linear Recharge Project	7/1/2022	4/30/2025
Component 14: SBMWC Flood Capture Project	7/1/2022	4/30/2025