

Agenda

- 1. Agenda Overview – Purpose of the Ad Hoc Committee**
- 2. Public Announcements**
- 3. Yolo Subbasin GSP: *Draft* Results of 2022 Project Prioritization Ranking**
 - a. Review of Final Prioritization Criteria (Attachment B)
 - b. Review of Project Prioritization Ranking (Staff Report and Attachment A)
 - c. Schedule for Submitting a DWR SGMA Implementation Grant Application (Staff Report)
- 4. Next Steps**
- 5. Adjourn**

Formation of the YSGA Working Group Committee

To eliminate confusion between Working Group and Board of Directors meetings – YSGA established an *ad hoc Working Group Committee* comprised of the following members

Ad Hoc Working Group Committee Members

- City of Davis
- City of Woodland
- City of Winters
- Dunnigan Water District
- Environmental Representative – Ann Brice
- Rumsey Water Users Association
- Reclamation District 108
- Reclamation District 787
- University of California, Davis
- Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
- Yolo County
- Yolo County Farm Bureau
- Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District

2022 GSP Project Prioritization Criteria

YSGA hosted meetings on 8/3 and 8/31 to discuss the project solicitation and project prioritization process; YSGA BOD approved criteria at 9/19 meeting

Project Eligibility Criteria

- Project must be located in the Yolo Subbasin
- Project is included in the GSP or the project proponent will submit the project for inclusion in the GSP
- The project proponent has the institutional capacity to implement the project
- The project is technologically and economically feasible to be completed within three years of receiving funding

2022 GSP Project Prioritization Criteria

- **Urgency**
- **Included in Adopted Plans**
- **SGMA Funding Preference**
- **Addresses GSP Sustainability Indicators**
- **Quantifiable/Measurable Benefits**
- **Benefits DAC or Vulnerable/Underrepresented Community**
- **Benefits the Subbasin**
- **Co-Benefits**
- **Positively Impacts SWSs, Private Shallow Domestic Wells, or Human Right to Water**
- **Secure/Stable Funding for O&M**
- **Achieves/Maintains Sustainable Groundwater Management**

No.	Name	Estimated Project Cost	Cost Share	Estimated Grant Request	Estimated Benefit (AFA)	Included in GSP? (Y/N)
1	China Slough Rehabilitation Project	\$787,050	\$100,000	\$687,050	2,000 to 4,000 afa	Yes
2	Dunnigan Area Recharge Program (formerly Buckeye Creek Recharge)	\$2,413,450	\$857,500	\$1,180,950	5,000 afa	Yes
3	Groundwater Model Enhancements	\$230,736	\$0	\$230,736	None provided	Yes
4	Integrated Overview of a Set of Nature-Based Projects for the Capay Valley Management Area	\$1,383,450	\$0	\$1,383,450	843 afa to 3,370 afa	Yes
5	Woodland ASR Well 31 Project	\$6,681,000	\$3,340,500	\$3,340,500	700 afa	Yes
6	Woodland Recycled Water Project Phase III Expansion	\$1,379,300	\$0	\$1,379,300	70 afa	Yes
7	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Winter Water Recharge Program	\$2,500,000	\$0	\$2,500,000	20,000 afa	Yes
8	Hungry Hollow Area: Water Budget Evaluation and Pilot Projects	\$621,863	\$29,613	\$592,250	None provided	Yes
9	GPS Subsidence Surveys	\$187,123	\$0	\$187,123	None provided	Yes
10	Oat Creek/Zamora Groundwater Recharge Pilot Project	\$375,000	\$0	\$375,000	596 afa	Yes
11	Winters Waste Water Treatment Facility	\$300,000	\$100,000	\$200,000	at least 250 af	Yes
12	Water Resources Information Database	\$258,000	\$0	\$258,000	None provided	Yes
13	East Adams and Acacia Canal Improvements for Groundwater Recharge	\$511,000	\$24,000	\$487,000	4,000 afa	Yes
14	Feasibility Study for the Development of Surface Water Supply Source for the City of Winters	\$570,000	\$190,000	\$380,000	500 - 1,000 afa	Yes
15	UC Davis Ag Booster Station Extension	\$1,337,214	\$0	\$1,337,214	None provided	No
16	RD 787 Monitoring Well SCADA Integration	\$102,303	\$10,000	\$92,303	None provided	No
		\$19,637,489	\$4,651,613	\$14,610,876		

Prioritized Project Results

- 14 projects submitted (3 consolidated to 1)
 - 1 ineligible based on institutional capacity concerns
 - 2 projects scoring < 5 “HIGH”s
 - 11 projects scoring ≥ 5 “HIGH”s will proceed in the grant development process
- Project proponents must
 - Have staff capacity to develop application components
 - Secure three comment letters from Underrepresented Communities
 - Commit to grant application schedule

After finalizing the project eligibility and prioritization criteria, Consero worked with YSGA staff to prioritize the submitted projects, which resulted in the following projects scoring five or more points (Attachment A):

1. China Slough Rehabilitation Project
2. YCFC&WCD Winter Water Recharge Program
3. Dunnigan Area Recharge Program (formerly Buckeye Creek Recharge)
4. East Adams and Acacia Canal Improvements for Groundwater Recharge
5. Oat Creek/Zamora Groundwater Recharge Pilot Project
6. City of Winters: Feasibility Study to Upgrade Waste Water Treatment Facility for Reclaimed Water Usage
7. YSGA Groundwater Sustainability Plan Updates (includes Groundwater Model Enhancements, GPS Subsidence Surveys, WRID Upgrades)
8. Woodland ASR Well 31 Project
9. Woodland Recycled Water Project Phase II Expansion
10. Hungry Hollow Area: Water Budget Evaluation and Pilot Projects
11. City of Winters: Feasibility Study for Developing a Surface Water Supply Source



DWR's SGMA Implementation Funding

- Round 1 awarded \$150M: 119 Projects in 20 Groundwater Basins
 - Water Efficiency
 - Groundwater Recharge
 - Feasibility Studies for Alternative Supplies
 - Installation of Monitoring Wells
 - Review all projects funded: <https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/Sustainable-Groundwater/Files/Award-List-COD-Basins-Final-Table.pdf>
- Round 2 Solicitation Opened October 3, 2022 with Applications Due November 30, 2022
 - \$20M per Subbasin – Only one application accepted per Subbasin

TABLE 7 – APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA

Section Name	Q#	Questions	Possible Points	Scoring Guidance
General	1	<p>Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility? If you feel a question component does not apply to your proposed project, please explain why it is not applicable. (Example "Measurable objective not applicable because project is planning only".)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i> 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 – Fully addressed 3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 – Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 – Marginally addressed 0 – Not addressed
General Implementation Only	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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.</i> 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4- At least three quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents. 3 – Two quantifiable benefits with explanations and supporting documents. 2 - Two quantifiable benefits lacking explanations and supporting documents. 1 - One quantifiable benefit with explanations and supporting documents. 0 – Benefits provided but are not explained or quantified.
General Planning Only	2- 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?</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 – Fully addressed 3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear 2 – Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear 1 – Marginally addressed 0 – Not addressed
General	3	<p>Does the Project or Component fully describe their plan for outreaching and engaging interested parties (e.g., residents, local leaders, non-profit representing Underrepresented Communities, etc.) located within Underrepresented Communities? Does the outreach and engagement include interested parties during all phases of the Project or Component (e.g., planning, design, and implementation)? Can interested parties provide input and be involved in the decision-making processes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</i> 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 – Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project or Component 2 – Interested parties engaged/involved, but not included on decision-making committees 1 – Marginally addressed 0 – Not addressed
General	4	<p>Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</i> 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 – Provided and all necessary information provided 1 – Provided but missing some information 0 – Not provided

General	5	Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)? Was there a map(s) depicting the Underrepresented Community (-ies) that the project will benefit? Does the project benefit an SDAC? Was there a map(s) depicting the SDAC(s) that the project will benefit? Please provide the amount of funding that will benefit both the Underrepresented Community and SDAC. • <i>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3- Project benefits an SDAC(s) • 2- Project benefits Underrepresented Community • 1 – Project partially benefits either • 0 – Project does not benefit either
General	6	Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (e.g., groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board’s SAFER Program?	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – Fully addressed • 2 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear • 1 – Marginally addressed • 0 – Not addressed
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the 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 style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 – Fully addressed • 3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear • 2 – Mostly addressed, with significant details missing or unclear • 1 – Marginally addressed • 0 – Not addressed
Scope of Work	8	Did the proposal provide a description of the tasks/subtasks that will be completed as part of this grant Project? • <i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – Fully addressed • 2 – Mostly addressed • 1 – Marginally addressed • 0 – Not addressed
Budget	9	Is a budget summary table provided? Is the budget reasonable for the project? Is the budget table tasks/subtasks provided in the scope of work coincide with the tasks/subtasks in the budget and schedule tables? Is local cost share included (minimum of 5%)? Local cost share may include costs expended on projects before grant agreement date. • <i>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – Local cost share is provided, and budget is consistent and feasible • 2 – Budget is consistent and feasible • 1 – Budget is consistent but not feasible • 0 – Not consistent and feasible
Schedule	10	Is the tasks/subtask in the schedule table consistent with those listed in the budget table and within the description in the application? Is the schedule feasible?	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 – Consistent and feasible • 0 – Not consistent and feasible
Total Range of Possible Points			0-30	
(a) Average of Questions 1 – 8 for Multiple Component Applications				
(b) Total Score for Questions 9 and 10				
Total Points Overall Project:				
TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED:				\$

Next Steps to Prepare Grant Application

- **October 20:** DWR Webinar on SGMA Implementation
- **October 21:** YSGA (Consero) sends completed Work Plan to each project proponent to review and provide additional information
- **October 28:** Additional information due to YSGA
- **October 31:** YSGA Special BOD meeting to authorize grant application submittal
- **October 31 – November 4:** YSGA scores projects according to SGMA GLs
- **November 7:** Draft application to project proponents for review
- **November 11:** Project proponent completes final review of draft
- **November 14-22:** YSGA uploads application to DWR's GRanTS portal