

PRC Preliminary Scoresheets

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	4
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	4
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		32
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	4
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	2
Total Range of Possible Points			30		31
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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? <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):				\$ -	

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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	0
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		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	4
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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	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? <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		31
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	4
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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		29
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	4
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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		28
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	4
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	4
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		33
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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 outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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	4
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 hundredth):				\$	-

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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 outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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	0
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		25
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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	0
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	0
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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 outreach 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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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? <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		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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 outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	NA
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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? <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		25
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

The one benefit is "reduced pumping," meter accuracy, reduced leaks

Reduced pumping does not specifically preserve the Human Right to Water.

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3	Prtoject doesn't state size of the six solar projects, therefore no way to assess appropriateness of cost.
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4	Rate reduction, rate protection, GHG reduction
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	NA	
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0	
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	4	Direct impact on affordability
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	1	What is the size of each PV system. Are these costs consistent with industry standards?
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		23	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	NA
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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	4
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		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Protecting Basin Water Quality

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	NA
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	3
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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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		17
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Developing guidance criteria for biological restoration.

No real outreach

Just a plan. No tangible benefits.

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Reviewers Comments

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewers Comments
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	2	"Conceptual" The activities may include ...
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2	Enhanced understanding of basin potential update of GMP and the equipment left behind
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	NA	
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	0	No outreach beyond standing meetings.
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	1	Missing Clark Dry Lake map
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0	
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	0	
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	1	Conceptually and "may include"
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	\$50K for EWG meetings?
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		12	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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	4
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	0
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		25
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

All Necessary work. However, most of these projects are to be paid with pumping fees rather than tax payer funding.

Board Meetings, TAC meetings,

Task 5(a)\$750K for one new well, and then\$100K for surface groundwater station. The Adendum is not "apples to apples." The request period extends through the end of the grant period where as the "offsetting already budgeted category" only goes through September 2022.

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	NA
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	1
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	0
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	1
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	0
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	0
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? <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	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		10
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ -	

Falase Hope. GMP notes there are no alternative sources outside the Subbasin.

There is no outreach beyond standing meetings and the person of the community rep.

This is a study of a issue that has been studied for 40 years and is unlikely to come up with a new answer.

This is a study of a issue that has been studied for 40 years and is unlikely to come up with a new answer.

\$500K of Reports

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	NA
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	1
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	1
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	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		11
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Via standing WM meetings

What does the platt map reference?

"Farmers and agricultural community."

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	NA
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	1
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	1
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	0
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		20
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Improved Water Conservation through education. Quantifiable increase in understanding of water situation in Borrego.

Assumes the common map of the SDAC

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	NA
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	0
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	0
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? <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		17
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Will this work in a desert environment.

Water conservation

**Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria**

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1) Improved understanding of basin water economy 2) Ability to monitor AQ impacts of following and restoration projects
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	
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	
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	AQ impacts the entire community.
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign 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	NA
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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? <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		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Standing up SC with ED, Stake holder Engagement Plan , GMP analysis

No line item for part-time ED

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	0
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	0
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	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	0
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	0
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	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		11
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Water Conservation

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	NA
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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	1
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		18
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Water Conservation

Biggest water conservation project

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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	NA
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

1) Fulfills SGMA requirements via GDE's 2) Permanent monitoring equipment

If WM approves, will have numerous interested parties involved in decision making

Local hiring from community or Indian Tribes. Ensures the provisions of SGMA are applied in the Subbasin. Potential significant impact on GMP.

WM-EWG Bio Restor, Follow

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Followed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

#4

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	3-4
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	0 - plan/study
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 outreach 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	1
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	1
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	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	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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Questions -

22-23

1. access to followed land - Viking Ranch even poss?
2. drone cost? rent?
3. p. 5 - one of many such statements, in sev. projects:
WM costs paid mostly by major pumpers (for profit or for private benefit (AEC) - not residents/rate-payers as stated
4. COSTS - p. 10

REW G GDE Monitor
esp Bosque

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") • 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	3
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	3
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	2
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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0?
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	0
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	1
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):			\$		

#5

-could be good info for domestic wells, but not claimed too \$\$\$, No cost share

Q3/Notes

1. COSTLY, Can measurements be taken sans well - e.g. isotopes
2. ? siting of mon, well & station
3. not thought through very well.

13-14

#6 Big Basic

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") • 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	2
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	2
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	1
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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	1
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	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	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	0
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ -	

F 15

#7

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") • 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	1
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	X
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	0
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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	1.5
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	1
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Questions/Notes

T=5

1. underlying assumption: will find ways to augment. See e.g. p. 5, impact on small w systems/dam, wells; "The Proj. will have a positive impact on priv dom wells... attrib to det-ing meths to incr. the overall rate of gw recharge, and the w supply and yield..."

2. MISCHARS previous work - both extent & conclusions - yet mentions an item from a 2019 BWS Bd Agenda (7/19/19) p. 6, HR2W - and ENSI

Clare Lake

#8

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") • 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	1
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	0 - <i>benef. assumed</i>
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	1
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	0
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0 - <i>not feasible to do Proj</i>
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	0
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	0
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	1 - <i>vague</i>
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	1 - <i>unrealistic C&EA, drilling</i>
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

1. Clare Lake studied already, \$1 million. Study T=6
 & Results not incomplete - concluded that

Ed #9

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") • 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	2
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	2
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	3
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	4
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	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	1
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

T = 27 - 31
inc both Plan and Impl.

#10

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	2
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	2
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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	1
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

T=22

**Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria**

AQ #11

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	2
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	2
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	3
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	1
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	0
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	0
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

- COSTLY

F = 20

#12

**Project #12 EVSC Resiliency Strategy
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria**

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	2
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	2
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	4
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	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	1
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	A3
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

T=27

#13

**Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria**

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	3
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	0
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	0
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	0
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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	1
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):			\$		-

T=11

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

#19

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	1
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	1
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	0
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	0
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefiting 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

T=12

#15

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	1
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? <i>not whole basin</i>	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
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	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	1
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	0
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		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	

T=21

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):					

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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	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? <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		25
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	0
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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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	0
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		11
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	1

536000

this project should NOT be funded, it's already been done

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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		11
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

742000

likely shouldn't support this, look at old study Clark Dry Lake

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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	0
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		19
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	1
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	0
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		10
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	1
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		15
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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	1
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	1
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	0
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	0
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		16
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	0
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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	0
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	0
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	1
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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	1
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		9
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	1
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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? • 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	1
Total Range of Possible Points			30		27
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Question: What is estimated savings in water?

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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	3
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	0
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? <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):				\$	-

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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	3
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	1
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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	3
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 outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	1
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	0
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	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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Question: How is this implemented if the land is not vacated? Using existing land?

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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	0
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	1
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ -	

Question: How would any of the objectives of the WM likely change if GDEs are dependent?

Question: Why revisit? Is it likely that GDEs exist?

Question: What could you actually do?

Question: Budget doesn't seem to tie to tasks.

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") • 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	1
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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		9
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Question: this just seems like paying for operating costs.

Budget is ridiculous.

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i>	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
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? <i>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.</i>	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	2
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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? <i>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</i>	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	1
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? <i>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</i>	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <i>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</i>	3	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	1
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? <i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i>	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. <i>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</i>	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	0
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		16
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Ya. Out of the box is always good.

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") • 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	2
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	2
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	3
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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	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	0
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		18
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Question: What was the gap? What were the findings?

Question: Does the aquifer reside within park boundaries?

Question: Why are we re-researching items?

Question: What about GDEs?

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	3
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 outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Question: How quickly could a change in air quality reasonably be detected?

Question: How would that degradation (if noted) be addressed by the WM?

Question: What data currently exists? How could we extrapolate?

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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	3
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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? <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		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Not specific. Should be part of educational strategy.

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <i>• No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i>	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
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? <i>• To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.</i>	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	3
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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? <i>• To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</i>	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? <i>• The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</i>	2	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <i>• No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</i>	3	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	0
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	0
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <i>• No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i>	3	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. <i>• Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</i>	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		19
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Question: Water savings?

Needs to re-write. Good idea.

With re-writes I would score higher.

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	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	0
Total Range of Possible Points			30		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	3	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	3	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. 	4	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			33		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	1,275,000

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	2	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	1	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. 	4	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
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	
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?	0	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	2	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			25		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General - Imp Only	2-Imp	Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	0	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	2	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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	2	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	1	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	2	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			22		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General - Imp Only	2-Imp	Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	0	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities. 	2	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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?	0	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	0	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	2	3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			20		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General - Imp Only	2-Imp	Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	0	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	1	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. 	1	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
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	
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?	1	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	0	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	2	3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			17		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			34		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	3,684,000

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	1	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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. 	1	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	2	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			28		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	536,000

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	1	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	3	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 outreach 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. 	1	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	2	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			27		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	742,000

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General - Imp Only	2-Imp	Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	1	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	3	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 outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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?	1	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	0	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			23		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	369,000

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	3	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	2	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 outreach 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. 	1	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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?	1	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	2	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			25		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	2,286,500

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	2	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General - Imp Only	2-Imp	Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	0	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	1	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 outreach 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. 	0	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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. 	0	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	2	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	0	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	0	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	2	3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			11		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	3	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General - Imp Only	2-Imp	Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation. 	0	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	0	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 outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	2	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	0	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	0	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 	2	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Budget	9	Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include costs expended on projects before grant agreement date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points. 	0	3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			13		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):					

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	3	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	1	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 outreach 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. 	1	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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. 	0	2 - Provided and all necessary information provided 1 - Provided but missing some information 0 - Not provided	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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?	1	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	1	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	2	3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			20		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	3	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	3	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 outreach 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. 	0	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	2	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	1	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	2	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			24		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	2	4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	3	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 outreach 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. 	2	3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 	2	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 0 - Project does not benefit either	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	1	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	0	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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. 	2	3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			22		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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? <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		15
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Data should be provided on current water waste. The submittal only provides monetary data of refunds provided over the last 3 years. Estimates of water conservation results form implementation of this project should be provided. Estimates of rates

Two benefits are are provided - 1. Water conservation and 2. Rates. However there is no quantifiable data provided on how much water will be saved to benefit the COD basin status and how DAC and SDAC rate payers will be sheltered from unneccasry increases. Additionally \$1,000,000 is requests for the 1959 meters after the pilot period but page 2 states that customers may pay for these at thier own expense. That paragraph also states that the AMI budget for the large scale implementation for the 1959 meters is not included in submittal.

not applicable

SAFE not applicable. Data on bebefit to Basin need to be included

The \$30,000 for education seems high when comparing to the descrption of this aspect. From reviewing grant applications on the WaterSmart program, the average cost to implement this project on a per meter basis is \$300 per meter

This project could also be submitted to the Bureau of Reclamation WaterSmart program. Refer to link below. <https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/applications/>

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	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	0
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? <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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	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	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	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		25
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	206,500

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	1
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	0
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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Do not recommend funding

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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? <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	1
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		11
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

do not recommend funding

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	1
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	0
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	1
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		16
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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 outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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	0
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		17
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	536,000

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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? <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	
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		15
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	500,000

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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? <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	1
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	100,000

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	1
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		18
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Fund Turf Conversion only

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ -	

Do not recommend funding

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	100,000

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	not provided
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		10
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Would recommend funding depending on cost

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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? <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	1
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		11
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Would not recommend funding as it duplicates Water Master's Mequite Bosque Project

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	4	4 quantifiable benefits listed at top of pg 3. Supporting documents not included, but these seem pretty straightforward. The benefits are explained, but the expected values are not indicated except as rough percentages in some cases. However, each of these benefits is "quantifiable," and the intent to measure during the pilot program, and then full deployment is stated.
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	N/A	N/A?? The point of the last sentence is not addressed, but perhaps will be in the overall BWD submission?
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? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	Lacks clear cost benefit to customers, unlike Solar Project, #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? <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 hundreth):				\$ 1,275,000		

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer Comments
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2	3 benefits listed on pg. 9 "quantifiable benefits provided by this Project includes (1) direct and immediate water rate relief for BWD customers and(2) insulation from future rate hikes and (3) GHG reduction."
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	2	Split score 2 for 2-Imp and 2-Plan. Scored separately, each scored 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	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	Maps mostly cut off in .pdf on my screen. Assuming this will be fixed.
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0	
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	4	Direct cost benefit to customers, among other benefits.
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	Is this done simply as a subcontract to SDG&E?
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	I'm assuming that cost estimate is accurate, based on it apparently comes from SDG&E, based on much similar experience throughout their territory.
Total Range of Possible Points			30		26	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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	2	bottom of pg. 2: "protection and potentially enhancement of water quality through future upgrades to the WWTF treatment processes, if necessary" ?Is this one or two quantifiable benefits? Possible help keeping water rates lower if added treatment equipment is shown to be unnecessary?
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	N/A	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1	
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	4	
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		25	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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 supportign 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		This project appears to be Planning-only: This project is proposed as a "three-year program to: characterize historical and current conditions; explore the feasibility of various biological restoration/ rehabilitation techniques; and develop guidance for future biological restoration projects on current and future fallowed lands within the Subbasin." 2 The proposed project does not plan to do any of these, but instead to prepare for when these might be undertaken: "The goals of restoration/rehabilitation are: reduce water consumption; manage airborne dust emissions; increase natural biodiversity and habitat value; and maintain or enhance values pertinent to the Anza Borrego State Park and the residents of Borrego Springs."
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		No \$ allocated to Budget Category (e) involving Interested Parties. However, Task 7 does address marginally: "Task 7 – Conduct EWG Meetings. At least two EWG meetings per year will be necessary for the EWG to: receive updates on project progress; receive input from the public and interested stakeholders; provide guidance and input to the Watermaster Technical Consultant 1 and subcontractors; review draft and final project deliverables and make recommendations to the Watermaster Board. Deliverables: Meeting agendas/packets; PowerPoint presentations; summary meeting notes; and memorandums with recommendations to the Watermaster Board. All EWG meeting deliverables will be posted to the Watermaster's website."
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	As a planning-only project, this affords no tangible benefits for the community.
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	0	
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	0	
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		16	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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		Doesn't describe what techniques would be utilized to perform "Investigation of rooting-depth and source-water of the Mesquite Bosque in the Borrego Sink." How would source-water from surface rain collection be distinguished from groundwater being the source, especially over time/season? Peripheral GDEs potentially dependent on the Borrego Subbasin aquifer level are only marginally addressed. It is unclear how the noted tasks would resolve the open question of dependence on the regional aquifer one way or the other (as noted on pg 4): "If the results and conclusions of the monitoring program indicate that GDE(s) are dependent on the regional aquifer of the Subbasin, then the EWG will provide recommendations for revisions to the GMP to protect the environmental beneficial uses of groundwater pursuant to the requirements of the SGMA."
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		the benefits "will enhance the understanding of the groundwater basin, and potentially, will result in revisions to the GMP to protect the environmental beneficial uses of groundwater pursuant to the requirements of the SGMA. These benefits will be quantified and described in the interim and final deliverables of the project." seems like 1 benefit.
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	N/A	
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		Outreach appears limited to the Watermaster Board and its Environmental Working Group, but without a strong outreach to the broader general public and organizations with an interest in ecological health of GDEs.
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefiting 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		missing location of Clark Dry Lake (pasted over by insets) that is mentioned in proposal.
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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		
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		proposal labels this "N/A"
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		proposal labels this "N/A"
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		Most detail is deferred to a Workplan to be developed
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		
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible		
Total Range of Possible Points			30			
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$		

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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	from pg 7 for Task 9: "The availability of SGM grant funding provides an opportunity for the Watermaster to perform a more comprehensive update to the BVHM to support the redetermination of Sustainable Yield by 2025. The proposed scope of work includes comprehensive model updates (e.g., updated model versions, model grids, FMP, etc.), model recalibration, development and implementation of a transparent process to use model projections to redetermine the Sustainable Yield, comprehensive reporting, and model documentation. This approach not only provides a more defensible and robust redetermination of Sustainable Yield in 2025, but also provides long-term benefits to the Watermaster Parties by avoiding future expenses associated with model updates and recalibrations." From pg 13 "These benefits can be quantified in a multitude of ways by analyzing the datasets and quantifying changed basin conditions, such as: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrating reductions in pumping through groundwater pumping monitoring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrating groundwater level trends through groundwater level monitoring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrating groundwater level trends through groundwater storage estimations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrating groundwater quality trends through groundwater quality monitoring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrating improved estimation of sustainable yield through model recalibration"
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	N/A	
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? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1	
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		??This project will not start until selected and funds awarded by DWR. However, WM claims a local cost share for ..."costs incurred on the project from January 1, 2022 through March 31, 2022." I would not expect that this could be applied to the cost share calculation, but I am unsure of DWR rules. Thus I have scored 2 instead of 3, but could revise upward if DWR rules allow such pre-project cost share.
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		25	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-	Most of this work should be part of the plan for how pumping fees are utilized, rather than Prop 68. To the extent private property owners' costs are offset, is this how Prop68 funds are to be used?

Project #7 BSWM AAWARE Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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	1	Hasn't this been studied <i>ad nauseum</i> before with no indication of a viable source outside the Subbasin? This is echoed in the GMP. Significant details such as potentially how much water might be made usable will only emerge from the results at the end of the 3-yr study.
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	N/A	This project is study-only, rather than Implementation.
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	1	I disagree with the assertion on pg 3 of the proposal that "Evaluation and investigation of alternatives for groundwater augmentation in the Subbasin will increase water supply for the community of Borrego Springs." Evaluation & investigation will not bring any more water, but it is <i>theoretically possible that this could</i> lead to planning of some later implementation that <i>might</i> bring more water into the usable aquifer.
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	1	
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	1	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0	There are no benefits, and there is only the remotest possibility of a practical out-of-subbasin source being shown to be practical.
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	0	There are no benefits, and there is only the remotest possibility of a practical out-of-subbasin source being shown to be practical.
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	significant details such as potentially how much water might be made usable will only emerge from the results at the end of the 3-yr study; and are likely to be zero.
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	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		10	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #8 BSWM AAWARE Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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	2	One significant detail that is missing is that, in the event this task shows a feasible method of augmenting Borrego Subbasin water supply with water from the aquifer beneath Clark Lake, this task does not account for modeling or assessing the resulting deleterious effects on the existing groundwater dependent ecosystem in the Clark Lake vicinity.
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1	Potential benefit of more water for the Borrego Subbasin could be quantified if this investigation is successful, but no quantitative range estimate provided of how much more water might become available, or of the impact, positive or negative, on water quality. This proposal seemed better than "0-Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified." The benefits are explained, but not quantified.
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	N/A	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1	
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	1	Unclear pupose of the plat map on pg 157 of the compilation of proposals, showing a number of adjacent small parcels, and title "Record of Surbvey No. 1841"
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	assuming the SDAC map can be added
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	0	
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	a missing significant detail is that no quantity is estimated of additional water that might come eventually, after this study is completed.
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	2	2% total cost share noted, indicating source as existing budget for regular WM Board meetings. Cost share noted only for Task 6 IP Outreach/Public Education.
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		14	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2	[Quantifiable benefits listed at bottom of pg. 5] The benefit noted of community water conservation through education is very useful. Can the proposer indicate a possible attributable saving, and cite a reference for this #. I would guess studies have been done and published in scientific literature, and at least a 10% water use saving could credibly be claimed across the LatinX households withing BWD. But for me, this is only a guess; I'm hopeful experts have some real data. I have scored as if supporting documentation gets referenced. Consider adding educational testing of high school students to quantify gained understanding of Borrego Springs' water situation.
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	N/A	
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	It appears that the Interested Parties of School District, ABDNHA, ABF, and State Park, because they are reaching agreement for their portions of the work, are fully part of the decision-making apparatus.
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	1	Proposal could note if families of students to be educated are users of small water systems and/or private domestic shallow wells. Is BWD a "small water system" by the definition for this grant opportunity?
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? <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		23	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Note San Diego Union article for pros & cons of grass vs. synthetic playing fields, including injury rates: <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/sports/chargers-rams/story/2021-11-12/nfl-rams-chargers-social-grass-free-sofi-stadium>

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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	2	a comparison with similar installations in similar desert locations would have been helpful to judge if the proposed solution is viable and long-lasting.
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2	Reduced water use was explained and quantified. Also reduced grass maintenance and gasoline use and air pollution by lawn mowers. Note that some sports reporting indicates that injury rates may increase with artificial turf. Unclear if this would apply in this situation, because the field quality described in the proposal is already poor. Trip-and-fall hazards might be increased or decreased with the proposed solution.
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	N/A	
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	1	
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	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	0	
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	I was surprised at the high cost, but I have no experience with costs for this type of installation. Also concerned about durability of the field surface under local desert conditions of high sunlight and temperature. How soon will the School District need to install another new surface?
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		18	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	Can the County provide funds for this?

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified		2 benefits cited pgs 11-12: "The quantifiable benefits of this Project are two-fold: first the filling of the hydroclimate data gaps will enhance the understanding of the water economy of the Subbasin, which is the critical driver of determining the rate of the water consumption rampdown, i.e. water conservation, under the GMP. " "Second, the filling of data gaps associated with water conservation achieved by fallowing will enable this essential Management Action to proceed in a manner consistent with the SGMA goal of retaining a healthy, thriving community throughout the rampdown process. "
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	N/A	
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	3	map assumed
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	1	
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	0	
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		21	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer Comments
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	2	Much good-sounding general descriptions. Many specific, quantifiable objectives that measure effort, but not results. (see, e.g., pg. 4 Objectives 1, 2 & 3). The results could be good, but that's not what's being measured.
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3	Explanations lacking for what the quantifiable <i>results</i> will be, as opposed to <i>effort</i> which is quantified to achieve some less-well-specified result. One quantifiable benefit is greater community appreciation and understanding of the coming water future and how to prepare. Objective 4 shows a second benefit of community criteria. 3rd benefit in recruiting 20-50 prtners in developing community plans for responding to water situation.
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	N/A	
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	Lots of effort described, with heavy stakeholder involvement in creating community response vision.
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	assumes map will be somehow get connected
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	1	
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	Lots of words, but any direct connection to Human Right to Water is unclear. It is unclear how, as stated on pg 7 "BVSC activities will improve overall watershed health, protect groundwater quality from potential degradation, and ensure the drinking water supply remains safe." Unclear that the activities to be funded by this grant will accomplish those outcomes.
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	lots of broad-range details about effort, but lacks a feeling of coherence.
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	**The last cell in Row (f) Grand Total, doesn't make sense. How is the local cost share 176%? \$60K/\$260K = 23%
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		22	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-	

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2	Quantifiable benefits include 1) water use reduction; 2) reduced cost of water for the community to support the park (not mentioned in the proposal, but obvious), and 3) Lowered maintenance costs as result of more even irrigation and better and more uniform soil water retention. The present state of these and expected improvement should be quantified.
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	1	
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	1	could cite making Sponsor Group and/or Borrego Days presentations, and get another point
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	0	would be easy to provide and increase score
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0	
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	0	
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		17	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -		Can the County provide funds for this?

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2	Water reduction, pesticide reduction (latter not cited, but should be), reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by reducing mowed turf area. There is a negative impact from plastic turf, that will have to be replaced from time to time and disposed of. May still be appropriate for Borrego Springs.
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	N/A	
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	0	
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	On the "Turf Reduction Plan" there is no key indicating what areas exist that are to be reduced, and what will be left. I've scored assuming this will be fixed.
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	4	
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	0	
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	0	
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	I am not experienced in the business of converting turf to xeriscape, but the overall project cost of \$2.6 M divided by a reduction in turf acreage of 54 acres converted to xeriscaping indicates an overall cost ~\$55 K/acre. Or is the conversion to plastic turf instead of self-maintaining xeriscaping? Off the top of my head, this sounds really high to me. For example, based on their desert garden experience, could ABDNHA or some other org or business do this task well for \$10K/acre? Perhaps someone should ask...if so, de Anza Desrt Club could claim >50% cost share. This doesn't account for the cost of changing the pond liner, for which it appears a credible estimate is provided at ~\$351K, but that part is proposed to be locally-funded by de Anza Desert Club.
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		19	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points [self-score; do not count in compilation]	Reviewer comments
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		
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		Ensures provisions of SGMA considered in subbasin for GDE. Could affect pumping rampdown plan depending on results. STEM education benefits local hiring
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		Major Watermaster involvement as an Interested Party
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		
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		
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed		
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed		
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • 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		
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		
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible		
Total Range of Possible Points			30			
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	0 Cannot score proposal for which I am POC/lead advocate

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	3
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	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	1
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	0
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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	1,275,000

Rate per unit	\$	3.59
Dollars Saved	\$	33,333
Units Not Pumped		9,285
Gallons per unit		748
Gallons Not Pumped		6,945,218
Gallons per AF		325,850
AF Not Pumped		21
Cost if Option had been completed	\$	36,234

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	2
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	4
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):				\$ 3,159,000	

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	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	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		26
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 206,500	

This is a regulatory compliance requirement and benefits beyond that element are speculative.

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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	0
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	1
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	1
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		12
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	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? <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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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? <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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	369,000

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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? <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		20
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	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		18
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	300,000

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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		12
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	0
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	0
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	161,399

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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		18
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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	0
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	1
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	1
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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		16
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 377,670	

Potential for
1. Dust control
2. native vegetation regrowth

no breakdown for large tasks
\$218,750 for all of Task 3
\$220,680 for all of Task 4

Use 50% of ask

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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 outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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	1
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		10
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 292,500	Use 50% of ask

The WM 3 year prelim budget for EWG tasks is \$77,680
Project cost is \$585K, 600+% increase not explained

Benefit is knowledge
This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs

No outreach, only transparency

\$200,000 for 2 wells not in this project
Why not use Sink wells 12G1 and 7N1?

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2	costs increases over WM budget not explained
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	1. reduced pumping secondary 2. groundwater level monitoring 3. transparency
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	1	Little history of outreach, little explanation of new outreach plans
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1	"Subtasks that accelerate GMP tasks to fill in data gaps will reduce risks associated with water quality and shallow wells"
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	0	
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	1	
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	1	
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		16	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ 2,500,000		

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	0	Not part of the GMP Does not help achieve SGMA
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified		This is a plan
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	2	No beneficiaries No change in pumping reduction No reduction in pumping No benefit to potable water supply
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	1	No outreach, just rreporting
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	1	Implied it is possible the water table will not need to drop as low as it will with current plan
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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	4.5% cost share
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		12	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	0	Not part of the GMP Does not help achieve SGMA
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified		This is a plan
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	2	No beneficiaries No change in pumping reduction No reduction in pumping No benefit to potable water supply
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1	No outreach, just rreporting
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	1	Implied it is possible the water table will not need to drop as low as it will with current plan
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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	2% Cost share
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		12	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Water conservation
Multiple communities outreach

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2	Turf: 4 Softball: 0
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	2	reduce water public access reduce GHG
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	1	
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0	
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	0	
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		17	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):					2,286,552	

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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		20
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

1. Early warning system for undesirable effects
2. Fulfills GMP requirement for avoiding undesirable effects

Great outreach, but only 2 letters

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only") <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3	1. The WM not being a public agency is not required to engage the community and to incorporate their responsibilities into the related plans of other agencies. This project provides that link 2. Possible water conservation through well planned growth. Growth is a benefit
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 outreach 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	No letters
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1	water conservation for domestic wells
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	0	
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	23% Cost Share
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		22	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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		18
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Water conservation
Public access

Map missing, but can be added later, no vagueness on location

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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	1
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		12
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 292,500	

The WM 3 year prelim budget for EWG tasks is \$78K
WM GDE grant ask is \$585K
Project cost is \$1,037K

Benefit is knowledge
This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs

2 not 3 comment letters

use cost from WM GDE project

Revisions to PRC Preliminary Scoresheets

From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:46 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Project Score Revisions
Attachments: AK_PRC SCORE CARD 2022.02.03 (1).xlsx

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: Atley Keller <akeller@lgc.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:31 AM
To: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org) <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Re: Project Score Revisions

Sorry forgot [project #5](#)

Change Q1 to 2
Change Q8 to 1

On Thu, Feb 3, 2022 at 11:19 AM Atley Keller <akeller@lgc.org> wrote:

Project #6

- Change Q1 to 2,
- Change Q3 to 0
- Change Q5 to 1
- Change Q8 to 2
- Change Q9 to 1

Project #7

- Change Q1 to 2
- Change Q3 to 0
- Change Q5 to 1
- Change Q6 to 1
- Change Q7 to 1
- Change Q8 to 1
- Change Q9 to 1

Project #8

- Change Q1 to 2

- Change Q3 to 0
- Change Q5 to 1
- Change Q6 to 1
- Change Q7 to 1
- Change Q8 to 1
- Change Q9 to 1

--

Atley Keller | [she/her\(s\)](#)

Project Manager | Local Government Commission

akeller@lgc.org | (916) 448-1198 x330

980 9th Street, Suite 1700

Sacramento, CA 95814

[Sign up](#) to receive
LGC communications



From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:47 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Garmon Rescoring #4

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: David Garmon <jdgarmon@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:22 AM
To: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org) <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Garmon Rescoring #4

Jessica,

Please change my scoring on this one to:

Increase General 5 to a 3

Thanks,

David

From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:46 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Garmon Rescoring #7

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: David Garmon <jdgarmon@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:13 AM
To: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org) <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Garmon Rescoring #7

Jessica,

Please change my scores to the following:

1
NA
1
0
1
0
0
0
1
1
0

Thanks,

David

From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:47 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Garmon Rescoring #8

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: David Garmon <jdgarmon@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:16 AM
To: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org) <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Garmon Rescoring #8

Jessica

Please change my scores on this one to:

1
0
1
0
1
0
0
0
1
1
1

Thanks,

David

From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:46 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Garmon Rescoring Project #6

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: David Garmon <jdgarmon@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:10 AM
To: jessica borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Garmon Rescoring Project #6

Please change my scores to the following:

2
2
1
0
2
1
1
2
2
2
2
0

Thanks,

David

From: djohnson@borregowd.org
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 8:00 PM
To: [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: New scores REVISED PROJECT SCORES FOR DIANE JOHNSON

From: djohnson@borregowd.org
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:21 AM
To: jessica@borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: New scores

sorry can't scan right now.

So my only changes are only Project 6. new scores are below.

Q1 4
q3 3
q3 1
q9 3
q10 1

From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:50 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Regrading - Bennett

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: Bennett, Jim <Jim.Bennett@sdcounty.ca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:27 AM
To: jessica borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: RE: Regrading - Bennett

Jessica,

Sorry, couple more:

Project 7 and 8:
QUESTION 1: 0
QUESTION 7: 0

Jim Bennett, P.G., C.H.G.
Water Resources Manager

County of San Diego

Planning & Development Services, Sustainability Planning Division
5510 Overland Avenue, Third Floor, San Diego, CA 92123
Cell Phone: 619-346-1476
SGMA Website: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/SGMA.html>

From: Bennett, Jim
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2022 11:23 AM
To: jessica@borregowd.org
Subject: Regrading - Bennett

Hi Jessica, here are changes for me. Thanks!

Project 9
Question 4 = 2

Project 11
Question 4 = 2

Project 12
Question 4 = 2

Project 15
Question 4 = 2

Project 14
Question 1 = 3
Question 4 = 2
Question 5 = 3
New total = 17

Thanks.

Jim Bennett, P.G., C.H.G.
Water Resources Manager

County of San Diego

Planning & Development Services, Sustainability Planning Division
5510 Overland Avenue, Third Floor, San Diego, CA 92123
Cell Phone: 619-346-1476
SGMA Website: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/SGMA.html>

From: jessica_borregowd.org
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:52 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Revised scores

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: Mark Stevens <mstevens@bsusd.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:17 AM
To: jessica_borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Revised scores

Changes in scores.

Project #6 - increase

Stevens
2
1
0.5
2
1
1
0
1
1
1
1
1
1
11.5

Reduce #4

Stevens
3
1.5
2
2
2

2
0
0
2
2
1
<hr/>
17.5

Increase #14

Stevens
4
2
1.5
2
2
2
1
0
3
3
1
<hr/>
21.5

Reduce #11

Stevens
3
1.5
2
1
2
3
0
0
2
2
1
<hr/>
17.5

Mark Stevens, Ed.D.
 Superintendent
 Borrego Springs Unified School District
 Phone (760) 767-5357

Fax (760) 767-0494

We aspire to produce graduates who have their own visions for the future, armed with strong values and the tools for success in college, career, family and community life.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This E-mail may contain privileged and/or confidential information only for use by the intended recipients. Unless you are the addressee, you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute this message (or any information contained in or attached to it) to anyone. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail or by telephone and delete the transmission. Thank you.

From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:45 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Changes

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: Mike Seley <mike@seleyco.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:19 AM
To: jessica borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Changes

Jessica

I didn't want to do this on the chat, but it was too minor to send my whole spreadsheet.

The only change I would make is project #12, question #1; change my score from a 3, downward to a 1. That's it. Thanks.

-Mike

Mike Seley
Managing Director
Seley Ranches
1515 Hope Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030
mike@seleyco.com
Primary/mobile: (415) 640-2261

From: jessica_borregowd.org
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:54 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Staehle re-scoring for PRC
Attachments: Staehle PRC Scoring Template by Project RLS rescore 20220203.xlsx

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: Robert Staehle <gaboona@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:18 AM
To: jessica_borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Staehle re-scoring for PRC

Hi Jessica—

I have rescored the following three in the attached. All others unchanged.

5 WM GDE	changed from 12 to 11
6 WM Monitoring & Reporting	changed from 25 to 15
8 AAWARE water augmentation	changed from 14 to 13

Thank you,
Robert Staehle
TCDC

From: jessica@borregowd.org
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:55 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Updated scores
Attachments: PRC Scoring Template by Project Shannon Smith 2 3 2022.xlsx

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: Shannon Smith <ssmith@considinecos.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:16 AM
To: jessica@borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Subject: Updated scores

Dear Jessica,

I have updated projects 8, 10,11, 12 and 14.

Thank you,
Shannon

Shannon Smith
Considine Companies
1268 Bayshore Boulevard
Dunedin, FL 34698
727-515-3475

From: [jessica borregowd.org](mailto:jessica@borregowd.org)
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:56 PM
To: [Jane Gray](#); [Trey Driscoll](#); [Claudia Flores](#)
Subject: Fw: Tammy re-scores
Attachments: PRC Scoring Template by Project Tammy 2022-02-03.xlsx

Jessica Clabaugh
Finance Officer
Borrego Water District
760-767-5806

From: tammy borregowd.org <tammy@borregowd.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:16 AM
To: jessica borregowd.org <jessica@borregowd.org>
Cc: Meagan Wylie <meagan.wylie@csus.edu>; geoff borregowd.org <geoff@borregowd.org>
Subject: Tammy re-scores

highlighted in yellow

projects # 6,7,8,15

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? • 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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		16
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 377,670	

Potential for
1. Dust control
2. native vegetation regrowth

no breakdown for large tasks
\$218,750 for all of Task 3
\$220,680 for all of Task 4

Use 50% of ask

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	1	The WM 3 year prelim budget for EWG tasks is \$77,680 Project cost is \$585K, 600+% increase not explained
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1	Benefit is knowledge This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs
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	1	No outreach, only transparency
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0	
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	0	
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	0	
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	1	\$200,000 for 2 wells not in this project Why not use Sink wells 12G1 and 7N1?
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		10	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 292,500		Use 50% of ask

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	1
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		21
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$ 2,500,000	

costs increases over WM budget not explained

1. reduced pumping secondary
2. groundwater level monitoring
3. transparency

Little history of outreach, little explanation of new outreach plans

"Subtasks that accelerate GMP tasks to fill in data gaps will reduce risks associated with water quality and shallow wells"

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0	No part of the GMP Does not help achieve SGMA
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified		This is a plan
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	0	No beneficiaries No change in pumping reduction No reduction in pumping No benefit to potable water supply
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	1	No outreach, just rreporting
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	1	Implied it is possible the water table will not need to drop as low as it will with current plan
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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	2	4.5% cost share
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		9	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	0	Not part of the GMP Does not help achieve SGMA
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified		This is a plan
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	0	No beneficiaries No change in pumping reduction No reduction in pumping No benefit to potable water supply
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	1	No outreach, just rreporting
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	1	Implied it is possible the water table will not need to drop as low as it will with current plan
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	0	No benefit to potable water supply
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	2	2% Cost share
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		9	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign 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	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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Water conservation
 Multiple communities outreach

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2	Turf: 4 Softball: 0
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	2	reduce water public access reduce GHG
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	1	
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0	
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	0	
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		17	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):					2,286,552	

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3	1. Early warning system for undesirable effects 2. Fulfills GMP requirement for avoiding undesirable effects
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	Great outreach, but only 2 letters
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0	
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	0	
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		20	
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-	

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	1
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	0
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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

1. The WM not being a public agency is not required to engage the community and to incorporate their responsibilities into the related plans of other agencies. This project provides that link
2. Possible water conservation through well planned growth. Growth is a benefit

No letters

water conservation for domestic wells

23%

Cost Share

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	3
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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		18
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Water conservation
Public access

Map missing, but can be added later, no vagueness on location

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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	1
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ 292,500	

The WM 3 year prelim budget for EWG tasks is \$78K
WM GDE grant ask is \$585K
Project cost is \$1,037K

Benefit is knowledge
This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs

2 not 3 comment letters

use cost from WM GDE project

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	3
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? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	1
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	0
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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	1,275,000

Rate per unit	\$	3.59
Dollars Saved	\$	33,333
Units Not Pumped		9,285
Gallons per unit		748
Gallons Not Pumped		6,945,218
Gallons per AF		325,850
AF Not Pumped		21
Cost if Option had been completed	\$	36,234

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	2
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	4
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):				\$ 3,159,000	

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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	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? <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):				\$ 206,500	

This is a regulatory compliance requirement and benefits beyond that element are speculative.

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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	0
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	1
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	1
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		12
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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? <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	1
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		20
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	2
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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? <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		23
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	369,000

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

**Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria**

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	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		16
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	300,000

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	1
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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		12
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
General - Planning Only	2-Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	
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	
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	4 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
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	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points			30		0
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	161,399

Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	1
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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		15
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	2
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	1
General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	1
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	0
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	1
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	1
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

243.75

40.625

Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	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? <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		24
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Project #2 BWD Solar Project
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	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	0
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? <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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	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	1
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? <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		21
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):					

Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	1
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? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • 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	0
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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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? <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	1
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		11
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	-

Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	1
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	0
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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	0
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	1
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):					

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	0
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	
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	0
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		6
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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 supportign 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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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? <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	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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	300,000

Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	3
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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		22
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-

Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy
Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	0
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	1
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none">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	0
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	0
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	0
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		14
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$	100,000

Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wth explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	1
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	1
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	0
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	not provided
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		10
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):				\$ -	

Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	3
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 supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	2
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	0
General	3	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreach 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	0
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)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	0
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	0
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? <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	1
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		13
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundredth):				\$	-