PRC Preliminary Scoresheets

#### Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

## Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		2
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

## Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	5
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	-
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		24

## Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		2

#### Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	۷
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	:
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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	Ĺ
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	۷
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	з
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

6event <ul> <li>Was a discription of the parasolated integet of Comparison and support (a) to depend on the term of the parasolate integet of the parasolate in</li></ul>	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
series 1-imp ord       2-imp       Desceries the traject or component provide a dramption of quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted base related and quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted base related and quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted base related and quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted base related and quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted base related and quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinations and supporting documents is non-adjusted or quantifields benefits with equinatis documents equint adjusted or quantifields benefits wit	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Secure 1-Plannia       2.       Provide 1 metry for the Project Occumpation decode a web security and reacting and within the basin are working together 2.       3Mostity addressed.       3Mostity ad	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	4	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	
Baseling Centrement General Baseling Centrement Support Centrement Baseling Centrement Baseling Centrement 	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General4benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21Provided but missing some information 0Provided but missing some informationGeneral5SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the DAC(s) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting 	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	-
General       5       Short Project benefits and SU(s)         Source       Source       Project benefits and SU(s)         General       5       Source       Sou	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
Generalorprivate shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, SAFER Program?332Notstly addressed 0Not addressed 0Not addressed 0Not addressed 0Not addressedNot addressed 0Not addressedNot addressed 0Not addressedNot addressed	General	5	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.	3	2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either	:
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       - Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1. Marginally addressed         Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       3       - Fully 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 table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share in stor required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1. Budget is consistent and feasible 0. Not consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible 0. Not consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible 0. Not consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible         Budget       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       - Co	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1- Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include - 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 - Budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Not consi	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	:
Budget       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.       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible and feasible costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       3       - Budget is consistent and feasible consistent with not feasible consistent with those listed in the budget table and event of the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?       3       1       Consistent and feasible consistent and feasible feasible and event of the budget table and feasible feasible?       1       0 - Not consistent and feasible and feasible feasible feasible feasible feasible?       1       0 - Not consistent and feasible f	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 10 O - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		28

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

General <ul> <li>             for a decreption of the strong of weight or common many and the file in the intern of the file in the</li></ul>	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General Import GeneralNoDesk the Project or Component provide a description of usanthable benefits 'it to component option into the binding that and usanthable benefits 'it to component option into the binding that and usanthable benefits 'it to component option into the binding that and usanthable benefits 'it to component option into the binding that and usanthable benefits 'it to component option into the binding that and usanthable benefits 'it to component 	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Planning       2       Description description description of the basin are working starsers with significant details missing or unclear is working starsers with significant details missing or un	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	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	2
Generalaprince (e.g., residents, local leaders, no-profit represented Communities, ecc) located within Underegressented Communities? Descented within Underegressented Communities? Descented and aspaced minipulation of the Project Component (e.g., planning, design, and 	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General4benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21 - Provided but missing some information • Not providedGeneral5SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the soDAC(s) the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • No points will be project benefit an UDAC represented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • No points will be project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or ext. provided? Does the project core component help address the needs of the State Wate Board's SAFER Program?3 - Fully addressed - Not addressed3 - Fully addressed - Not addressedGeneral7Set Board Project or Component address the needs of the State Wate Board's state Wate Board's state Wate Board's SAFER Program?- A - Fully addressed - Not addressed- A - Fully addressed - Not addressed- Not addressedGeneral7Set Board Project or Component address the needs of the State Wate Board's state Wate Board's state Wate Board's state Wate Board's - Not addressed- A - Fully addressed - Not addressed- Not addressed - Not addressedScope of Wirk8gentProject? and non a consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?- Not addressed - Not addressed- Not addressed - Not addressedScope of Wirk88abudget summary table provide? Is the budget reasonable for the project 21 the budget cost seqended	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	
General5the Underegresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an source of funding that will benefit both the Underegresented Community and SDAC:332Project benefits an SDAC(S) 2Project benefits and SDAC(S) 2Project benefits and SDAC(S)3332Project benefits and SDAC(S) 2Project benefits and SDAC(S) 2Project benefits and SDAC(S)33	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       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, science provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?       3       2       -Mostly addressed - Mostly addressed - Not addressed         General       7       How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Schern Pumme heing has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and santary purposes?       4       -Fully addressed, with minor details not included 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 the grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       3       3       3       3       3         Budget       9       is a budget summary table provided 1 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 transma include (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly 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?       3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed       3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed         Budget       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project?       3 - Fully addressed       3 - Fully 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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share ins not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table anable?       1       1 -	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	ź
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 or unclear 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible - 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 - Not consistent and feasible - Not consistent and feasible - 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 - Not	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
BudgetIs 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 ocsts expended on projects before grant agreement date. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.33 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasibleSchedule10Is 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?11 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	:
Total Range of Possible Points30	Schedule	10		1		
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		33

#### Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

General1General - Imp Only2-ImpGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanGeneral - Planning Only3General4	1 Imp 2- Ian 3	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. 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.	Points           4           4           4           4           4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>4 - At least 3 (untifiable benefits) lacking explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>4 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> </ul>	Points
General - Imp Only       2-Imp         General - Planning       2-         Only       2-         General - Only       3         General       3         General       4	Imp 2- lan 3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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,</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only       2- Plan         General       3         General       4	2- lan 3	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? 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,	4	3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear	
General 3 General 4	3	parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities,		1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed	
General 4		<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
General 5	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General 6	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General 7	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
Budget 9	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule 10		Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	:
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		26

## Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		25
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

## Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

#### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting document</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		1
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

#### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

General - Imp Only 2-Ir General - Planning 2	1 -Imp	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. 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting</li> </ul>	
General - Planning 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	4	documents	
-				documents 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supporting documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified	
Only Pla	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General 3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
General 5	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General 6	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General 7	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work 8		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
Budget 9	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule 10	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		24

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		23
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

## Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	The one benefit is "reduced pumping," meter accuracy, reduced leaks
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul><li>4 - Fully addressed</li><li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li></ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Reduced pumping does not specifically preserve the Human Right to Water.
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		25	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

## Project #2 BWD Solar Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	Rate reduction, rate protection, GHG reduction
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	Direct inpact on affordability
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		23	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

## Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Protecting Basin Water Quality
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		24	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		
		-				

#### Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	= 1
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	NA	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	Developing guidance criteria for biological restoration.
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	No real outreach
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>		Just a plan. No tangible benefits.
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(	)
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	L
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		17	7
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

#### Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

## Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

**Reviewers** Comments

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	Enhanced understanding of basin potential update of GMP and the equipment left behind
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		12	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-		

## Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	All Necessary work. However, most of these projects are to be paid with pumping fees rather than tax payer funding.
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Board Meetings, TAC meetings,
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	C	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 extents through the end of the grant period where as the "offsetting already budgeted category' only goes through September 2022.
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	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		25	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

## Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

	Q#	Questions	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Falase Hope. GMP notes there are no alternative sources outside the Subbasin.
ieneral - Imp Only 2		Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	NA	
		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	There is no outread beyond standing meetings and the person of the community rep.
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	1	L
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C	This is a study of a issue that has been studied for 40 yean and is unlikely to come up with a ne answer.
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	This is a study of a issue that has been studied for 40 yea and is unlikely to come up with a ne answer.
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	\$500K of Reports
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		10	

		Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater / Project / Component Evalua				
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
ieneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Via standing WM meeting
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	1	What does the platt map reference?
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C	"Farmers and agricultural 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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		11	

#### Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Improved Water Conservation through education. Quantifiable increase in understanding of water situation in Borrego.
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	Assumes the common ma of the SDAC
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		20	5
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

#### Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	Will this work in a desert environmer
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Water conservation
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	NA	
General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	)
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	- <u>?</u>
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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	-
General	6	<ul> <li>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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):		\$ -		1

#### Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>		1) Improved understanding of basin water economy 2) Ability to monitor AQ impacts of fallowing and restoration projects
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>		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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>		
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	1
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$		

## Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	Standing up SC with ED, Stake holder Engagement Plan , GMP analysis
J J	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
Scope of Work		<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3	No line item for part-time ED
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		24	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

## Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

General 1		Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this			Points	
	1	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
Seneral - Imp Only 2-I	-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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Water Conserva
	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General 3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	0	
General 5	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	1	
General 6	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
General 7	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
Budget S	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	
Schedule 1	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		11	

#### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Water Conservation
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul><li>4 - Fully addressed</li><li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li></ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? <ul> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	2	Biggest water conservation proje
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		18	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-		

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	1) Fulfills SGMA requirements via GDE's 2) Permanent monitoring equipment
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	If WM approves, will have numerous interested parties involved in decision making
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	Local hiring from community or Indian Tribes. Ensures the provisions of SGMA are applied in the Subbasin. Potential significant impact on GMP.
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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):		\$ -		

#### Bio Restor to UM-546 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Project / Component Evaluation Criteria Actual Possible Scoring Guidance Section Name Q# Questions Points Points Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project 4 - Fully addressed 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 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 4 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear General 1 explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed planning only".) No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks 4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting 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 documents 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting docume General - Imp Only 2-Imp with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported 4 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents with backup documentation. 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified 4 - Fully addressed Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 General - Planning encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the 2-2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are Plan Only 1 - Marginally addressed working together? - Not addressed Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested 3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully 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 engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decisionimplementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? General 3 making committees 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed · To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the derrepresented Com unities - Provided and all necessary information provided Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and

2

1 - Provided but missing some information

3

a

3

d

benefitting areas? 0 - Not provided · The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting 3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit ar 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either 3 General SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the 5 amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. 0 - Project does not benefit either Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or 3 - Fully addressed private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 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 3 General 6 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed SAFER Program? 4 - Fully addressed How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 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 4 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear General 7 - Marginally addressed consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes? 0 - Not addressed 3 - Fully addressed Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 3 Scope of Work 8 grant Proje 1 - Marginally addressed No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks - Not addressed Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table 3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget and 2 - Budget is consistent and feasibl Budget schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include costs 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible expended on projects before grant agreement date. - Not consistent and feasible · Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full point Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and 1 - Consistent and feasible Schedule 10 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? **Total Range of Possible Points** 30 TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth): Ś

General

4

22-23 (Luestions Viking Ranch access to tallowed land even poss? 2. drone? cost? rout? P.5-one of many such statements, it seul projects: WM costs paid mostly by major pumpets (for p or for private benefit (ACC)-not residents/ra for prast payers as stated 0515-p.10

REW 6 tote Monitor

#### 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	45
Seneral - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	V
General - Planning Only		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	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	ø	
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	ø	could be
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	Ø?	ONT in For
General	1	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	Ø	for domest
Scope of Work		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	not clarmed
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? I si 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 -	- too \$\$, No
Schedule		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 O - Not consistent and feasible	0	Costshand
And a star		Total Range of Possible Points	30		0	0
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):	S. S	\$ -		

1. COSTLY, Can measurements be taken sans well 2. ? Sitiling of mon, well estation eig. isotopes 3 bot 10 bill well estation Q3/Notes 2. ? sitting of mon, well estation 3 not thought through very well.

#6 BBASIC

#### 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	)
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.	Q* 3	<ol> <li>Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	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	ACCOUNTS
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 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not 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		
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

F= 15

#### 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
eneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	X
ieneral - 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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	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	<ol> <li>Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	-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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	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	1-1
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.	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		
					TARGET COMPANY

Questional Notes 1. underlying assumption: will find ways to angreat , see e.g. p. 5, impact on Small W systems) don, welks : "The Proj. will have a partive impact on priv don wells ... attrib to det-ing meths to incr. the overall rate of gw re charge, and the w supply and yield ..." 2. MISCHARS previous work-both extent & conclusions - yet mentions an item from a 2019 BWB BD Agenda-(7/19/19) p. 6, HRDW - and ENSI

Clark Lake



Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Only     Pin     propositify Dest id section how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working togeneral working togeneral working togeneral working togeneral working togeneral (s.g., residents, hourspectra for component e.g., residents, and many expressed Communities and hully engaged. Involved, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully engaged. Minoteed, but not included on decision-making committees and fully decising the submet and ensage fully decising the submet	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Sereal - Ing Oky         Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be raisized from the Project or Component         4         - A desta 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents           - To obtain full provide d description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits with explanations and supporting documents         - To obtain full provide d benefits labeling explanations and supporting documents         - To obtain full provide d benefits labeling explanations and supporting documents           General - Planning         2         Does the Project Description decribe a well-coordinated memory as (SMP(1) that and fully supported in the provide but are not explained or rundare system provided but are not explained or rundare system provide d but multiple GA(2) surrounding and decision-making or undiver system provide in the basis in not covered in the data in the system provide d but are not explained or rundare system provide d but multiple GA(2) surrounding and enging in terrated are system provided but minute of the Project Component (Leg planning decision-making and the project accomponent (Leg planning decisi	General		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".)	4	<ol> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> </ol>	(International States)
General - Haming Only         2         Desk the Project Description describes any apel coordinate of proposal including a GSP(s) that encompass teachines the entre basin or describes why approximation of the basin in covered in the working tedescribe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and webbin the basin are working tedescribes how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and webbin the basin are working tedescribes how port the source how and engaging interested particle (a, residents, local ladoest, non-priorit reverseding Undergressenting Undergressente Undergressenting Undergressenting Undergressentergressenting	ieneral - 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	4	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	Ø-
general       3 - Interseting a parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities, and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved, but not included on decision-making communes and engageed involved in a spect of the project Common in the information function is a project barefit and inderrepresented Community (isi)? Was there a maps() depicting the solution in the given in the project barefit and inderrepresented Community (isi)? Was there a maps() depicting the solution in the project barefit and inderrepresented Community and SOAC.         General       Construction should be dear and easy to read. If not, the project therefore component help address the needs of the State Water System or project barefits underrepresented Community.       3       3       3       3       3       4       1         General       Construction should be dear and easy to read. If not, the project therefore component help address the needs of the State Water St		2- Plan	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	4	<ol> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> </ol>	1
General       4       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefiting areas?       2       1       Provided and all necessary information provided 2       1         General       4       benefiting areas?       2       1       Provided and all necessary information provided 2       1         General       5       Socar the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Desse provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the the orderrepresented Community and SDAC. • No provided       3       2       - Froject benefits an SDAC(s) 2       2       - Froject benefits an SDAC(s) 2       0         General       6       Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small wate systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g. groundwater contamination underability, drawdown, ecc)? Was justification such as domestic well (e.g. groundwater contamination underability, drawdown, ecc)? 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 Sector 106.3/? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State the every human being that the gift to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and santary purpose?       3       3       3       4       Fully addressed 0       - Not addressed 0       - Not addressed       1	General	3	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	3	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
GeneralSDoes the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? The the project will benefit? Please provide the mount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.33 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2-Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1-Project does not benefit either9General6Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic well (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? was justification such as domestic well (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? was justification such as domestic well cesus results, water system maps, service area maps, service area maps, etc. area domestic server, provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?3 - Fully addressed - Not yiddressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 3 - Notify addressed 3 - Notify addressed 3 - Notify addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed1 - Norginally addressed 3 - Notify addressed 3 - Notify addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 3 - Notify addressed, with significant details motincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - No	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and henefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	1
General       6       private shallow domestic well (e.g., groundwater contamination unlearbility, drawdown, etc.)?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear       0         General       6       Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, ser	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.	3	2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either	OA
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       Fully addressed       3       Mostly addressed       0         Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the task/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       Did the proposal provide a description of the task/subtasks shat will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       Fully addressed       2       Mostly addressed       0         8       grant Project?       • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       3       Coal cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 0       0       Not addressed 0       0       Not addressed       1       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 schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 0       0       Not consistent and feasible 0       0       0         10       Is the t	General	6	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	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	0
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the task/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed.       3       2 - Mostly addressed.       1 - Marginally addressed       2 - Mostly addressed       2 - Most	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	4	3 - 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
Budget       9       table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget of tasks of the tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget of tasks of ta	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	11
Schedule 10 Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and 1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and	Budget	9	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	2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	10
	Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and	1		
Total number of the second s			Total Range of Possible Points	30		

1. Clark Lake studied already, \$1 million. Study T=6 ERESULTE Not incomplete - concluded that

#### 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	9
Seneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3
ieneral - 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	<ol> <li>Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	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)? 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		,
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

T=27-21 bcboth Plan and Impl

r 3

#### 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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	working together?	4	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	erritanise
Scope of Work		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 task/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the task/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	- Tocal cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible     - 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible     - Budget is consistent but not feasible     - 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 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		(
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$	-

1=22

#10

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

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actu
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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	4
ieneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
ieneral - Planning Only	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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	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)? 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	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0
icope of Work	8 1	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 a	is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table task/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		s 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		4
	1.25	TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$	

- COSTLY

T= 20

#12

T=27

#### 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	<ol> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ol>	4
Seneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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)? 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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	A3
Scope of Work		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		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	UTIL I COURTS	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$	

#### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

#B

T=H

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
Seneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two guantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Fully addressed</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> <li>Not addressed</li> </ol>	Ø
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	ф
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	6
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	Za
General		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	Ø
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	ø
Scope of Work		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	ł
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	0 - Not addressed 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		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		1
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$	C.K. Star

		Project #14 DADC Water Cons	ervation Pla	an	
		Project / Component Evaluat			
Section Name	Q#		Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual
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	
Seneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	Ò
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	Ô
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	7
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	6
General		How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3
Schedule		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

2.0

30

\$

Total Range of Possible Points

TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):

T=12

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

#### Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

General         • An Use 3 advanced of the proposed project of Composent provide 3 monitor of the sequence sector of the project of Composent provide 3 monitor of the sequence sector of the project of Composent advanced of the project of Composent advanced of the project of Composent advanced of the project of Composent provide 3 monitor advanced and the composent field of the project of Composent provide 3 monitor advanced and the composent field of the project of Composent provide 3 monitor advanced and the composent provide 3 monitor advanced and the composent field of the project of Composent provide 3 monitor advanced and the composent field of the project descent provide 3 monitor advanced and the composent field of the project descent project 3 for the project descent project 3 for the project descent provide 3 monitor advanced and the composent field of the project descent project 3 for the project of the project descent project 3 for the project descent project 3 for the project of the project descent project 3 for the project of the project of the project descent project 3 for the project 3 monitor advanced and	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Boots the Project or Component provide a discription of quantifiable benefits? Was an exploration of the benefits with a requested to be related on the Project or Component of the Project or Component Induced on undear or or Com	General	1	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".)	4	<ol> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> </ol>	9
Seneral - Mainting 2-       Compares the entry basis or describe swip a pertoid of point will and covered in the property Down wells describe how well the mainer (SK) in uncluding and whith the basis reveared in the pertoid of point will be entry in percesses?       3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed with minor details on tincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed with minor details on tincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed with minor details on tincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed with minor details on tincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed with minor details on tincluded or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed with a material particle (are, resident), Cal aide within (b basis revealed particle specification) Can interest darge the project Component (are, planning, design, and engaging interested particle provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees and fully empace/involved in all appects of the Project Component (are, planning, design, and engaging interested particle provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees and fully compared to the project Component (are, planning, design, and are required from the underropresented Community (sei) that the project will benefit particle provide addressed design and and are required from the underropresented Community (sei) that the project will benefit Plans provide the mainer and planning (seing) and the project and the project will benefit provide addressed design and and are required from the underropresented Community (sei) that the project will benefit? Plans provide the mainer and planning (seing and the planning free and planning (seing and the project and the project will benefit? Plans provide addressed design and the project and the project will benefit? Plans provide addressed design and the project and the project will benefit? Plans the project will benefit? Plans prevised addressed provide addre	Seneral - 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	4	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	
General       a       - Intersted parties (c.g., resident), local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, intersted parties bruing all phases of the Project or Component (c.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties bruinded on the decision-making processes?       a       - Intersted parties included on decision-making committees and fully emplementation? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes?       a       - Intersted parties included on decision-making committees and fully decises and easy to read. If not, the point will not be project momunities.       a       - Intersted parties included on decision-making committees and fully intersted parties included on decision-making committees and fully addressed       - Not addressed       - Not addressed       - Not provided back back on the decision-making committees and fully intersted parties included on decision-making committees and fully addressed       - Not provided back back on the decision-making committees and fully intersted parties included on decision-making committees and intersted parties included on decision-making committees and and and parties included on decision-making committees and intersted parties included on decision-making committees and intersted parties inclocod in the decision incload and interested			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	<ol> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> </ol>	2
General       4       Benefitting areas?       2       1 - Provided but missing some information         General       - The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.       0 - Not provided         General       - SobAC: Was threa anap(s) depiciting the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there anap(s) depiciting the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will be given if a map(s) is not provided.       3 - Project benefits underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either         General       - Work 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.)?       3 - Fully addressed         General       - SobAC: Was it the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Read"s       3 - Fully addressed         General       - Project beams consumption, cooking, and sanitary purpose?       - Fully addressed       - Montaddressed         General       - SobAC: Was it the Project or Component address the human Right to Water (AB 685       - Fully addressed       - Fully addressed         General       - SobaC: Not addressed       - Mox dows, with significant details not included or unclear       - Fully addressed         General       - SobaC: Not addressed       - Mox dows, with minor details not included or unclear       - Fully addressed	General	3	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	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	3
General       5       Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there an ang(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? the the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit benefit? Please provide amount of fundier project of component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       Fully addressed       3       - Not addressed         General       6       Was justification such as domestic well 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 the very human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and santary purposes?       3       3       - Pluly addressed vith minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed vith minor details no	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       Was justification such as domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       2 - Houly addressed         General       7       Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area ma	General	5	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.	3	3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either	1
General       7       Section 106.37 House the project of Component supports the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?       3       Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally 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?       3       - Mostly addressed       3       - Mostly 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?       3       - Mostly addressed       3       - Mostly addressed       3         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget rasonable for the tasks/subtasks in the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule table consistent and feasible       3       - Local cost share is nort required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local cost share is nort required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local cost share is nort required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local	General	6	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	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	1
Scope of Work       8       grant Project?       • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear       1 - Marginally addressed       0 - Not consistent and feasible       0 - Not consistent and feasible <t< td=""><td>General</td><td>7</td><td>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</td><td>4</td><td><ol> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> </ol></td><td>0</td></t<>	General	7	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	4	<ol> <li>Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>Marginally addressed</li> </ol>	0
Budget       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.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent but not feasible - Not consistent and feasible - Not consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - budget is consistent but not feasible - Not consistent and feasible - Not	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 0 - Not consistent and feasible	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	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
			Total Range of Possible Points			1

T=21

#15

## Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

# Project #2 BWD Solar Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

General     • Note decomption of the proposed project accomposed project accomption accompting accomparties accomption accomption accomption accomption accom	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Base         Inside the Project or Component provide a decreption of quastifiable benefits (w) and quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting decaments with explanations and supporting decaments is the explanation of quastifiable benefits (q) and qualifiable benefits with explanations and supporting decaments is the explanation of quastifiable benefits (q) and qualifiable benefits (q) qualifiable be	General		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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Planing       2.       Does the Project Decorption decifies a well-coordinated proposal including a GSNS in the encompass the active Sain or decifies any solution of the Basin are working together?       3 Nostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear investing proposal Dues it describes why solution of the Basin are working together?       3 Nostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear investing properties included in the East are working together?       3 Nostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear investing properties included in the East are equired from the unclear decision-making commutities or Component (a, planing, decign, and project Component investing properties included in the decision making properties included and all accessary information provided on unclear investing to describe and store are equired from the Undeerropersented Community in the Store are areginal and Project map(d depicting the site location, current conditions, and interest depicting the site location, site are angle depicting the information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given in a map(s) is not provided in the cite site are angle depicting the information ville Half Plane are angle depicting the site location will not be given in a map(s) is not provided.       3 Provided and all necessary information provided or unclear information information ville Half Plane are angle depicting the information ville Half Plane are angle depicting the site information ville Half Plane are	Seneral - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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	2
Generala a scheducedanterested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities a implementation)? Can interested parties toring all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide inplat and be involved in the decision- making processes? a a a benefitting areas? benefitting areas? benefitting areas?a. Interested parties included on decision- making committees and all necessary informationa. Interested parties included on decision- making committees and all necessary informationa. Interested parties included on decision- making committees and all necessary informationa. Interested parties included on decision- making committees and all necessary information and all necessary informationa. Interested parties included on decision- making committees and all necessary informationa. Interested parties included on decision- making committees and all necessary informationa. Interested parties included on decision- making committees and all necessary informationa. Interested parties included on decision- making committees 	Ũ		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General       4       benefitting area?       2       1. Provided but missing some information         General       - The information should be clear and easy to read. if not, the point will not be given.       0       Not provided       0         General       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) is not provided.       3       -Project Aerial SDAC(s)       -Project Denefits Underrepresented Community - ies)? Was there a map(s) is not provided.       3       -Project Aerial SDAC(s)       -Project Denefits Underrepresented Community - ies)? Was there a map(s) is not provided.       3       -Project Aerial SDAC(s)       -Project Aeria	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	3
General555555555676767677777777777777777777777777177771777177 <td>General</td> <td>4</td> <td>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</td> <td>2</td> <td>1 - Provided but missing some information</td> <td>2</td>	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       - Mostly addressed         Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc.       3       - Mostly addressed       - Mostly addressed         General       7       How does the project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?       3       4       - Fully addressed         A       How does the 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 for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?       4       - Fully addressed       3       - Mostly addressed       3       Mostly addressed       4       - Fully addressed       3       - Substly addressed       4       - Fully addressed       3       3       - Substly addressed       3       - Substly addressed       4       - Fully addressed       3       - Substly addressed       3       - Substly addressed       4       - Fully addressed       3       - Substly addressed       3       - Substly addressed       4       - Substly addressed       3       - Substly addressed       3       - Substly addressed       4       - Substly addressed       3       - Substly addressed       3       - Substly addressed       3       - S	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	3
General7How 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?44Fully addressed 3Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 25Scope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.34Fully addressed 33Fully addressed 36Budget9Is a budget summary table provide? 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 a schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include 	General		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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table asible?       1       1 - Consistent and feasible on Not consistent and f	General		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include to budget is consistent and feasible to budget table and to budget table table tables?         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule feasible?       1       1       Consistent and feasible to budget table and table and table tables?       0 - Not consistent and feasible tables?       0 - Not consistent and feasible tables?	Scope of Work		grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	3
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		23

# Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

<ul> <li>Max a decayation of the proposed project to Component provided D is audiant with the provided, community and characteristic standing the Max and the standing of methods and the provided community and characteristic standing of methods and the provided community and characteristic standing of methods and the provided community andiffer provided community and the p</li></ul>	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Base Description of the Project of Component purports description of quantifiable benefits via a completion of the Description of expeription of the Project Organization and supporting a With Properties Provide Description of quantifiable benefits via a supporting of quantifiable benefits via a support of component via via a support of component via via a support of quantifiable benefits via a	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Planting Original         2         Desk the Project Description describe A partice According a Lossing a Lossing (MAT encompasses the entire basin or accilence with a public ESA(s) surrounding and within the basin are variant gradeshies have a public describe thing plan for outversed in the variant gradeshies on port description in the basin are variant gradeshies of the Project Variant and provide main are provide in the description making are processed in the project base of the Project Variant and the provide in the description making are processed in the project base of the Project Variant and the provide with and the provide in the provide in the project Variant and the provide with a description and are provide and any provide main description and are provide and any provide and description of the project Variant and	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	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	3
Seneral Generala parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit agrees motion the intersected parties included in all spaces of the Project Component intersected parties provide in parties included in all spaces of the Project Component intersected parties provide in the project of component include innpinementation) Can intersected parties provide in the decision-making committees includerspresented Communities.333 </td <td>Ũ</td> <td></td> <td>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</td> <td>4</td> <td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td> <td></td>	Ũ		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General       4       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and a benefitting areas?       2       2 - Provided and all necessary information provided       2         General       4       benefitting areas?       2       1 - Provided and all necessary information provided       2         General       5       Simple the project benefit an Undergoresented Community (-isp? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project well benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit? Does the project benefits undergoresented Community (-isp? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit so the project benefits undergoresented Community (-isp? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit so the project benefits undergoresented Community (-isp? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that a will benefit so the project benefits undergoresented Community (-isp? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the state so the solution will benefit? Please provide the solution will benefit? Please provide the solution will benefit? Please provide the solution will be project map(s) depicting the solution will benefit? Please provide to a solution will benefit? Please provide the solution will be project?       3       - Project benefits undergoresented Community (-isp? Was will be project and the solution will benefit? Please provide the solution will benefit	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
Generalis the underrepresented Community (les) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community a 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.33332Project benefits and SDAC(s) 1 - Project benefits underrepresented Community 1 - Project benefits underrepresented Community 2 - Mostly addressed3General6Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system on system carea maps, etc provided? Does the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.31? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State the very human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purpose?4441- Uily addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressed2Budgetbit the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?331- Wostly addressed 2 - Most	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
Generalorivate 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?33345Fully addressed 033General7How does the project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the estabilished 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?444445Mostly addressed 0255 <t< td=""><td>General</td><td>5</td><td>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.</td><td>3</td><td><ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul></td><td>3</td></t<>	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	3
GeneralAHow does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB BSS Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed2Scope of Work8Did 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 - Fould with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed3Budget9Is a budget summary table provide? 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 table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible3Budget10Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and with in the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?11 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible3	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       3         Budget       • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in 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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include to - Not consistent and feasible - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Not consistent and feasible - N	General	7	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
BudgetIs 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 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible 1	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	3
Total Range of Possible Points30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		25

# 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		
		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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		
		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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		C
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

# Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Was a decision of the project of Composent provided D is each with the Product of Composent provide is each of the second with the Product of Composent provided is each of the second with the Product of Composent provided is each of the second with the Product of the property provided is each of the second with the Product of the property provided is each of the second with the Product of the property provided is each of the second with the Product of the property provided is each of the property bases with the Product of the property provided is each of the property bases with the Product of the property provided is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the property bases with the Product bases with the property provide is each of the proproduct property provide is each of the p	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
spect but tracks or component provide a decrylation of quantifiable bunching?       A       a. "Two quantifiable bunching at a set provide the provide to the Project Component quantifiable bunching at a set provide but the explanations and supporting documents are explained bunching at GPS() that a provide but the role calculated are untiple GPS() humonitation of the basis is not covered in the answer of the basis are working together?	General		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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
Beneral         Description descri	General - Imp Only		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	4	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	
Generala a sa strice (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underepresented Communities, explored within Underepresented Communities? Does the outced condex and engaged Minobied in all species of the Project Orgonoponet (e.g., planing, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? 	•	2-	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	C
General4benefitting areas? > The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21 - Frovided but missing some informationGeneral5SDAC for Was there a map(s) depiciting the project will benefit 2 hosts the project 2 hosts addressed will wind will benefit 2 hosts the project will benefit 2 hosts the project 2 hosts addressed will benefit e human Right 0 water (AB 6AS 5 etc. project) and addressed will be more dealis not included or unclear 2 hostsy addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 hostsy addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 hards reading addressedGeneral7For will be project 7 component address the Human Right 0 water (AB 6AS 5 etc. project) and will be project 2 hostsy addressed with minor details not included or unclear 2 hostsy addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 hostsy addressed 0 host dareased 0 host dareased 0 hos	General		<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	C
General5ShoC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide that an anount of funding that will benefit SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide that an anount of funding that will benefit sDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide that an anount of funding that will benefit sDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide that an anount of funding that will benefit sDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide that an anount of funding that will benefit sDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide that an anount of funding that will benefit sDAC(s) that the project to component positively impact issues associated with small water systems on the state state shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       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       1       -Fully addressed 0       - Nostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1         General       7       Kostly addressed set 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       Fully addressed 9       4       Fully addressed 9       - Notaty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1       - Notaty addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1       - Notaty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1       - Notaty addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1       - Notaty addressed       - Notaty	General		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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	C
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       Fully addressed 3       Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2       Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1       Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2       Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1       Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1       Mostly addressed       Most	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	(
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       - Not consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible       -	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	(
Budget       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.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not	Scope of Work		grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget		<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		11

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		19
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

## Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		14
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

# Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		1
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-	

# Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		1
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

#### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		1
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-	

#### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		13
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		9
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-	

# Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	Question: What is estimated savings in wate
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General		How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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):		\$ -		

# 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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		26

# Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

			Points	Scoring Guidance	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
ieneral - Imp Only 2		Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	:
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

#### Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Section Name	Q# Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	<ul> <li>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</li> <li>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".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	Question: How is this implemented if the land is not vacated? Using existing land
General - Imp Only	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	
General - Planning Only	<ul> <li>Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that</li> <li>encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the</li> <li>plan</li> <li>proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	
General	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and</li> <li>benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	
General	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	2	
General	<ul> <li>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?</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General	7How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
Budget	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
	Total Range of Possible Points	30		23	
	TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-		

## Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Question: How would any of the objectives of the WM likely change if GDEs are dependent?
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Question: Why revisit? Is it likely that GDEs exist?
General - Planning Only	-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Question: What could you actually do?
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.	З	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Question: Budget doesn't seem to tie to tasks.
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	C	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		13	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

## Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Question: this just seems like paying for operating costs.
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	Budget is rediculous.
General - Planning Only	-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	0	
		Total Range of Possible Points			9	
		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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	
I					

#### Ya. Out of the box is always good.

# Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Question: What was the gap? What were the findings?
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	Question: Does the aquifer reside within park boundaries?
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	Question: Why are we re-researching items?
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Question: What about GDEs?
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	0	
		Total Range of Possible Points			18	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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):		\$ -	

## Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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):		\$ -	

# Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

# Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Section Name	Q# Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	<ul> <li>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</li> <li>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".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	Question: How quickly could a change in air quality reasonably be detected?
General - Imp Only	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	Question: How would that degredation (if noted) be addressed by the WM?
General - Planning Only	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 Plan proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?		<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	Question: What data currently exists? How could we extrapolate?
General	<ul> <li>Boes 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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and</li> <li>benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	
General	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	
General	<ul> <li>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?</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
General	7How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
Budget	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
	Total Range of Possible Points	30		22	
	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	Not specific. Should be pa
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		24	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

rt of educational strategy.

## Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	Question: Water savings?
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	Needs to re-write. Good idea.
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	With re-writes I would score higher.
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		19	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

#### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	:
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		23
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Miss a computer of the proper of Proper of Composition Propero Propero Propero Properot Properot Properot Properot Propero Properof Composition Proper	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Base International State International Construction of quantifies benching Water any equivation of the Universe of the State International State Internation State Internaternation State Internation State Internation State	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Plannia       2.       Does the Project Description description activitie a well characterize the contraduction of the basin in a contraductin contresecont of the contraduction of thebasin in a c	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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	2
Generala a processer)a - interested parties included on decision-making committees implementation? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees and engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees a - Marginally addressed - Not addresseda - interested parties included on decision-making committees a - making committees and engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees - Not addressedGeneral4benefitting areas?benefitting areas?a - interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees - Not addressed- Not addressed - Not addressedGeneral5Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community-(sel)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (sel) that the project will benefit? Poess the project benefit an sobAC(18) that the project will benefit? Poess the project benefit an - No provided but missing some information - No provided - Project benefits underrepresented Community (sel); that the project will benefit? Poess the project benefit an - No provided - Project does not benefit either - Project does not benefit either- Project addressedGeneral7Was there a map(s) depicting the SAC(18) that the project will benefit? Poess the project does not benefit either - No point addressed- No point addressedGeneral7No does the project or Component positively impact (sees social social does social does not benefit either - No point addressed- No point addressedGeneral7No does the project or Component positively impact (see social social does does does does does does doe	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General4benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21Provided but missing some informationGeneral5SDAC (Vas there a map(s) depicing the SDAC(s) the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicing the SDAC(s) amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicing the SDAC(s) amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicing the SDAC(s) • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.33Projects benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicing the SDAC(s) • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.33- Project benefits an SDAC(s) 2 - Project benefits underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) end provided community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.33- Fully addressed 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mosty addressed 0 - Not addressedGeneral7Both the proposal provide a description of the task/subtasks that will be completed as part of the star project? • No funds will be avarded without	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	1
General       5       SPOJEC Substrate 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.       3       2       Project benefits an SDA(s) substrate a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the substrate anapoly of project benefits and SDA(s) substrate anapoly of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.       3       3       2       Project benefits underrepresented Community 1       Project benefits and SDA(s) substrate substrate and provide the substrate substrate substrate anapoly of project benefits and SDA(s) substrate substr	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       2       Houly addressed         Was justification such as domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       2       Housty addressed       2         SAFER Program?       3       4       Fully addressed       0       Not addressed       0         General       7       thow does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685       4       4       4       4       5       Notity addressed       0       Not addressed       4       5       Mostly addressed       0       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       4       5       Mostly addressed       0       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       4       5       Mostly addressed       0       Not addressed       4       1       Marginally addressed       0       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       4       5       Mostly addressed       0       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       3       5       Fully addressed       3       5       Fully addressed       3       5       Fully addressed       3       6       1       Nostly addressed       3       6	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally 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?       3       - Fully addressed 3 - Nostly addressed         8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       - Not staddressed 	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed, or Not addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget tables/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget is consistent and feasible       3       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       2 - Budget is consistent but not feasible       2 - Budget is consistent and feasible <td>General</td> <td>7</td> <td>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</td> <td>4</td> <td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td> <td>0</td>	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
Budget       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.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent but not feasible - Budget is consistent but not feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent but not feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Not consistent and feasible - Not consistent and feasible - Doel - Not consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Doel - Not consistent and feasible - Doel - Not consistent and feasible - Doel - Not consistent and feasible - Budget is	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 10 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	2
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		0
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		14

### Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

General - Ing Ordy         Vex a decoupler of the proposed Project a Component power to a soft of the internal control of the proposed community of the provide of components encode neuronal bight control internal control of the project and provide community of the proposed power to a soft of the internal control of the project and provide community of the proposed power to a soft of the project and provide internal control of the project and provide community of the proposed power to a soft of the project and provide internal control of the project and pro	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Senserial - Imp       2	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Seneral-Planing         2         Description description description and producting a GAPM (mining GAPM) (mining G		2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	
General3interstet parties include on decision-making committees and fully engaged/movied in all appets of the Project/Component (e.g., phaning, edges, and inplement the decision-making processes? 	-		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	3	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General       4       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?       2       2       1       Provided and all necessary information provided 1       1         General       5       a benefitting areas?       0       Net provide and all necessary information provided 0       1       1         General       5       a benefitting areas?       0       Net provide and all necessary information provided 0       1       1         General       5       a SDAC(s) a sDAC(s)       2       1       Provide but missing some information 0       1       1         General       5       a SDAC(s)       1	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	4	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	
General5the 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.3332Project benefits and SDAC(s) 2Project banefits and SDAC(s) 	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	
General       a       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       a       a       a Marginally addressed         General       7       for words of the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685       4       4       Fully addressed       a Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear       a Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear         Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685       a Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear       a Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear         Scope of Work       8       for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?       a Mostly addressed       a Mostly addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       a Suddressed       a Mostly addressed         Budget       1s a budget summary table provide? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget terasonable for the project? Is the budget summary table provided? Is the sudget summary table provide? Is too that exers/subtasks in the budget tasks/subtasks in the budget table and consider with the tasks/subtasks in the subs/subtask in the schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	
Answer of the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?       3 - 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?       3 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed       2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressed         Budget       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 (minum of 5%)? Local cost share include cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget task of the budget task of the schedule fasible?       1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	General	6	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	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally 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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table system of two included on projects before grant agreement date.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         Budget       9       Is the tasks/subtasks in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         2 - Mostly addressed       0 - Not addressed       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         2 - Budget is consistent and feasible       1 - Budget is consistent and feasible       2 - Budget is consistent and feasible         2 - Mostly addressed       3 - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Not consistent and feasible       1 - Consistent and feasible         3 - Not consistent and feasible       1 - Consistent and feasible       1 - Consistent and feasible       0 - Not consistent and feasible	General	7	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget       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 is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and 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 consi	Scope of Work	8	this grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	
Total Panga of Dessible Deinte	Schedule	10		1		
i otal kange of Possible Points 33			Total Range of Possible Points	33		

# Project #2 BWD Solar Project

		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
ieneral - Imp Only 2	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.	2	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	4	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	25		

# Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

GeneralProject provide implem your pr not app • NoGeneral - Imp Only2-ImpDoes the explana provide • To implem with bateGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes the explana provide • To implem propos workingGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes the explana provide • To implem propos workingGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes the encomp propos workingGeneral4 • Does the parties • To implem provide • To implem • To implem provide • To implem • To implem provide • To implem • To implem <b< th=""><th>Questions</th><th>Possible Points</th><th>Scoring Guidance</th><th>Actual Points</th></b<>	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General - Imp Only2-Impexplana provide • To with balkGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes the encomp proposivorkingGeneral - Planning 	as a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this oject or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits ovided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan oplementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to our proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective ot applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only2- Planencomp propos workingGeneral3Does th parties etc.) loc interest implem process • To the UnderrGeneral4Was th benefit • TheGeneral4Does th parties etc.) loc interest implem process 	<ul> <li>bes the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an planation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component ovided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported th backup documentation.</li> </ul>	0	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
GeneralAparties etc.) loc interest implem process • To underrGeneral4Was the benefit • TheGeneral4Does the the UnderrGeneral5Does the the Underr • NoGeneral5Will the private • NoGeneral6Will the private • NoGeneral6Will the private • NoGeneral6Does the the Under • NoGeneral7How do SAFER I of that events for hunderScope of Work8Did the grant P	pes the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that compasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the oposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are orking together?	2	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
GeneralWas the benefit • TheGeneral4Was the benefit • TheGeneral5Does the the Unit SDAC? amoun • NoGeneral6Will the private 	<ul> <li>bes the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested arties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, c.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include terested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and uplementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making ocesses?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the inderrepresented Communities.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General5the Unit SDAC? amoun • NoGeneral6Will the private Was just provide SAFER IGeneral7How do Section that ev for hunScope of Work8Did the grant P	as there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and enefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
General 6 private Was just provide SAFER 1 General 7 How do Section that events for hund Scope of Work 8 Did the grant P	bes the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting e Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an DAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the mount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General 7 How do Section that ev for hun Scope of Work 8 Did the grant P	ill the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or ivate shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? as justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. ovided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's .FER Program?	1	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work 8 grant P	ow does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 ction 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State at every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate r human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	2	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
	d the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this ant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget 9 and sch costs ex • Loc	a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget ble tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget d schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include sts expended on projects before grant agreement date. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule 110	the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and thin 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		

# Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

General <ul> <li>Mus description of the proposed register &amp; Composition provided. Data is explored, instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of benefits is a first, measurable objective, informating the instances of the instances of a matches and supporting decomments.</li></ul>	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Back         Desc the bracket or Component provide a disciplinan of quartifiable benefits? Was an solution of the sendit that are explained on the Project component to solution of the sendit that are explained on quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         S- Two countifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.           General - timp ONP         Participations are micropatibility benefits and quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         In Orequantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.           General - timp ONP         Participations are micropatibility benefits and from the sensite on another mittage CSRPU that the project Description af quartifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         In Orequantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.           General - Timp Additional - time of the sensite of the sensite on another mittage CSRPU that the project Description af quartifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         In Orequantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents.           General - Desce the Project Description af quartifiable benefits in the sensite of the explanation of the sensite of the sensensensite of the sensensensite of the sensite of the s	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Planning         2         Description of exclusion and basin proposed To besit description of the basin are working tradeworking of unclusing or unclear unoing groups and Description of the basin are working tradeworking of unclusing or unclear to any point proposed To besit description of the basin are working tradeworking of unclusing or unclear to any point proposed To besit description of the basin are working tradeworking of unclusing or unclear to any point proposed To besit description of the basin are working tradeworking of the tradeworking the terret description of the tradeworking and engaging interested of the tradework of the Project or Component (a, Phonen, Gelega, Andersead         3         - Instructed parties included or unclear to description of the basin are working tradeworking of the Project or Component (a, Phonen, Gelega, Andersead         4         2         - Nostly addressed of the Project or Component (a, Phonen, Gelega, Andersead         - Instructed parties included on decision-making processes '1 - No abain full points, and instructed parties provide input and be involved in the decision making processes '1 - No abain full points, and instructed parties provide input and be involved in the decision making or winderesed         - Instructed parties included on decision-making on worked in the decision making or worked in the second of the point will not be points will not be point will not be	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	0	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	
Generala project benefits in composed for expresented Communities, to obtain full phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and impresentation)? Can interested parties torice of the respective for the project of the proje	Ŭ		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General       4       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?       2       2       2       2       2       2       2       1       Provided and all necessary information provided         General       4       benefitting areas?       2       1       Provided but missing some information       2       2       1       Provided but missing some information         General       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depiciting the soluble beclear and easy to read. If not, the point will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC(s)       3       3       Projects benefits an SDAC(s)         Sonor Vorket       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depiciting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amap(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amap(s) depicting the sonort provided.       3       - Project benefits undercepresented Community         General       6       Was intera and somestic well consurt soutist, waith sonort provided.       3       - Project benefits undercepresented Community         General       7       How does the project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells censure system, wang, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component adgress the needs of the State Water Board's       0       3       - Fully addressed         General       7       How does the pro	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	2	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	
General5555676Sonce Y Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will be given if a map(s) is not provided.3332Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 + Project partially benefits Underrepresented Community 	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	
Generalprivate 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?03 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed 0 - Not addressed 0 - Not addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed 0 - Not addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressedScope of Work8Did 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 project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is 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 po	General	5	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.	3	2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either	
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       3 - Mostly addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       0       0       Not addressed       0 <t< td=""><td>General</td><td>6</td><td>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</td><td>0</td><td><ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td><td></td></t<>	General	6	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	0	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feas	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	0	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
BudgetIs 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><li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li></ul> <li>Schedule</li> <li>10</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A cocal cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible a cost share is provided on projects before grant agreement date.  <ul><li>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?</li><li>A consistent and feasible</li><li>A consistent and feasible</li></ul></li>	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Total Range of Possible Points 20	Schedule	10		1		
			Total Range of Possible Points	20		

# Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Available         Available <t< th=""><th>tion Name</th><th>Q#</th><th>Questions</th><th>Possible Points</th><th>Scoring Guidance</th><th>Actual Points</th></t<>	tion Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Second	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Planing Driv       2       0065 the Project Usexplot of accides way well-continuated proposal including a SANS () that encompasses the entre basic or describes why a potion of the basis is not covered in the working regreterie?       1       3	ral - Imp Only 2	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	0	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	
General     a     Intersected parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities 20 est the outrack and engagement include intersected parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and molementation)? Can intersected parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees intersected parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and molementation)? Can intersected parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees inderrepresented Communities.     1     1       General     d     Was three a regulated from the Underrepresented Communities.     2     2     Provided and all necessary information provided in Provided but missing some information in Not provided       General     d     benefitting areas?     2     Provide but missing some information information     2     Provided but missing some information information       General     d     by Sthree a regulard plotting the project benefit an information should be claran and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.     3     3     Project benefits an SDAC(s) information       General     d     by Obst the exploration provided.     1     3     3     Project benefits and Underrepresented Community of sub the mount of funding that will benefit how the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.     1     1     Project benefits and SDAC(s) in Project benefits and SDAC(s) in Project benefits and sub decision on the advection on wheread and areas maps, etc. in Marginally addressed.     1     1     1       General </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>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</td> <td>1</td> <td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td> <td></td>			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	1	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General       4       benefitting areas?       2       1 - Provided but missing some information         General       5       • The information should be clear and easy to read. if not, the point will not be given.       0 - Not provided         General       5       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting among the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting among the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting among the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting among the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting among the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was update the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was update the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was update the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting among the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was update the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was update set and the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was update set and the update set and the project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or provided dor unclear 1. Marginally addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Mostly addressed 0. Not	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	1	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	
General       5       Shc2 Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the analysis of the project of community and SDAC.       3       Shc2 Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the analysis of the project of community and SDAC.       3       2       Project benefits Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Please provide the analysis of the project of community and SDAC.       3       3       2       Project benefits Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Difference presented Community (-ies) the project of commonity and SDAC.       5       No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.         General       6       Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water system or private shallow domestic well census results, water system maps, service are maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's Section 106.3]? How will the 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         Scope of Work       8       grant Project?       bit the project of component details for the proposed task/subtasks.       3       3       3       3       1       1       1       Addressed         Scope of Work       8       grant	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	
Generalprivate 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?13 - Fully addressed 2 - Modxly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressedGeneral7How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the 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 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressedScope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?3 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed 0 - Not addressedBudget9is 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 cost expended on projects before grant agreement date. • Local cost share is not voltani full points.3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible8Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table a	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	
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         Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       Fully addressed       0 - Not addressed         Nostly addressed       0       Nostly addressed       0 - Not addressed       0 - Not 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?       3       4 - Fully addressed       0 - Not addressed         8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       4 - Fully addressed       2 - Mostly addressed       2 - Mostly addressed       0 - Not addressed         9       Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks in the budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       2 - Budget is consistent and feasible       2 - Budget is consistent and feasible       2 - Budget is consistent	General	6	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	1	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       8       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget is consistent and feasible and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and 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 1       1 - Consistent and feasible	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	0	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget       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.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and 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       1       1 - Consistent and feasible	ppe of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	
Schedule 101	Budget	9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	
	Schedule	10		1		
Total Range of Possible Points 17			Total Range of Possible Points	17		(

### Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		C
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 3,684,000	

# Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	1	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	1	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 536,000	

# Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	1	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	1	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		C
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 742,000	

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	1	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	23		(
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 369,000	

### Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	3	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	1	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	25		
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 2,286,500	

# Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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.	2	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	0	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	0	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	0	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		(
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-	

# Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

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.	3	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	0	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	0	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):			

### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	3	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	1	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	0	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

#### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	3	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	0	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		(
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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.	2	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		C
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

# Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	P p 1 ir y n	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		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 reults form implementation of this project should be provided. Estimates of rates
General - Imp Only	e 2-Imp p	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	0	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 beneift the COD basin status and how DAC and SDAC rate payers will be sheltered from unneccasry increases. Additonally \$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.
General - Planning Only	g 2- e Plan p	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	not applicable
General	3 B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging nterested 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 n the decision-making processes? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General	4 b	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and penefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	
General	5 p S	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	1	
General	V p 6 e n	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	SAFE not applicable. Data on bebefit to Basin need to be included
General	7 S	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
Scope of Work	8 t	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
Budget	9 b	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>		The \$30,000 for education seems high when comparing to the descrition of this aspect. From reviewing grant applications on the WaterSmart prorgram, the average cost to implement this project on a per meter basis is \$300 per meter
Schedule	10	s 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 #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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	-
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	5
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		22

# Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	(
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	(
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

Wase detection of the proposed Points or Composent provide? Dial acquire in which the specific or Composent specific acquires acquires in terms of strength provide?         - Fully addressed           General         - Solution of the proposed Points or Composent provide? Dial acquires in specific acquires acquires acquires and specific acquires ac	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Section         Section <t< td=""><td>General</td><td>1</td><td>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".)</td><td>4</td><td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td><td>3</td></t<>	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Planing       2.       Does the Project Description describe why avoid the des	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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	1
Generalaa price (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities) ec. () locative within Underegresented Communities? Does the outread and engeament include in minement statistics? Does the outread and engeament include in minement statistics? 	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
General4benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21 - Provided but missing some informationGeneral5SDAC (Was there a map(s) depiciting the SDAC(s) the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depiciting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depiciting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depiciting the SDAC(s) - Project benefits an SDAC(s) - Project partially benefits Underrepresented Community - Project partially benefits is uther - Project partially benefits is uther - Project does not benefit eitherGeneral6Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic well (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well cesus results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the project or Component help address the needs of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for huma consumption, cooking, and sanitary purpose?4 - Fully addressed - Mostig addressed - Not addressedScope of Work8Bott proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the proposal provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project 2 is the budget is consistent and feasible - Not addressed3 - Social cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Not addressed - Not addressed<	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General       5       Sbp.C? 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.       3       3       2       Project benefits an SDAC(s)       Project benefits an SDAC(s)       Project benefits an SDA	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       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, SAFER Program?       3       3       3       4       Fully addressed Norstly addressed 0. Not addressed 0. Not addressed       4       Fully addressed 0. Not addressed 0. Not addressed       4       Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	O
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       - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly 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       - Fully 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 in cluded (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule tables? Is local cost share in cluded (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule tables? Is local cost share in the description in the application? Is the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1- Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       1- Cocal cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2- Budget is consistent and feasible 1- Budget is consistent and feasible 2- Budget is consistent and feasible 0- Not consistent and feas	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	C
Budget       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.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent but not feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Not consistent and feasib	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	1
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		16

# Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Beneral       1       Non-advergence of the proposed Project or Composer provided D at a public why the provider, communities since, meaning experience, mean	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Sec:         Processes         Pro	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Blanding       2       Descher Pröget Deschaption describes way a portion of the basis in a covered in the basis are working storaged, including a LS-W(1) mark the basis are working storaged in the basis are working storaged and basis working storaged in the basis are working storaged i	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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	1
BaseBase series (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, ec.) location within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outcach and engegeem included in minementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making prometers and provides parties (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making prometers and provides parties (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making promuters and provides parties (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making promuters and provides due to instruct due due no interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making promuters and provided due to instruct due due no interested parties provide input and be involved in the due to interested parties provide input and be involved in the due to interested parties provide input and be involved in the project the due to interested community (-ies)? Was there an angle (adprovide) a short the underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there an angle (adprovide) a short induiting benefit batt the project Was there an angle (adprovide) a short induiting benefit batt in project will benefit? Poset the erropict benefit an short induiting benefit batt in underrepresented community (-ies)? Was there an angle (adprovide) a short induiting benefit batt in underrepresented community (-ies)? Was there an angle (adprovide) a short induition due to inducted or undear a hort provided? Due the Project or Component anderest inducation induced in adverses of the short induced or undear benefit under and short will be provide? The information and the short provide induced in the experimentation induced in undear short induced or undear benefit undearested in the induced	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General         Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?         2 - Provided and all necessary information provided           General         4         benefitting areas?         2         1 - Provided and all necessary information provided           General         5         SDACP Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the for amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-les)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the for 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 - Project benefits an SDAC(s)           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, drawdow, 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 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component address the twan accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and santary purpose?         4 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed 0 - Not addressed           Scope of Work         8         Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks.         3	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>		engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General       5       Sbp(2) was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Does the period: benefit an anount of funding that will benefit both the Underepresented Community and SDAC.       3       2       Project benefits an SDAC(s)       Project benefits an SDAC(s)       Project benefits an SDAC(s)	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3	General	5	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.	3	2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either	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       - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly 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 the grant Project?       3       - Fully addressed 3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressed         Budget       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project?       3       - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed         Budget       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project?       3       - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed         Budget       8       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget table tasks/subtask provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget table tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent date. • Local cost share is not	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 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 and feasible 0 - Not co	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	(
Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include but not feasible tasks/subtasks in the schedule table tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include but not feasible tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent and feasible tables?       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?       - Budget is consistent and feasible	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	3
Total Range of Possible Points30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		17

# Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		15
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 500,000	

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it exciting why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in why the Was declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence provider D to it excits in the declaption of the project or Composence project project D to excits in the declaption of the project D to excits in the declaption of the project D to excits in the declaption of the project D to excits in the declaption of the project D to excits in the declaption of the project D to excits in the declaption of the project D to exci	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Base         Description of constraints provide a description of quantifiable bandfully supported existance of the bendfully as in expected to be raining from the Project or consponent on the bandfully as in expected to be raining from the Project or consponent as in the bandfully as in expected to be raining from the Project or consponent on the bandfully as in expected to be raining from the Project or consponent to the bandfully as in expected to be raining from the Project or consponent in the bandfully as in expected to be raining from the project or constraints and constraints and supporting documents are the project Description and relations and supporting documents are the project Description and relations or constraints and consponent level due to the basin as project Description and relations or constraints and constraints and supporting documents are the project Description and relations or constraints and constraints and supporting project Description and relations or constraints and relation or constraints and supporting documents and constraints constraints and supporting documents are constraint to the relation of constraints and support in the basin as relations and relations and support in the relation of constrainting and within the basin are relations and relations and relations and relation and relation and relations and relations and relations and relations and relation and relation and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relation and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relations and relation relations and relations and r	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	4
General-Planin Ori         2         Does the Project Description describe with a policy bind encompose the hearing bin or describes with a policy bind working general-Deal Dest & describe with a policy bind describe hearing bind or describes with a policy bind working general-Deal Dest & describe how well the multiple GAQ(s) surrounding and engaging interested particle (e.g., reidents), coal lacescribe ther plan for outreaching and engaging interested particle (e.g., reidents), coal lacescribes the project or Component (L) describe ther plan for outreaching and engaging interested particle (e.g., reidents), coal lacescribes the project or Component (e.g., handing, design, and particle (e.g., reidents), coal lacescription (Inderregnested Communities) processes?         - Inderested parties proved input and be involved in the decision-making processes?         - Inderested parties proved engage/involved, but not included on decision- making committees interested parties proved in plant and the involved in the decision-making processes?         - Inderested parties proved input and be involved in the decision-making processes?         - Inderested parties proved input and be involved in the decision-making processes?         - Provide but missing some information provided         - Provide but missing some information proved but missing some information         - Provide but missing some information         - Provide but missing some information         - Provide but missing some information           General         5         Does the project benefit an the point will not be proved in plant the project will be proved in plant project proved in	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	C
Generala ab a retres (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities 70 best the outget of component include inderrepresented Communities. Interested parties druged molecule and all accessary information provided inderrepresented Communities.3333111<	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	C
General4benefitting reas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21. Provided but missing some informationGeneral550.CV Was there an ang(s) depicting the project will benefit 2Des the project benefit an SDAC(s) • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.3333-Project benefits an SDAC(s) • Project particulty benefits either • Project particulty benefits eitherGeneral6Will the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Boards • SAFER Program?3- Fully addressed • Not addressedGeneral7Setter project or Component address the unan Right to Water (AB 685 • SAFER Program?- Avalty addressed • Not addressed- Avalty addressed • Not addressed • Not addressedScope of Wick8gat the project addressed with minor de	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>		engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	1
General55 <td>General</td> <td>4</td> <td>benefitting areas?</td> <td>2</td> <td>1 - Provided but missing some information</td> <td>2</td>	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	-
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       - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly 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?       3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed       3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed         Budget       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project?       3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed       3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed         Budget to the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project?       3 - Subject for the project Proje	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	(
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - 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 - Not consistent and feasible - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Not consistent and feasible - N	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1
Budget       Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget       3       Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget       3       Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         9       9       Is chedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include       3       3       Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         0       Not consistent and feasible       1       Budget is consistent and feasible       1       1         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget feasible?       1       1       1       0	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	2
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	1
Total Range of Possible Points30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		13

### 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		18
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	(
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General		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?	I 4 I/- Winstly addressed with significant details missing or linclear		(
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	:
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		14
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

Do not recommend funding

# Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

GeneralProje prov impl prop appl or impl prop appl or appl or impl prov stateGeneral - Imp Only2-ImpDoes expla prov impl prov or impl prov or impl prop impl impl prop impl impl prop impl impl prop impl impl prop impl impl impl prop impl<	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 mplementation 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. 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	Points
General - Imp Only2-Imp Planexpla prov withGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes enco prop workGeneral - Planning Only3-Does enco prop workGeneral - Planning Only3-Does enco prop workGeneral - Planning Only3-Does enco prop workGeneral - Planning Only3-Does partietc.) inter impliproc on and on and on ano on ano on ano on ano on ano on ano on ano on ano on ano on ano 	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. Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only2- Planenco prop workGeneral3Does parti etc.) inter impl proc orti etc.) inter impl proc ortic etc.) inter impl proc ortic etc.) inter impl proc 	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? Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested			1
General 3 General 3 General 4 General 5 General 5 General 5 General 6 How General 7 How Safe How Section that		4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General 4 bene General 4 bene Does the U SDAG amo • 1 General 6 Was etc. 1 SAFE General 7 How Section	<ul> <li>barties (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 mplementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General 6 the General 5 SDAG amo • I General 6 Was etc. 5 SAFE General 7 How Section that be a section to the section to	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
General 6 priva General 6 Was etc. SAFE General 7 How Section that	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General 7 How 7 that	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 GAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work 8 gran	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget 9 and costs	s a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget able 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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule   10	<ul> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	1	1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
	<ul> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> <li>s 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?</li> </ul>	30		14

# Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

# Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

<ul> <li>We a description of the proposed Property of Composed proposed Property (a property of Composed property (a prot property (a property (a property (a property (a property</li></ul>	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
Beneficies       Available       Description	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2	
Beneral-Planning       2	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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	1	
Generalaabit is included and accision-making committees and apages of the project of communities, ecc, located with underrepresented communities, ecc, located with underrepresented communities, and magges of molecule and langes of the project of component set, planning, design, and implier matrices are reguled from the decision-making committees and apages of molecule and langes of the project of communities. In Advances and and presente the project of communities and apages of molecule and langes of the project	Ű		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General       Vas there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and be determined on the project benefit an theorem site will not be given.       2       Provided but missing some information provided.       0         General       A       benefitting areas?       2       0       Not provided but missing some information and and increasary information provided.       0         General       Soback project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-is)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Dease provide the amount of funding that will benefit project will benefit? Dease the project benefits an SDAC(s)       3       Project sheefits an SDAC(s)       3       3       Project sheefits an SDAC(s)       3       3       Project sheefits an SDAC(s)       3       3       1       0 <td>General</td> <td>3</td> <td><ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul></td> <td>3</td> <td>engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	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	
General55550AC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide that amount of funding that will benefit to the funderrepresented Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.3331- Project observation community 1 Project does not benefit either3General6Will the Project or Component positively impact issue associated with small water systems or provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?33- Fully addressed 2 Nosity addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 Marginally addressed 0 Not addressed0General7How does the project or Component adgress the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3) How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?4- Fully addressed 3 Notify addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 1 Marginally addressed0Scope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this cost sexpended without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.33Budget9Solad test share is not fundided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks.33- Not addressed610Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks.33- Not addressed78Did the proposal provide a descript	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	0	
General       6       private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       2       Notify addressed       0         General       7       Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. softward? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's O-Not addressed       3       4       Fully addressed       0       0       Not addressed       0       0       0       Not addressed       0       0       0       No addressed       0	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       - Kully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2. Mostly 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 0. Not addressed 0. Not addressed       2       Mostly 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 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 1. Budget is consistent and feasible 0. Not consistent and feasible       0       Not consistent and feasible       1       or tor         8       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule tables consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?       3       1       Cacal cost share is nor required but nece	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       2         Budget       • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the project? 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 or Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Budget is consistent and feasible       - Not consistent 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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>		
BudgetIs 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 • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	2	
Schedule       10       1       0 - Not consistent and feasible       1         within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?       1       0 - Not consistent and feasible       1	Budget	9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	nc	ot pro
Total Range of Possible Points3010	Schedule	10		1		1	
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		10	

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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	0
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		11
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ Would not recommend funding as it duplicates Water Master's Meguite Be	

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

# Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
General		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	-
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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 depolyment is stated.
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	2
General		<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	3
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	Lacks clear cost benefit to customers, unlike Solar Project, #2
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points			27	,
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 1,275,000		

# Project #2 BWD Solar Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer Comments
General	1	<ul> <li>Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this</li> <li>Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits</li> <li>provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan</li> <li>implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to</li> <li>your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	Direct cost benefit to customers, among other benefits.
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		25	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

#### Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
General	1	<ul> <li>Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this</li> <li>Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits</li> <li>provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan</li> <li>implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to</li> <li>your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Thsi 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." 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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	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 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	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	1	As a planning-only project, this affords no tangible beneits 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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	з	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		16	

### Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		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 nited 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		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	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-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	N/A	
General	з	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	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		<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	1	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	proposal labels this "N/A"
General		How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	proposal labels this "N/A"
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	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. <ul> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	-
		Total Range of Possible Points			12	2
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

### Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>		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: Demonstrating reductions in pumping through groundwater pumping monitoring Demonstrating groundwater level trends through groundwater level monitoring Demonstrating groundwater level trends through groundwater storage estimations Demonstrating groundwater quality trends through groundwater quality monitoring Demonstrating improved estimation of sustainable yield through model recalibration"
General - Planning Only	-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	<u>,</u>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	3
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>??This project will not start until seleted 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.</li> </ul>
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	1
		Total Range of Possible Points TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$	25	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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 briong any more water, but <i>it is theoretically</i> <i>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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General		<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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 "O-Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified." The benefits are explained, but not quantified.
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		14	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-		

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	1
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	It appears that the Interested Parties of Schoold 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		<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3	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	<ol> <li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		23	

#### Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

### Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		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		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>		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-	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	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	:	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:	3
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>		I was surprised at the high cost, but I have no experience with costs for this type of installation. Also concverned 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		
		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

General - Imp OnlyDoes 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 must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.A descal a quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documentsof 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 documentsGeneral - Imp OnlyDoes 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 must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.4441 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents3water conservation achieved by fallowing will enable this essential Management Action to proceed in a	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer comments
events         in         Interpretation of partialization of	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2	4
Scherozii Hammig         - Joseph Hammig         - Joseph Hammig         - Modely Addressed, with mitor details not included or undear processpirate the subset of control the subset of	•	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>		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
General       Desceed to Project or Component fully describe therp juits for outracking and engaging       - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully         General       - Interested parties included on decision-making committees       - Interested parties included commites       - Int	-		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	N/A	
General       4       benefitting areas?       2       1 - Provided but missing some information       2         General       5       Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-iss) has the project will be the project or component subsex associated with small water systems or private shallow dones: twells (e.g., provided Doc will be groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.) Will be project or Component address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program       3       Full addressed       3       4       4       4       5       Amount of the project or Component address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program       3       4 </td <td>General</td> <td>3</td> <td><ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul></td> <td>3</td> <td><ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td> <td></td> <td>2</td>	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>		2
General       Does the project benefits an Underrepresented Community (1:e) 2 Was there a map(s) depicite thenefit, the Underrepresented Community (1:e) the the origict will benefit? Please and status the project benefits an SDAC(3)       3       - Project benefits an SDAC(3)       - Project benefits an SDAC(3)         S       an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depiciting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please and sDAC(3)       - Project benefits and SDAC(3)       - Project benefits and SDAC(3)       - Project provide there are and sDAC(3)       - Project provide are are are and sDAC(3)       - Project provide are are and sDAC(3)       - Project provide are are are and sDAC(2)       - Project provide are are are are and sDAC	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2	2
General       Will the Project or Component positively impact issue associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc., J? 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 Foodra's SAFER Program?       3 - Fully addressed.       1 - Marginally addressed.       1         General       7       that work the project or Component help address the needs of the State for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?       4 - Fully addressed       4 - Fully addressed       1         Scope of Work       8       Did the project?       A statistication such addresses the tuman Right to water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?       4 - Fully addressed       3 - Mostly 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?       3 - Mostly addressed       3 - Not addressed       3 - Not addressed         Budget       9       bid the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks in the project? Is the budget rassonable for the project? I	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> </ul>		map assumed
About does the proposed Project or Component address the Human kight to Water (AB dessed)43 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1. Marginally addressed0General7Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?443 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed0Scope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?3- Multipaddressed 2 - Mostly addressed3Budget9Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?- Marginally addressed3- Mostly addressedBudget1Is a budget summary table provide? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share table tasks/subtask provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible1	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>		1
Scope of Work8Did 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.32 · Mostly addressed. • Marginally addressed • No taddressed3BudgetIs 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 is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 · Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 · Not consistent and feasible2Schedule10Is 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?11 · Consistent and feasible 0 · Not consistent and feasible 0 · Not consistent and feasible 0 · Not consistent and feasible1	General	7	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	(	
Budget       9       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       3       3       - Docal cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       2       Budget is consistent but not feasible       2       Budget is consistent but not feasible       2       Budget is consistent but not feasible       2       Budget is consistent and feasible       2       Budget is consistent but not feasible       2       Budget is consistent and feasible	Scope of Work	8	this grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>		3
Schedule     10     1     0 - Not consistent and feasible       within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?     1     0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	2
Total Range of Possible Points3021	Schedule	10	within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1			1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		21	L

# Project #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

General         Was a description of the proposed Project or Component was chosen over all others is provided, communities served, messurable object is implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you fee your proposed project, please explain why it is not a paplicable because project is planning only".)	ons	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	Reviewer Comments
General - Imp Only       2-Imp Provided, along with how those benefits will be ex- - To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable be supported with backup documentation.         General - Planning Only       2- Plan       Does the Project Description describe a well-coord encompasses the entire basin or describes why a p proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple G working together?         General       3       Does the Project or Component fully describe their interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, no Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresents engagement include interested parties during all p planning, design, and implementation)? Can intere in the decision-making processes? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three com- Underrepresented Communities.         General       4       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to re vill the Project or Component positively impact iss project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depict benefit? Please provide the amount of funding tha Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provic benefit? Please program? Will the Project or Component positively impact iss private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater or etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well censul for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary pure for human con	identified in the Plan in terms of benefits rives, minimum thresholds, plan eel a question component does not apply to t applicable. (Example "Measurable objective	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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 - Planning       2-       encompasses the entire basin or describes why a p         Only       Plan       proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple G         Working together?       Does the Project or Component fully describe their interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, no Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresente engagement include interested parties during all p planning, design, and implementation)? Can intere in the decision-making processes?         General       3         General       4         Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting benefitting areas?         • The information should be clear and easy to re depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depict benefit? Please provide the amount of funding tha Community and SDAC.         General       Will the Project or Component positively impact iss private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater of etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well censumary, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the project or	e realized from the Project or Component valuated and quantified?	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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.
General3General33interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, no Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented engagement include interested parties during all pi planning, design, and implementation)? Can intere in the decision-making processes? • To obtain full points, a minimum of three communiterepresented Communities.General44Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to re project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies) project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depic benefit? Please provide the amount of funding tha Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provid benefit? Please provide the amount of funding tha Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provid etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well censumaps, etc. provide? Does the Project or Component water Board's SAFER Program?General76Flow does the proposed Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component that every human being has the right to safe, clean for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary pur this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justific Is a budget summary table provide? Is the budget	portion of the basin is not covered in the	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	N/A	
General4benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to re • The information should be clear and easy to re depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depic benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provide benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provide the Project or Component positively impact iss private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater of etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census maps, etc. provide? Does the Project or Component Water Board's SAFER Program?General7How does the proposed Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component that every human being has the right to safe, clean for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purpScope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks, this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justific Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget	on-profit representing Underrepresented ted Communities? Does the outreach and phases of the Project or Component (e.g., ested parties provide input and be involved	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	Lots of effort described, with heavy stakeholder invovement in creating community response vision.
General5depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) - project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depic benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provid Will the Project or Component positively impact iss private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater of etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component Water Board's SAFER Program?General7How does the proposed Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component that every human being has the right to safe, clean for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purpScope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks, this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justific Is a budget summary table provide? Is the budget		2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	2
General6private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater of etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well censumaps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component Water Board's SAFER Program?General7How does the proposed Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component that every human being has the right to safe, clean for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purpletScope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks, this grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justific Is a budget summary table provide? Is the budget	) that the project will benefit? Does the icting the SDAC(s) that the project will at will benefit both the Underrepresented	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	assumes map will be somehow get connected
General       7         For the proposed Project or Component add Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component that every human being has the right to safe, clean for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposed for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposed provide a description of the tasks, this grant Project?         Scope of Work       8         Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks, this grant Project?         • No funds will be awarded without clear justific         Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget	contamination vulnerability, drawdown, sus results, water system maps, service area	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
Scope of Work       8       this grant Project?         • No funds will be awarded without clear justific         Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget	nt support the established policy of the State n, affordable, and accessible water adequate	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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.
		3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	lots of broad-range details about effort, but lacks a feeling of coherence.
Budget       9       budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share incomparing the second s	k coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the cluded (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share ant agreement date. to obtain full points.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3	**The last cell in Row (f) Grand Total, doesn't make sense. How is the local cost share 176%? \$60K/\$260K = 23%
Schedule10Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consister within the description in the application? Is the sch	-	1	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
	Total Range of Possible Points	30		22	

### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	-	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		could cite making Sponsor Group and/or Borrego Days presentations, and get another point
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	(	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>		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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	<u> </u>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points			17	7 Can the County provide funds for this?
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		can the county provide funds for this:

### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	4
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul><li>4 - Fully addressed</li><li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li></ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
General		Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? <ul> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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)? 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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	4	1 1
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	3
Budget		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 askIf 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

					Actual	Reviewer comments
Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Points[self- score; do not count in compilatio n][	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>		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		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>		
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>		
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>		
		Total Range of Possible Points			0	Cannot score proposal for which I am POC/lead advocate
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

# Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		26
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 3,159,000	

# Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	<ul> <li>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".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	This is a regulatory compliance requirement and benefits beyond that element are speculative.
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li><li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li><li>0 - Not provided</li></ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		26	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 206,500		

# Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

Wess adscription of the amound instruct or composend power in the plan in two this Project or Composent sub scheme over, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation therein, and realising 19 years for a guardinate, (Example Y-Massarable objective your projects pipelace, passa splain not included by the plan of the plan in the plan in two this your projects pipelace, passa splain not included by the plan of the plan on power of does at apply to your projects pipelace, passa splain not included by the plan of the plan opposed tably/ubtasis. <ul> <li>Include a plan of the amound the plan of the plan opposed tably/ubtasis.</li> <li>Include a plan of the amound table benefits and the explanations and support explanation of the amound table benefits and the explanation of the project of component with backparability downed tables.</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Include table benefits that are expected to be enables and table benefits and the plan opposed table benefits and the plan opposed table benefits and the plan opposed table benefits that are explaned to be composed table benefits.</li> <li>Dest the tropect perception decombination on the plan opposed table benefits.</li> <li>Dest the tropect perception decombinated proposed table benefits.</li> <li>Dest the tropect composed table benefits that are expected to be enables and the plan opposed table benefits.</li> <li>Dest the tropect composed table benefits.</li> <li>Dest the tropect composed table benefits.</li> <li>Dest the tropect communities.</li> <li>Dest the tropectometres and opposed table and tables.</li>             &lt;</ul>	Actual Points
Beneral - March         Some Project or component provide a docupation of quantitable benefits? We any provided documents         3         Some Project or component provide a docupation of quantitable benefits? We any control and elements with explanations and supporting documents         3	ar
General - Planing Only         Desk the Project UseShiption describe 3 well-coordinates proposal including a User(s) that encompass the entrie basis in sin occurrent of the working together 7         3         Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or under the many sing of the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together 7         3         3           General         7         8         - Not addressed         3         3         - Not addressed         - Not addressed           General         7         Section and the project of component fully describe their plan for outreaching and epaging interested particles (e.g., residents, loon address, non-profite) (e.g., planing, edition, addressed         3         - Not addressed           General         7         O chain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include the underrepresented Communities?         2         - Provided and all necessary information provided           General         4         Describe and any community (e.g., planing, edition, and benefitting areas?         2         - Provided and all necessary information provided           General         6         Describe and say to read. If not, the point will not be given.         2         - Provided and all necessary information           General         5         SDAC? Wis three a map(s) depicting the size of addressed of the project of Component positive in provided in the decision-making provided in a map(s) SDAC? Wis thr	ign
General     a     a parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, ect.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement indude processes?     a - Interested parties included on decision-making processes?       General     4     was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and Underrepresented Community.     2     1. Provided Dati Marginally addressed       General     4     benefiting areas?     2     Provided and all necessary information provided Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community.     2     1. Provided Dati Marginally addressed       General     5     SOAC? Was there a negloin depicting the Site location, current conditions, and Underrepresented Community.     2     1. Provided Dati Marginally addressed       General     6     besite project benefit an Underrepresented Community.     3     3. Projects benefits an SDAC(s)       SoaC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Dest the project benefit an source of funding that will benefit with the project will benefit? Please provide than amount of funding that will benefit setther underrepresented Community.     3     3     3     1. Fundientis ether       General     6     Will the Project or Component positively impact tasse associated with small water system angly.     3     3     1. Fundientis ether       General     6     Will the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Socpe of Work Ref     3     1. Fundientis et	
General       4       benefitting areas?       2       1 - Provided but missing some information         General       5       Construction       0 - Not provided       0 - Not provided         General       5       benefitting areas?       3       - Project benefits an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Dess provide the anount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.       3       - Project benefits an SDAC(s)         General       6       Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or provided to routherability. Anounce stic wells cans, regroundwater contamination nullenability. Anounce stic wells cans, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and santary purposes?       3       - Fully addressed         General       7       the oropside provide a description of the tasks/subtasks. that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       - Fully addressed         General       7       the very human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and santary purposes?       3       - Fully addressed         Scope of Work       8       2       Did t	
General       5       the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC(s)       3       3       3         General       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the project benefits underrepresented Community and SDAC.       3       3       3         General       6       Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shalow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination underability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       5       Fully addressed         General       6       Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water system or private shalow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination underability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       5       Fully addressed         General       7       Setter Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?       3       4       Fully addressed       4       Nostly addressed       3       Nostly addressed, with minor details not included or uncle 1. Marginally addressed, with significant details missing or unclea 1. Marginally addressed       3       4       Fully addressed       3       Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or uncle 1. Marginally addressed       3       5       5       4       Fully addressed       3       5       Mostly addressed       3       5 <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	
General       6       private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       3       3         General       6       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       1       Marginally 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       Fully 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?       3       3       1       Arstip addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table asks/subtasks in the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       1       Areally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget is consistent and feasible       3       1       Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	
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       - Fully addressed, with minor details not included or uncleand - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or uncleand - 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?       3       - Fully addressed       - Nostly addressed         8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       - Fully addressed         8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks.       3       - Nostly addressed         9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         9       Is budget is consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible         0 - Not consistent and feasible       - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Locansistent and feasible	ar
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or uncle 1 - Marginally addressed         8       • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or uncle 1 - Marginally 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 or uncle costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible         Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and       1 - Consistent and feasible	
Budget       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 to budget is consistent and feasible to budget table consistent with those listed in the budget table and the budget table and the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and the budget table and the budget table and the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and the budget table and table tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and table consistent and feasible table consistent and feasible table and table consistent and feasible table and table consistent and feasible table and table consistent table and tab	ar
Schedule 10 Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and 1 - Consistent and feasible	easible
within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 0 - Not consistent and feasible	
Total Range of Possible Points 30	0

# Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Was a tentation of the proposed project to Compound source (20 is region with the         provide, source intermed source)           - (1/q) defined             General           Point of the proposed project to Compound source)           Point of the proposed project to Compound source)             General             Point of the proposed project to Compound source)           Point of the proposed project to Compound source)             General           Point of the proposed project to Compound source)           Point of the project of Compound source)           Point of the project of Compound source)             General           Point of the project of Compound source)             General           Point of the project of Compound source)           Point o	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Base Interpreter of component punches advarging of quantified B workshow and quantified P works where quantified B workshow and quantified P will be explored at the model and fully supported to the model of the methysic of component table benefits that supporting documents. The operand Tubbe benefits will be evaluated and quantified P will be evaluated and fully supported to the model of the methysic of component table benefits that supporting documents. The operand Tubbe benefits will be evaluated and quantified P will be evaluated and fully supported to the model of the parameters will be evaluated and quantified P will be evaluated and fully supported P will be evaluated and fully supported to the model and table parameters will be evaluated and fully supported P will be evaluated and fully supported P will be evaluated and table parameters will be evaluated and fully supported P will be evaluated and table parameters will be evaluated on the evaluated of the table is not installed or quantified P will be evaluated and fully supported P will be evaluated and table parameters will be evaluated and fully supported P will be evaluated and table parameters will be evaluated and fully supported P will be evaluated and table parameters will be evaluated and table p	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Burning         2:         Desk the Project Description describe A year Action and Eq projection Eq projection Eq projection Eq Eq (Eq projection Eq Eq Projection Eq Eq (Eq Projection Eq Eq Projection Eq Eq (Eq Eq E	General - Imp Only		<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	
Berneral Generalas a strest (e.g., residents, lucal leaders, non-port represented Communities, tec) located within Underepresented Communities? Does the outward and engagement include in minement aparties included on decision-making communities and inderepresented Communities? 	Ű	2-	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General       4       Image: heariting areas?       2       1 - Provided but mising some information         General       - The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.       0 - Not provided       0 - Not provided         General       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) is not provided.       3 - Projects benefits underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) is not provided.       3 - Projects benefits underrepresented Community - ies)? Was there a map(s) is not provided.       3 - Project benefits underrepresented Community - ies)? Was there a map(s) is not provided.       3 - Project benefits underrepresented Community - ies)? Was user system sore project benefit an and point positive will be given if a map(s) is not provided.       3 - Fully addressed       3 - Fully addressed         General       6       Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water system sore provided for bose the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 6B's).       3 - Fully addressed       3 - Fully addressed         General       7       Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 6B's).       4 - Fully addressed       3 - Nortly addressed         Scope of Work       8       grant Project Submit on the ads/subtasks that will be completed as part of the project? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget somister and feasible       3 - Fully addressed       - Nortly addressed       - Nortl	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	
Generalbe underrepresented Community (-les) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SUAL(3)3332Project benefits an SUAL(3)SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting that will benefit? Was there a map(s) depicting that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.332Project benefits and SUAL(3)General6Will the Project or Component positively impact issue associated with small water systems or provided?3331Project does not benefit eitherGeneral6Will the Project or Component positively impact issue associated with small water system or provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?331Project addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed2Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed41Marginally addressed411Project addressed, with significant details mosting or unclear 1. Marginally addressed, with significant details mosting or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with significant details mosting or unclear 1. Marginally addressed411Mostly addressed11 <td< td=""><td>General</td><td>4</td><td>benefitting areas?</td><td>2</td><td>1 - Provided but missing some information</td><td></td></td<>	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	
Generalprivate 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?33 <td>General</td> <td>5</td> <td>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.</td> <td>3</td> <td>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either</td> <td></td>	General	5	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.	3	2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either	
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       - Fully addressed 	General		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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the project? Is the budget table asks/subtasks.       3       2 - Mostly addressed       - Not addressed         Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include - 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 - Not consistent and feasible       - 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       - Consistent and feasible       -	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget       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.       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0	Scope of Work		grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		

### Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		C
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

# Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

Server       1       Note a decupate of the proposed Project. Composent provide: DB is separate into into a trans of beededs, paneline into interest of the provides (communities served, neuropset) (symposent provides, paneline).       1	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Second	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning         2         bits the Project Description describes with a producting a LSMU (1) and encompases the entities basin or accursed in the basin are working togenan? Does the describes with a producting and engaging interseted particle (a.g., residents, local Ladens, non-proif regressing to describes with a producting and engaging interseted particle (a.g., residents, local Ladens, non-proif regressing to describes with a producting and engaging interseted particle (a.g., residents, local Ladens, non-proif regressing to describes with a producting and engaging interseted parts (a.g., residents, local Ladens, non-proif regressing to description the thrested parts during all hases of the Project or Component (a.g. Hanning, design, and processes)         3         -Interested parts engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees           General         4         X         Not have the area provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes?         - To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Londerregressing commutations and processes?         2         - Invoided to making some information provided Descriptions and the point with no be proved.           General         4         With the Project or Component (a.g. Hanning, Hase) with the project with analy description the analysis of a more analysis analysis of a more	Seneral - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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
Generalaprotects (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities) est, locate within underegressented Communities? Does the outrices and engagement include implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes? 	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefiting areas?       2       2       Provided and all necessary information provided         General       4       benefiting areas?       2       1       Provided but missing some information         General       5       SACFA Project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-iss)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SAC(s) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SAC(s)       3	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	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
General5the 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? Deset provide the anount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.3332Project partially benefits either 0. Project does not benefit eitherGeneral6Was justification such as domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdow, etc.) private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdow, etc.) rec. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?3Fully addressed 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed 3. Notify addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed 3. Notify addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed 0. Not addressedScope of Work8give the proposal provide a description of the task/subtasks that will be completed as part of this to honds will be avarded without clear justification for the proposed task/subtasks.33330. Notify addressed, with minor detai	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       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       1       Marginally addressed 0       1       Marginally addressed<	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       4       3       Mostly addressed Addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2       2       Mostly addressed 0       Not significant details missing or unclear 1       3       Mostly addressed 0       Not addressed       3       Fully addressed       3       Mostly addressed 0       Not addressed       Not addressed       3       Fully addressed       3       5       Fu	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       - Mostly addresse	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
BudgetIs 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.33 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	1
	Schedule	10		1		0
Total Range of Possible Points     30			Total Range of Possible Points	30		12

# Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Image: section of the section decribes a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entre basin or decribes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the working together?         Image: section of the section of the basin is not covered in the working together?         Image: section of the section of the basin is not covered in the working together?         Image: section of the section of the basin is not covered in the working together?         Image: section of the section of the basin is not covered in the working together?         Image: section of the section of the basin is not covered in the working together?         Image: section of the section of the basin is not covered in the working together?         Image: section of the section of the basin is not covered in the partice (e.g., widehts, biol alocations on port if representing Undercrypter togeth component (e.g.) humanly, deficing, and partice (e.g., widehts, biol alocations on port if representing Undercrypter togeth component (e.g.) humanly, deficing, and processed **********************************	on Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Series1-Imp ON         Series1	eneral		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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Planing Droposition describes with exploring describes with explosition of the basis in a covered in the encompassite the entrobasis or describes with sendicated proposition of the basis in a covered in the working togosition?     3 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed 3 - Interested parties included on decision-making processes?	- Imp Only 2-		<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	2
Generalaprices (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, Does the outpect which underrepresented Communities, Does the under the decision-making processes? 	-	2-	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?       2. Provided and all necessary information provided         General       Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the project will benefit? Please provide the namount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the project will benefit? Please provide the namount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.       3. Project benefits an SDAC(s)         For project project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3. Fully addressed         General       Will the Project or Component help address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 SAFER Program?       3. Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed         General       Project Project all project or Component adgress the Human Right to Water (AB 685 SAFER Program?       3. Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed         General       Budget       Did the project or Component adgress the Human Right to Water (AB 685 SAFER Program?       3. Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed         Scope of Work       B       Did the proposal provide a	eneral	3	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	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General       5       5       5       1 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit to both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.       3       3       2 - Projects benefits underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either         General       6       Was justification such as domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       3       2 - Folgets benefits underrepresented Community 1 - Project dees not benefit underrepresented 2 - Mosty addressed 2 - Mosty addressed, with minor details not included o	eneral	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
Generalprivate 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?33333General7How 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- Fully addressed 94- Fully addressedScope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?33- Study addressed 9- Not addressed 9Budget9Is a budget summary table provide? 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 oots sepended on projects before grant agreement date. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.33- Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 0. Not consistent and feasible 0. Not consistent and feasibleBudget10Is the tasks/subtasks in the budget table consistent with those listed in the budget table and oots sepended on projects before grant agreement date. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.3- Local cost	eneral		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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear         Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear         8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       Fully addressed         8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       1       Austignally addressed         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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       3       1       Consistent and feasible         9       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and       1       1       Consistent and feasible	eneral		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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear         grant Project?       • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear         Budget       Is a budget summary table provide? 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       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible         costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       1 - Consistent and feasible         costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       1 - Consistent and feasible	eneral	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include to 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 - Not consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 1 - Consistent and feasible 1	of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
	udget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	2
within the description in the application r is the schedule reasible reasible U - Not consistent and reasible	nedule	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			Total Range of Possible Points	30		23

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Was decision of the project of Composent provider 3 with the set of the final set of the set of the set of the project of Composent set of the set of the project of Composent set of the set of the project of Composent set of the set of the project of Composent se	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Example in the Project or Consource provide a description of quantifiable bandfs if was an exploration of the Project Or Consource of the Project Or Conso	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Blanch Original         2: 	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	1
BaseBaseBase of the component (action profit represented Communities, occupied and angeed movied in all appeed to the Project/Component (action interested parties included in all decision making committees and unique instances	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General4benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21Provided but missing some information2General5SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the solut() that the project will benefit? Dees the project benefit an SDAC(s) • No points will be solut() should be clear anap(s) depicting the SDAC() should be clear anap(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • No points will be project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • No points will be project of unding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • No points will be project of Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or ext. provided? Ose the project of Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?3 - Fully addressed • Not points will be project of Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?3 - Fully addressed • Not oddressed with minor details not included or unclear • Not addressed4 - Fully addressed • Not addressed4 - Fully addressed 	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	3
General5the 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.33332Project benefits an SDAL(s) c Project benefits will benefit? Please provided.33332Project benefits an SDAL(s) c Project benefits will benefit? Please provided.33<	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
GeneralSolution	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	3
General7How 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 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressed1Scope of Work8Did 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 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressed3 - Fully addressed 3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressed3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feas	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally 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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1
BudgetIs 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.33 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible33Schedule10Is 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?11 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible1	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
Schedule       10         within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?       1         0 - Not consistent and feasible       1	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3
Total Range of Possible Points30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		23

### Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

General         Was advectaped of the project of composite setting in the Name in terms of baseling in	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Base and the section of the frequency of the section of quantifiable benefits? Was and supporting connection of quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting connection of the section with the value benefits with explanations and supporting connection of quantifiable benefits? Was and the section of quantifiable benefits? Was and the section of quantifiable benefits? Was and supporting connection of the connection decision of quantifiable benefits? Was and supporting connection of quantifiable benefits?	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Benefation         Description descriptintent descriptin description descriptintentescription description	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	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	2
Generala parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Due the output cache and engaged involved in all appeters of the Project Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making provides set in the project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making provides and parties (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making provide in all appeters the Project Component (etcs are required from the Underrepresented Communities.22Provided and all necessary information provided 	Ũ		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1
General4benefitting reas?21 - Provided Dut missing some information2General550.42 W sthree a map(s) found be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.30 - Not provided3General550.42 W sthree a map(s) depicting the project will benefit 2 Does the project themefit an SDAC(s)3332 - Project benefits an SDAC(s)3General6550.42 W sthree a map(s) is not provided.333 - Fully addressed30 - Not provided Doe monity3General6Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private ablow domestic wells (e.g. groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?33 - Fully addressed33 - Fully addressed3Was justification such as domestic well censure seults, water system maps, service are maps, etc. provider 2 Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Boards33 - Fully addressed4 - Fully addressedGeneral78How does the project or Component address the human Right to Water (AB 68544 - Fully addressed3 - Fully addressed1Scope of Work8graft Project?90 - Not addressed3 - Fully addressed- Not addressed1Scope of Work8graft Project?90 - Not addressed- Not addressed- Not addressedBudget98graft Project?0 - Not addressed- Not addressed- Not addressedScope of Work88graft Project?	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General5the Underrepresented Community (i=s) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SJAC(1)33<	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       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       1       -Fully addressed Nostly addressed 0 - Not addressed       0         Reneral       7       Kostly addressed sets proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the 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 	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally 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?       3       3 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed       3 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed       3       3       - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed       3       3       - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed       3       3       - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed       3       - Marginally addressed 0	General	6	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	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally 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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       3       2 - Mostly addressed       3 <t< td=""><td>General</td><td>7</td><td>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</td><td>4</td><td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td><td>1</td></t<>	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1
BudgetIs 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.33 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible Budget is consistent but not feasible D - Not consistent and feasib	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible 1	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	3
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10	· · · · · ·	1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		20

# Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

construction         a proposed protect, plasme output to to applicable. (Complet "Network output doined outpu	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Sec         Processes         Proc	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1
General - Planing Drive         2 Planing         Description the Stription description and using a GMP31 hat encompass to the instre basin of exception in the basin and covered in the working isocaP2 does it describe two year but the multiple GS4(3) surrounding and within the basin are working isocaP2 does it description networking isocaP2 encompass to the Project of Component (July describe their plan for outreaching and depagaing interested parties (e.g., readents, local ladents, non-prior (respecting interested parties included on decision-making processes <sup>2</sup> , * 10 obtain full points, non-prior (respecting interested parties included on decision-making processes <sup>2</sup> , * 10 obtain full points, non-prior (respecting interested parties included on decision-making processes <sup>2</sup> , * 10 obtain full points, non-prior (respecting interested parties included on decision-making processes <sup>2</sup> , * 10 obtain full points, non-prior (respecting interested parties included on decision-making processes <sup>2</sup> , * 10 obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrespecting of the project (Component (e.g., Planting, design, and processes <sup>2</sup> )         1 - Interested parties included on decision- making committees         2         2         - Provided and all necessary information provided         2         - Provided but making provided         2         - Provided	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	0
Generalaaa-netres/cg/arcside/arcsid	Ũ		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
General       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?       2       Provided and all necessary information provided         General       4       benefitting areas?       1       Provided and all necessary information provided         General       5       SACFW Project Denefits an Underrepresented Community (-les)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-les) 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) So to provided.       3       Project benefits an SDAC(s)         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.)?       3       3       1       Fully addressed         General       6       Will the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?       3       1       1       Nostly addressed 0       0       Nostly addressed 0	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	1
General55- Projects Dentity and SU(s) 2- Project benefits and SU(s) <br< td=""><td>General</td><td>4</td><td>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</td><td>2</td><td>1 - Provided but missing some information</td><td>1</td></br<>	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	1
General       6       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       3       4       Fully addressed Providerssed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed 0. Not addressed       1       Marginally addressed 0. Not addressed       1       Nosty addressed 0. Not addressed       1       Narginally addressed 0. Not addressed       1       Narginally addressed 0. Not addressed       1       Narginally addressed       1       1       3       1       1       1       Narginally addressed       1       1       3       1       1       1       1	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       - Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally 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?       3 - Fully addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       bit abs/subtasks provide a the completed as part of the sochedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule tables? Is local cost share in not equired but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is consistent and feasible 1 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is consistent and feasible	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1- Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget is consistent and feasible - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Budget is consistent and feasible - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.         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 - Consistent and feasible - O - Not consistent and	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
BudgetIs 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.33 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasibleSchedule10Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget feasible?11 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	3
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		12

### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

Was a feacibility of the project of Composent provider? Of it equipates with the provided community and co	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General - Imp ONY         Zero         Does the Project for Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits Vits an paphratic of the benefits with explanations and supporting documents in the benefits with explanation and supporting documents with backgroup documentation.         2         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting document with backgroup documentation.         2         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting document with backgroup documentation.         2         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting document with backgroup documentation.         2         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting document with backgroup document documents.         3         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting document with backgroup document documents.         4         4         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting document with explanations and supporting documents.         4         4         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         5         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         5         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         5         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         5         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         5         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         5         A for the benefits with explanations and supporting documents.         5         A for the benefits with explanations.         5         A for the benefits with explanatis documents.         5         A for the bene	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Blanding         2         Descher Horgett Deschande desprise Aus automing & SAP(4) that noromasses the entire basin or accurate in the working generation of the basin are working generation of the basin are partes (e.g., vieldets), call addets, non-port (e.g., paning, generation processes)         3         - Modely addressed         3         - Modely addressed         1           General         4         2         - Modely addressed         3         - Interested partes processes - To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Undergressented Community, etc.         3         - Interested partes processes - To obtain full points, and all necessary information provided - Net generated - Net generated Community, etc.         3         - Provided but missing some information - Noted addressed         3         - Provided but missing some information - Noted datressed - Noted but missing som more - Noted	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	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	2
Generalaab-interested parties (ag, residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, ec) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outpact and an engement include interested parties and rule project or component (e.g., planning, design, and interested parties included on decision- making committees are required from the Underrepresented Communities.3B-interested parties included on decision- making committees are required from the Underrepresented Communities.0General4benefitting areas?benefitting areas?22-provided and all necessary information provided in-Provided but missing some information provided parties included on decision- making committees in-Natgring waters in-Natgring waters in-Natgring waters in-Natgring waters in-Natgring waters in-Natgring waters333-Project benefits in-Natgring waters in-Natgring waters3General52Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting in benefit? Planse the project benefit in anoton through the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting in spoint waters specifies in SDAC(s) in-Project partial benefits busines in-Project partial benefit	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	1
General       Vasi there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?       2       2       2       2       1       Provided and all necessary information provided       0         General       5       back the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the back(s) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC(s)       3       3       3       2       0       Not provided       3       2       0       Not provided       3         General       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC(s)       3 </td <td>General</td> <td>3</td> <td><ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul></td> <td>3</td> <td>engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed</td> <td>0</td>	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	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
General5the 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 th amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.3332Project benefits an SDAC(s) a Project benefits an SDAC(s)3General6Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or ster. provided? Does the Project or Component the padress the needs of the State Water Board's ster. Project panelits with minor details not included or unclear ter. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's Ster. Progress de Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's Ster. Progress de Project or Component the padress the needs of the State Water Age addressed o Not addressed441Project banefits unit included or unclear ter. Mostly addressed o Not addressed0General7How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the 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 the very human being thas the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?3441Project banefits to the underesed to taddressed 0. Not addressed0Budget8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?31Fully addressed 2. Mostly addressed, with minor d	General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	0
General6private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, scrice area maps, SAFER Program?333	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	3
General7How 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- Fully addressed 3Mostly addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 20Scope of Work8Did 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- Fully addressed 33- Fully addressed 30Budget9Is 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 table? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may included • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.33- Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 22Budget is consistent and feasible 02Schedule10Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table askipe within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?11Consistent and feasible 01	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       3       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       3       1       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally 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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include but not feasible tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent and feasible tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible table consistent and feasible tables?       2       Budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?       2       Budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible table consistent and feasible tables?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?       2       Budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?       2       Budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3       3 - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3 - Local cost share is	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	2
Total Range of Possible Points3014	Schedule	10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		14

#### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

		Questions	Points	Scoring Guidance	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Imp Only វ	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		18

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

Beneral         Image: Second and the proposed project of Component porced project of Component to activity of the second project activity of the second project of Component to acti	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General - Ingo ON       2-Prop Control	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Paning       2       3- Mostly addressed, with spinICat details missing or unclear a working together?         General - Paning       2       - Mostly addressed, with spinICat details missing or unclear a working together?         General       2       - Mostly addressed, with spinICat details missing or unclear a working together?         General       3       - Mostly addressed, with spinICat details missing or unclear a working together?         General       4       2       - Mostly addressed, with spinICat details missing or unclear a working together?         General       4       2       - Mostly addressed, with spinICat details missing or unclear a working together?         General       4       4       2       - Interested parties increating the spinICat details missing or unclear a spinICat details missing one information provided in the decision-making more mappenent include in missing one information provided in the decision-making more mappenent include in the decision-making more mappenent include in the indiverse metal of more mappenent will not be given.       2         General       4       As there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and indiverse metal device will be mining metal mappenent will not be given.       2         General       5       SAC2 Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, unclear will be mining the spinICat device will be mining the spinICat device will be worked and all necessary information provided in the underse mappenent will be more details n	eneral - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	0
Generalaarities (e.g., residuents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, Poet the outcach and engagement included receiped receiped within Underrepresented parties at uning 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?ainterested parties included on decision-making committees in an interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and underrepresented Communities).ainterested parties included on decision-making 	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General       4       benefitting areas?       2       1 - Provided but missing some information       0         General       5       • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.       0       0 - Not provided       0         General       5       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Poes the project benefits an SDAC(s)       3       3       - Project benefits underrepresented Community.       1 - Project does not benefit an SDAC(s)         SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Poes the project benefits underrepresented Community.       3       3       - Project benefits underrepresented Community.       1 - Project does not benefit either       0 - Not provided         . No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General       5       5       -Project benefits an SDAC(5)         General       5       SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the project benefit 2 Materepresented Community and SDAC.       3       2       -Project benefits and SDAC(5)         SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the project partially benefits either       0       -Project benefits and SDAC(5)         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.)?       3       3       - Fully addressed         General       6       Was justification such as domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       - Fully addressed         General       7       Kerprogreement       6       Was justification such as domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       - Fully addressed         General       7       7       Section 106.3]? How will the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685       4       - Fully addressed       3       - Mostly addressed, with significant details not included or unclear         Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the task/s/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Projec	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	1
Generalprivate 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?334- Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed 0 - Not addressedGeneral7How 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 	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       - Fully addressed 3 - 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 0 - Not addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 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 not included, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible       3         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and 1 - Consistent and feasible       1 - Consistent and feasible	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       0 - Not addressed         Budget       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 or unclear 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include and schedule tables? Is 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 an	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	1
	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	1
	Schedule	10		1		0
Total Range of Possible Points 30			Total Range of Possible Points	30		13

### Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		

# Project #2 BWD Solar Project

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

General		Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this			Points
	1	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Imp Only 2 <sup>.</sup>		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
Ŭ	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		0

# Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

		Questions	Points	Scoring Guidance	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Imp Only :		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		

#### Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	Potental for 1. Dust control 2. native vegetation regrowth
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	no breakdown for large tasks \$218,750 for all of Task 3 \$220,680 for all of Task 4
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		16	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 377,670		Use 50% of ask

### Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

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.	,	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Benefit is knowledge This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	No outreach, only transparency
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	<ol> <li>reduced pumping secondary</li> <li>groundwater level monitoring</li> <li>transparency</li> </ol>
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Little history of outreach, little explanation of new outreach plans
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	]
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		16	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>		This is a plan
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	No benefit to potable water supply
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	4.5% cos
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):		\$-		

cost share

Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation
---

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

			Possible		Actual	1
Section Name	Q#	Questions	Points	Scoring Guidance	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	No beneficiaries No change in pumping reduction No reduction in pumping No benefit to potable water suppl
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	No outreach, just rreporting
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	0	No benefit to potable water supp
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	Implied it is possible the water tak will not need to drop as low as it v 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	No benefit to potable water supp
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	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		12	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-		

Cost share

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	<ul> <li>Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this</li> <li>Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits</li> <li>provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan</li> <li>implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to</li> <li>your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	Water conservation Mulitple communities outreach
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	
General	5	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Turf: 4 Softball: (
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	reduce w public ac reduce G
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	

# Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	1.Early warning system for undesirable effects 2. Fulfills GMP requirement for avoiding undesirable effects
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Great outreach, but only 2 letters
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	<ol> <li>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</li> <li>Possible water conservation through well planned growth. Growth is a benefit</li> </ol>	
General - Planning Only	·	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>			
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	No letters	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0		
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3	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 hundreth):							

Cost Share

### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	<ul> <li>Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this</li> <li>Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits</li> <li>provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan</li> <li>implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to</li> <li>your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	
General - Imp Only	2-Im	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	Water conservation Public access
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	Map missing, but can be added later, no vagueness on location
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		18	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	only modest reduction in turf for the 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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	1. water conservation
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	No outreach
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	2	Minimal impact to Borrego SDAC, that community does not use the golf course for recreation. Some SDAC community work there
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points			13	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	The WM 3 year prelim budget for EWG tasks is \$78K WM GDE grant ask is \$585K Project cost is \$1,037K
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	Benefit is knowledge This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	2 not 3 comment letters
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
General	/	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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			12	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 292,500		use cost from WM GDE project

## Revisions to PRC Preliminary Scoresheets

From:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:46 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Project Score Revisions
Attachments:	AK_PRC SCORE CARD 2022.02.03 (1).xlsx

From: Atley Keller <akeller@lgc.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:31 AM
To: 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 <<u>akeller@lgc.org</u>> 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 | <u>she/her(s)</u> Project Manager | Local Government Commission <u>akeller@lgc.org</u> | (916) 448-1198 x330 980 9th Street, Suite 1700 Sacramento, CA 95814

#### <u>Sign up</u> to receive LGC communications



From:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:47 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Garmon Rescoring #4

From: David Garmon <jdgarmon@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:22 AM
To: 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,

From:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:46 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Garmon Rescoring #7

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

Jessica,

Please change my scores to the following:

1

0

Thanks,

From:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:47 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Garmon Rescoring #8

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

Jessica

Please change my scores on this one to:

0

1

1

1

Thanks,

From:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:46 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Garmon Rescoring Project #6

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

0

Thanks,

From:	<u>djohnson borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Tuesday, February 8, 2022 8:00 PM
То:	<u>Claudia Flores</u>
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:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:50 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Regrading - Bennett

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.HG. 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: <u>http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/SGMA.html</u>

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 = 2Project 11 Question 4 = 2Project 12 Question 4 = 2Project 15 Question 4 = 2Project 14 Question 1 = 3Question 4 = 2Question 5 = 3New total = 17 Thanks.

Jim Bennett, P.G., C.HG. 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: <u>http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/SGMA.html</u>

From:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:52 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Revised scores

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
11.5

#### Reduce #4

Stevens
3
1.5
2
2
2

2
0
0
2
2
1
17.5

Increase #14

Stevens
4
2
1.5
2
2
2
1
0
3
3
1
21.5

Reduce #11

Stevens
3
1.5
2
1
2
3
0
0
2
2
1
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:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:45 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Changes

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 spreadhsheet.

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 <u>mike@seleyco.com</u> Primary/mobile: (415) 640-2261

From:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:54 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Staehle re-scoring for PRC
Attachments:	Staehle PRC Scoring Template by Project RLS rescore 20220203.xlsx

From: Robert Staehle <gaboon@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:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:55 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Updated scores
Attachments:	PRC Scoring Template by Project Shannon Smith 2 3 2022.xlsx

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:	j <u>essica borregowd.org</u>
Sent:	Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:56 PM
То:	Jane Gray; Trey Driscoll; Claudia Flores
Subject:	Fw: Tammy re-scores
Attachments:	PRC Scoring Template by Project Tammy 2022-02-03.xlsx

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

highlighed in yellow

projects # 6,7,8,15

### Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Was decopion of the project of Component provider, Data is update in atoms of basis             provider, commutative score, measurable adjustmess, manuaus threadously, pain             measurable adjustmess, and score that is update in a score of basis             provider, commutative score, measurable adjustmess, meastres, measures, meastres, measurable adjustmess, measur	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Bareard - Imp GN         2-bit Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an exploration of the softward of unpublic supported with beckenet with explorations and supporting documents?           Comment 2-bit Project Description description of quantifiable benefits? Was an exploration of the softward of unpublic supported with the basis is not compared to the basis is not compared to the softward or quantifiable benefits? Was an exploration of quantifiable benefits? Was and exploration of quantifiable benefits? Was and exploration of quantifiable benefits? Was andexploratin of the Voice? Comploret Project? Component Project? Co	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Beneral-Plennin         2         Joins the Project Description describe why well the multiple SAL9 strong of the basis and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the basis are working togosal for describe why and the togosal for describe why and the basis are togosal and the basis are togosal and the second the togosal for the togosal	General - Imp Only		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	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	
Generala a strest (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Communities, ec.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the uncerteak and engagement include in indementation)? 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.331-Interested parties included on decision- making committees - Interested parties included on decision- making committees331-Interested parties included on decision- making committees - Interested parties included on decision- making committees - Not addressed331-Interested parties included on decision- making committees - Interested parties included on decision- making committees - Not addressed331-Interested parties included on decision- making committees - Not addressed331-Interested parties included on decision- making committees - Not addressed331-Interested parties included on decision- 	Ű	2-	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General4benefitting reas? • The information should be clear and essy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21Provided but missing some informationGeneral5Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (ies)? Was there a map(s) depiciting the Underrepresented Community (ies)? Was there a map(s) depiciting the SDAC(s) to the the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (ies)? Was there a map(s) depiciting the SDAC(s) the Underrepresented Community (ies)? Was there a map(s) is not provided.33-Project benefits an SDAC(s) 2-Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1-Project partially benefits either 0-Project not benefit submerspresented Community 1-Project partially benefits either 0-Project partially benefits either 0-Project partially denesed.33-Fully addressedGeneral6Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or provided Does the Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 66S SAFER Program)?33-Fully addressed 2-Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1-Marginally addressedGeneral78Spate Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 66S s on the state/subtasks that will be completed as part of the state that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate in human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?4-Fully addressed 3-Notity addressed 3-Notity addressed 3-Notity addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	
General5Shoc/S 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.33334Project benefits an SDAC(s) • Project benefits either • Project benefits either • Project benefits either • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.3334-Project pentifs an SDAC(s) • Project benefits either • Project benefits either • Project benefits either 	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	
General       6       Private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)?       3       3       3       4       Mostly addressed         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       4       4       4       1       Marginally addressed       0       Not addr	General		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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	
GeneralAddressed proposed project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressedScope of Work8Did 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 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressedBudget9Is a budget summary table provide? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include cost sexpended on projects before grant agreement date. • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasibleSchedule10Is 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	General		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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       - Morginally addressed       - Morgi	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include but not feasible to the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent and feasible tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent and feasible 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?       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible tables?         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget feasible?       1       1 - Consistent and feasible tables?       0 - Not consistent and feasible table?	Scope of Work		grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 10 O - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10	-	1		
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		

### Project #2 BWD Solar Project

General		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	Points		Points
		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
ieneral - Imp Only 2-	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
Ŭ,	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		

### Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		

### Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	Potental for 1. Dust control 2. native vegetation regrowth
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	no breakdown for large tasks \$218,750 for all of Task 3 \$220,680 for all of Task 4
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points			16	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 377,670		Use 50% of ask

### Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General		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.	,	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	The WM 3 year prelim budget for EWG tasks is \$77,680 Project cost is \$585K, 600+% increase not explained
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	Benefit is knowledge This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	No outreach, only transparency
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	4	costs increases over WM budget not explained
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	<ol> <li>reduced pumping secondary</li> <li>groundwater level monitoring</li> <li>transparency</li> </ol>
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	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> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	"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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		21	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>		This is a plan
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	2	4.5%
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):		\$ -		

cost share

Cost share

#### Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation **Project / Component Evaluation Criteria** Possible Actual Q# Section Name **Scoring Guidance** Questions Points Points Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this 4 - Fully addressed Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear Not part of the GMP implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to 4 0 1 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear General Does not help achieve SGMA your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks. 4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents Does the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an 3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component documents General - Imp 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign 2-Imp provided, along with how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? 4 This is a plan Only • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported documents with backup documentation. 1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents 0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified 4 - Fully addressed No beneficiaries Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the General - Planning 2-No change in pumping reduction 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 0 4 Plan proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are No reduction in pumping Only 1 - Marginally addressed working together? No benefit to potable water supply 0 - Not addressed Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging 3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-3 General 3 1 No outreach, just rreporting planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in making committees the decision-making processes? 1 - Marginally addressed • To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the 0 - Not addressed **Underrepresented Communities.** Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 2 - Provided and all necessary information provided General 4 benefitting areas? 2 1 - Provided but missing some information 2 • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given. 0 - Not provided 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 3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s) an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please 2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 5 3 General 0 No benefit to potable water supply provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and 1 - Project partially benefits either SDAC. 0 - Project does not benefit either • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided. Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or 3 - Fully addressed private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, Implied it is possible the water table 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 6 etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area 3 will not need to drop as low as it will General 1 1 - Marginally addressed maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State with current plan 0 - Not addressed Water Board's SAFER Program? 4 - Fully addressed How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear General 4 0 No benefit to potable water supply 7 that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate

		that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?		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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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		9
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-	

### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4	Water conservation Mulitple communities outreach
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3	
General		Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? <ul> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		23	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

### Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	Turf: 4 Softbal
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	reduce public a reduce
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	1

### Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	<ol> <li>Early warning system for undesirable effects</li> <li>Fulfills GMP requirement for avoiding undesirable effects</li> </ol>
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		Great outreach, but only 2 letters
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points			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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	<ol> <li>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</li> <li>Possible water conservation through well planned growth. Growth is a benefit</li> </ol>
General - Planning Only	·	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	No letters
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3	23% Co Sh
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points			22	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

Cost Share

### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	3	Water conservation Public access
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	2	Map missing, but can be added later, no vagueness on location
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		18	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

## Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1	only modest reduction in turf for the 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? • To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	1. water conservation
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	No outreach
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	2	Minimal impact to Borrego SDAC, that community does not use the golf course for recreation. Some SDAC community work there
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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			13	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -		

### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	The WM 3 year prelim budget for EWG tasks is \$78K WM GDE grant ask is \$585K Project cost is \$1,037K
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2	Benefit is knowledge This could lead to water being allocated to GDEs
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>		
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	2 not 3 comment letters
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points			13	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 292,500		use cost from WM GDE project

### Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Project / Component Evaluation Criteria

General       * Mark a decision of the proposed Frace Component provided FDB is used in information the information of the information in the in	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General Import General ControlDoes the Project or Component purplets and supporting applications of the bunch is hair are quantified to bunch the Project or Component the Destination and supporting applications of the bunch is hair are quantified to bunch and any quantified to the Project Description descripts a well-conducted and quantified to the Project Description descripts a well-conducted and quantified to the Project Description descripts a well-conducted and quantified to 	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Plank         2         Description description description description and possibility in the encomparation of the basis in a course of in the variety general relation is the entrife basis or exception of the basis in a course of in the variety general relation is provided by a course of the possibility of the encomparation of the basis in a course of inter- section of the basis in the course of inter- section of the basis in the course of inter- section of the basis in the course of the encomparation of the basis in the course of the encomparation of the encomparation of the course of the encomparation of the basis in the encomparation of the course of the encomparation of the encomparation of the course of the encomparation of the basis in the encomparation of the course of the encomparatis down and the possible of the encomparatis dow encomparatis dow	General - Imp Only		<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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	1
Bernel Lei ConstructionBernel Lei Con	J. J	2-	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
General         Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?         2 - Provided and all necessary information provided         2           General         4 benefitting areas?         - The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.         2 cmoulded and all necessary information provided         2           General         5         Does the project benefit an Undergrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Undergrepresented community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Dease provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Undergrepresented Community and SDAC.         3 - Project benefits an SDAC(s)         2 - Mostly addressed.         3 - Project benefits undergrepresented Community - Project provided for the project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water system sor provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFRE Program?         3 - Fully addressed.         3 - Fully addressed.         - Narginally addressed.         1           General         7         For does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFRE Program?         3 - Fully addressed.         4 - Fully addressed.         4 - Fully addressed.         1           General         8         gant Project or Component help address the and project or Component address the maps.         3 - Fully addressed.         4 - Fully addressed.         4 - Fully addressed.         4 - Fully addressed. </td <td>General</td> <td></td> <td><ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul></td> <td>3</td> <td>engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed</td> <td>2</td>	General		<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General555570 points bank (15) some a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an somout of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.3332Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 2 - Mostly addressed 0 - Not addressed3General7How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.31? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State the every human being has the right and for short purposes?3- Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed0Scope of Work8Did the proposal p	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
Generalorivate 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. softer Project or Component help address the neaps, service area maps, etc. SAFER Program?333435 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed 0 - Not addressed11General7How does the 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 for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?4 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed4 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed0Scope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project?333 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed0Scope of Work8Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the scale tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the scale and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include?333 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed33Budget9is a budget summary table provide? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include?333 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible333 - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.33Budget Scale cost share i	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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?       3 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear       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?       3 - Fully addressed       3 - Mostly addressed       0         No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3 - Mostly addressed       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       3 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Not consistent and feasible       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible <td>General</td> <td></td> <td>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</td> <td>3</td> <td><ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td> <td>1</td>	General		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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       3	General	'	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
Budget       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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include to budget is consistent and feasible tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent and feasible tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent and feasible tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and the budget table and the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?       3          3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible to budget is consistent and feasible tables?       3          3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible to budget table and to budget is consistent and feasible to budget table and ta	Scope of Work		grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible 1	Budget	9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	3
Total Range of Possible Points30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		22

Rate per unit	\$	3.59
Dollars Saved	\$	33,333
Units Not Pumped		9,285
Gallons per unit		748
Gallons Not Pumped	6,9	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".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		26
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 3,159,000	

# **PRC MEMBER REVISIONS**

### Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points	
General	1	<ul> <li>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".)</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	This is a regulatory compliance requirement and benefits beyond that element are speculative.
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		26	
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 206,500		

#### Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
ieneral - 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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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

### Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

with a discussion of the proposed project as Component approximation of the project of Component approximation and project of Component approximation of the project of Component approximation and project of Component approximation a	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Base And Answer And A	General	1	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> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Barenal - Plannia         2         Poortiky office the service and office continuities of proposal micluling is GSP(b) that encompasses the entre basin of control for the basin in a covered in the working torquest? Use it describe how well the multiple CSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working torquest? Use it describe how well the multiple CSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working torquest? Use it describe how well the multiple CSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working torquest? Use it describe how well the multiple CSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/molved in all aspects of the Project C/Component etc.) Located within underearpresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties are required from the Undergregoresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include processes? • To obtain full points, uninimum of three comment lecters are required from the Undergregoresented Communities?         3        Interested parties included on decision- making committees • To obtain full points, uninimum of three comment lecters are required from the Undergregoresented Communities?         3        Interested parties provide in • To obtain full points, uninimum of three comment lecters are required from the Undergregoresented Community (est) that the project will heap for the project will heap for • Do tradied be dear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given • Do obtain sufficient theory provide will heap for the project will heap for the project will heap for • Do points will be given if a map(r) stort provided • Do obtain will be given if a map(r) stort provide will heap for the project will heap for • Do points will be given if a map(r) stort provide.         3        Interested parties provide deas • -Interest deas not included or unclear • -Not addre	General - Imp Only		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	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	
Generalastrice (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, exc) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the uncertex and engagement include implementation? Can interested parties turing all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, disign, and implementation? Can interested parties turing all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, disign, and implementation? Can interested parties turing all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, disign, and implementation? Can interested parties turing all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, disign, and implementation? Can interested parties turing all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, disign, and implementation? Can interested parties turing all phases of the Project or component (e.g., planning, disign, and implementation? Can interested communities?a	•	2- Plan	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General       4       Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 4       2       2       2       2       1       Provided and all necessary information provided 1       1         General       5       ShC/V was there a map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and 5       2       1       Provided and all necessary information provided         General       5       ShC/V was there a map(s) depicting the ShC/Si bat the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-les) Plant the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will be given if a map(s) ShC/Si bat the project will benefit? Please provide the 7       3       3       Project benefits underrepresented Community 1. Project partially benefits either amount of funding that will be given if a map(s) ShC/Si bat the project will benefit? Please provide the 7       3       3       3       Project does not benefit either       3         General       6       Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water system angs, service area map, set- provided? Does the project or Component address the needs of the State Water Board's 5       3       3       3       Fully addressed 0       0       Not addressed 0	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	
Generalbe Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC?333 <td>General</td> <td></td> <td>benefitting areas?</td> <td>2</td> <td>1 - Provided but missing some information</td> <td></td>	General		benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	
Generalorivate 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?33332How does the group of the details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed 0. Not addressed 0. Not addressed2How 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?44Fully addressed 24Fully addressed 234510	General		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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	
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       - Fully 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?       3       Fully addressed         Not funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposal for the project or consistent and feasible and schedule tables? Is local cost share ins not included in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget table tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent with those listed in full points.       3       - Fully addressed 3       - Mostly addressed         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget feasible?       3       - Fully addressed       - Mostly addressed         Schedule       10       Is the tasks/subtasks in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget feasible?       1       - Not consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible         0       Not addressed       - Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible       - Not consistent and feasible       - Sudget is consistent and f	General	6	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	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally 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?       3       3       Fully addressed       2       Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear         8       No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       3       - Kully addressed       2       Mostly addressed       2       Mostly addressed       2       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       2       Mostly addressed       2       Mostly addressed       0       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       2       Mostly addressed       0       Not consistent and feasible       0       0 <td>General</td> <td>7</td> <td>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</td> <td>4</td> <td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td> <td></td>	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget       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.       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0	Scope of Work		grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget		<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		

### Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		0
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

### Project #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

General         4         - Fully addressed         3         - Fully addressed	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
Bits         possibility         possibility <thp< td=""><td>General</td><td>1</td><td>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".)</td><td>4</td><td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td><td>2</td></thp<>	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Planink     2     José the Pröject Description describe way and the coordinate proposal notaing a SuPA (1) that encompasses the entire basin or accered in the basin are working tegether?     3     Joséts the Project Description describe way and the coordinate proposal notaing a SuPA (1) that encompasses the entire basin or accered in the basin are working tegether?     3     Joséts the Project or Component Uily describe ther plan for outreaching and engaging interested a working tegether?     3     Joséts the Project or Component Uily describe ther plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., reidents, local description, making committees and fully engaged/involved in all appects of the Project or Component (z.g., hong) for the project/Component 2     3     Joséts the Project or Component (2)     0       General 4     4     2     Provided and all necessary information provided to the Project/Component 2     2     1       General 5     5     South the Project Description in the set of the Project or Component (z.g., hong) for the project benefit an Andre partice parties provide input and be involved in the decision- making processary - the information for provided in the point will not be playen.     2     1     Provided and all necessary information provided in 0     2     2       General 5     5     South the project benefit an Andre parties teget and project map(s) in and provide in the project will hear and all necessary information provided in 0     3     3     1     1       General 6     5 <td>General - Imp Only</td> <td>2-Imp</td> <td><ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul></td> <td>4</td> <td>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</td> <td>0</td>	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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
Generala parties (e.g., residents, local ladders, non-profit represented Communities, ecc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outrechas and engagement include in interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and inpermentation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees and regaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees and regaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees are required from the underrepresented Communities.33 </td <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>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</td> <td>4</td> <td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td> <td>2</td>	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General4benefitting areas?21 - Froided but missing some information2General5SDAC? Was there a map(s) to red. If not, the point will not be given.0 - Not provided0 - Not provided3General5SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Dess the project benefits an SDAC(s)2 - Project benefits an SDAC(s)3General6Will the Project of community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) for oproxided.33 - Frojects benefits an SDAC(s)3General6Will the Project of Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic well (seg. groundwater contamination unlerability, drawdown, etc.); etc. provided? Does the Project of Component help address the needs of the State Water Beards33 - Fully addressed- Fully addressed1General7Will the Project of Component help address the needs of the State Water Beards33 - Fully addressed- Fully addressed1General7Sector Dorosed Project of Component support the established policy of the State Water Beards44 - Fully addressed- Fully addressed1General7Sector Dorosed Project of Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 6B or hat were needs of the State Water Beards44 - Fully addressed- Fully addressedGeneral7Sector Dorosed Project of Component address the water adequate for hat every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for hat every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for hat addressed	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	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
General5the Underrepresented Community (i=s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the smount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.33332Project benefits an SDA(3) service the angl () depicting that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.33	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       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       3       1       Mostly addressed       1         General       7       Kostly addressed       4       Fully addressed       4       Fully addressed       1         General       7       Kostly addressed       4       Fully addressed       4       Fully addressed       0       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       1         General       7       Kostly addressed       4       Fully addressed       4       Fully addressed       0       Not addressed       0       Not addressed       0	General	5	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.	3	2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community 1 - Project partially benefits either	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 - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed 0 - Not addressed       9         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 - Fully addressed 0 - Not addressed       3 - Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed       1 -         Budget       Part       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 table?? Is local cost share in local cost share in cluded (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include • Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Morginally addressed 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed       1         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 and schedule tables? Is 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 - 0 - Not consistent and feasible - 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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
BudgetIs 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.33 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible1Schedule10Is 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?11 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible0	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	1
Schedule     10     within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?     1     0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	1
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		0
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		12

## Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Was a security of the project of Composent projecomposent project of Composent project of Composent project of C	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
science:         1. Does the Project Component provide description of guarafields benefits with explanations and supporting optimization the benefits with explanations and supporting to constraint the project Component the benefits with explanations and supporting to constraint the benefits with explanations and supporting to constraint the project Component the benefits with explanations and supporting to constraint the benefits with explanations and supporting to constraint the benefits with explanations and supporting to constraint the benefits with explanating to constraint the benefits with explanation theore the explanat	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General-Plantial Only         2         Description descriptin descriptio	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	<ul> <li>documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> </ul>	2
Series (e.g., resident), local leaders, non-profit regresenting Underregresented Communities, ecc) location within Underregresented Communities, imprementation) Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees and imprementation) Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making committees, involved, but not included on decision-making committees, 	-		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	0
General4benefitting areas? • The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.21Provided but missing some information21General5SDAC? Was three a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) so DAC? Was three a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • No points will be project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • Project benefits an SDAC(s) • Project benefits underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was three a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • Project benefits underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) • Project partially benefits ether • Project partially benefits ether • Project partially benefits ether • Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or • Project benefit an Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.333	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General555777 <td>General</td> <td>4</td> <td>benefitting areas?</td> <td>2</td> <td>1 - Provided but missing some information</td> <td>2</td>	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
Generalorivate shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, SAFER Program?3 - Fully addressed - Not addressed2 - Mostly addressed2 - M	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	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       - Fully addressed . Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2. Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1. Marginally addressed       2         Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       - Fully addressed Not addressed       2         Budget       B       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of the grant Project? • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.       3       - Fully addressed Not addressed       2       Mostly addressed Not addressed       3       - Second constant and feasible No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget reasonable for the project of constant and feasible Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible Not consis	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	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?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed       3       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1. Marginally addressed       3 <td< td=""><td>General</td><td>7</td><td>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</td><td>4</td><td><ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul></td><td>2</td></td<>	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
Budget       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.       3       3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible and feasible costs expended on projects before grant agreement date.       3       - Budget is consistent and feasible consistent and feasible and feasible consistent and feasible consi	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	3
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible 1	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	1
Total Range of Possible Points30	Schedule	10		1		1
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		20

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		23
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 369,000	

### Project #10 BSUSD or Turf Conversion Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		0
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

### Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	0
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		12
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$-	

### Project #13 CC Water Reduction Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		0
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ 161,399	

#### Project #14 DADC Water Conservation Plan

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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):		\$-	

#### Project #15 TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment and Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	0
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas? <ul> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	3
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
General		How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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):		\$ -	

### Project #1 BWD Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General		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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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> <li>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
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		24
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$	

### Project #2 BWD Solar Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	:
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		2

## Project #3 BWD WWTP Monitoring Wells

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only	2-	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	Ĩ
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	:
General		Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	5
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		21

#### Project #4 BSWD Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

GeneralProject provide implem your print app • NoGeneral - Imp Only2-ImpDoes the explant provide • To with bateGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes the encom proposition workingGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes the encom proposition workingGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes the encom proposition workingGeneral4 PlanDoes the parties etc.) lo interess implem process • To UnderrGeneral4 PlanDoes the parties etc.) lo interess implem process • To UnderrGeneral6 PlanPlanGeneral6 PlanPlanGeneral6 PlanPlanGeneralPlanPlanGeneralPlanPlanGeneralPlanPlanGeneralPlanPlanGeneralPlanPlanGeneralPlanPlanGeneralPlanPlanPlanPlanGeneralPlanPlan <t< th=""><th>Questions</th><th>Possible Points</th><th>Scoring Guidance</th><th>Actual Points</th></t<>	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General - Imp Only2-Impexplant provide • To with bateGeneral - Planning Only2- PlanDoes th encom 	as a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this oject or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits ovided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan plementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to ur proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective t applicable because project is planning only".) No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only2- Planencom proposivorkinGeneral3Does th parties etc.) lo interestimplem process • To UnderrGeneral4Boes th parties etc.) lo interestimplem process • To UnderrGeneral4Boes th the Un SDAC? amount 	es the Project or Component provide a description of quantifiable benefits? Was an planation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component pvided, 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 th backup documentation.	4	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General3parties etc.) lo interes implem proces • To UnderrGeneral4Was th benefit • The Does th the Un SDAC? amoun 	es the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that compasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the pposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are orking together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General4benefit • The • The Does the Un SDAC? amount • NoGeneral5Does the Un SDAC? amount • NoGeneral6Will the 	es the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested rties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, c.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include erested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and plementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making ocesses? To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the derrepresented Communities.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General5the Un SDAC? amoun • NoGeneral6Will the private Was ju provide SAFERGeneral6How de Section that ev for hurScope of Work8Did the grant P	as there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and nefitting areas? The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
General 6 private Was ju provide SAFER General 7 How de Section that ev for hur Scope of Work 8 Did the grant P	es the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting e Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an AC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the nount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	
General 7 How do Section that ev for hur Scope of Work 8 grant P	II the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or vate shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? as justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. ovided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's FER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work 8 grant P	w does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 ction 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State at every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
	d the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this ant Project? No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Budget 9 and sch costs e • Loo	a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget ole tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget d schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include sts expended on projects before grant agreement date. Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	
Schedule 10	he tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and hin 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		1

### Project #5 BSWD GDE Monitoring Program

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	(
General - Planning Only	2- Plan	Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General		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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	(
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work		Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? <ul> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
Budget		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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

### Project #6 BSWD Monitoring, Reporting and GMP Update

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	3
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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 #7 BSWM Water Supply Augmentation

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	:
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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	
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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	(
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	:
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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	:
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		13

## Project #8 BSWM Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation by Importation

Was a decision of the process of Composent provide? Of languine with the provide community set of the provide community. <ul>             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Provide community set of the provide community set of the provide community.             Proprovide communitse to the provide community set of th</ul>	Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
general - Imp Obly       2-m       positive hordpott or component powels a decorption of quantifiable bondfor 3 was an explanation of the explanation and supporting documents and	General	1	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".)	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	2
General - Planing       2       Joint the Project Description description and the project in contrast the basin are working transmissing or unclear is the project or Component the project or Component the provide has the project or Component to project or Component to project or Component to the project or Compo	General - Imp Only	2-Imp	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported</li> </ul>	4	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	(
Berner GeneralProject (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit represented Community, is processer? in processer? • to obtain full points, a minimum of the comment letters are required from the underrepresented Community (e.g., planning, design, and improment stating commutes are required from the underrepresented Community (set) to obtain full points, a minimum of the comment letters are required from the underrepresented Community (set) to obtain full points, a minimum of the comment letters are required from the underrepresented Community (set) to obtain full points, a minimum of the comment letters are required from the underrepresented Community (set) that the project will be peint? • The information should be charand easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.2.2.Provided but missing some information provided 0. Not addressed 0. Not addressed2.General2Des the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (set)? Was there a map(s) depicting to full benefit? Poess the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC (s) 0. Not provided but missing some information 0. Project benefits underrepresented Community (set)? Was there a map(s) depicting to project benefits underrepresented Community (set)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC (set) 0. Project benefits underrepresented Community (set)? Not sub	•		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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	
General4benefitting areas?21-Provided but missing some informationGeneral55- The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.00- Not providedGeneral5550AC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) - Project partially benefits underrepresented Community - Project partially benefits under project partially benefits under project partially benefits under project partially benefits underrepresented Community - Not datressed - Not datressedGeneral	General	3	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the</li> </ul>	3	engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component 2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision- making committees 1 - Marginally addressed	2
General5SbAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Poes the project benefit an anot of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.332Project benefits an SUAL(s) 2Project benefits and SUB ending that will benefit? Please provide the anot of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC.332Project benefits and SUB ending that will benefit?3332Project benefits and SUBL(s) 2Project benefits and SUB ending that will benefit?333 <th< td=""><td>General</td><td>4</td><td>benefitting areas?</td><td>2</td><td>1 - Provided but missing some information</td><td>2</td></th<>	General	4	benefitting areas?	2	1 - Provided but missing some information	2
General       6       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, science provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?       3       3       3       4       How Soly addressed 	General	5	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.	3	<ul><li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li><li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li></ul>	C
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       - Fully addressed 3 - Mostly addressed, with significant details not included or unclear 2 - Mostly 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?       3       Fully addressed 2 - Mostly addressed 2 - Mostly addressed       3       Fully addressed         Budget       16 a budget summary table provide? 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 table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget and schedule table? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may included and schedule table? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may included and schedule table? Is local cost share ins not required but necessary to obtain full points.       3       3       - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 1 - Budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget	General	6	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	3	<ul> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	(
Scope of Work       8       Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?       3       2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed         Budget       9       Is a budget summary table provide? 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 and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include - 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 - Budget is consistent	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	4	<ul> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> </ul>	(
BudgetIs 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.33 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible 2 - Budget is consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasibleSchedule10Is 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?11 - Consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Scope of Work	8	grant Project?	3	2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 1 - Marginally addressed	
Schedule 10 within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible? 1 0 - Not consistent and feasible	Budget	9	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.	3	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> </ul>	(
Total Range of Possible Points 30	Schedule	10		1		(
			Total Range of Possible Points	30		(

#### Project #9 BSUSD or ABDNHA Education Project

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance	Actual Points
General	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".) • No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	4
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	2
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
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> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ol> <li>Consistent and feasible</li> <li>Not consistent and feasible</li> </ol>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		22
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	

### Project #11 BVEF Air Quality Monitoring

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	(
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	(
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	5
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 #12 BVSC Resiliency Strategy

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	C
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C
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	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	(
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	2	
General - Imp Only		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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	1	
General - Planning Only		Does the Project Description describe a well-coordinated proposal including a GSP(s) that encompasses the entire basin or describes why a portion of the basin is not covered in the proposal? Does it describe how well the multiple GSA(s) surrounding and within the basin are working together?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	0	
General		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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	0	
Scope of Work		<ul><li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li><li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li></ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>		not pro
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

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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - At least 3 quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>3 - Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supportign documents</li> <li>1 - One quantifiable benefit wtih explanations and supporting documents</li> <li>0 - Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
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	<ul> <li>3 - Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project/Component</li> <li>2 - Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	4	<ul> <li>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</li> <li>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</li> </ul>	2	<ul> <li>2 - Provided and all necessary information provided</li> <li>1 - Provided but missing some information</li> <li>0 - Not provided</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Projects benefits an SDAC(s)</li> <li>2 - Project benefits Underrepresented Community</li> <li>1 - Project partially benefits either</li> <li>0 - Project does not benefit either</li> </ul>	C
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	C
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?	4	<ul> <li>4 - Fully addressed</li> <li>3 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	1
Scope of Work	8	<ul> <li>Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project?</li> <li>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</li> </ul>	3	<ul> <li>3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>	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	<ul> <li>3 - Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>2 - Budget is consistent and feasible</li> <li>1 - Budget is consistent but not feasible</li> <li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>	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	<ul><li>1 - Consistent and feasible</li><li>0 - Not consistent and feasible</li></ul>	1
		Total Range of Possible Points	30		13
		TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED (rounded to nearest hundreth):		\$ -	