



**GREATER KAWEAH**  
**GROUNDWATER**  
**SUSTAINABILITY**  
**AGENCY**

# Prop. 68 Implementation Scoring

**Presented by – Matt Klinchuch, PE**

May 28, 2021

GKGSA TAC Meeting



# Discussion Topics

- Funding Available and Basins Eligible
- Current Scoring Criteria\*
- Upcoming Schedule\*

*\*Subject to Change*



# Prop. 68 Implementation Funding

- Provides \$103 Million in implementation projects between two rounds:
  - Round 1 - \$26 Million for Critically Overdrafted basins only (Kaweah successful for ~\$3.8M).
  - Round 2 - \$77 Million open for medium- and high-priority basins (inclusive of Critically Overdrafted basins)
- Grant program guidelines and PSP applicable to both rounds. However, there could be revisions to the PSP ahead of Round 2. Likely would see a draft ahead of a final revised PSP.

# Prop. 68 PSP Scoring Criteria

- Total Application Score is 60 Points across 26 weighted questions.
- If multiple projects (components) each is scored separately out of 60 Points, then averaged for a total Application Score.
- Five scoring categories:

Category	Questions	Points (%)
Project Description	6	18 (30%)
Project Benefits	6	17 (28%)
Technical Expertise	5	9 (15%)
Scope of Work & Deliverables	3	6 (10%)
Budget & Schedule	6	10 (17%)

# Prop. 68 PSP Scoring Criteria

Section Name	Q#	TABLE 9-APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA QUESTIONS	Attachment	Possible Points	Scored Points	Scoring Guidance
Project Description	1	Was a description of the proposed Project or Component provided? Did it explain why this Project or Component was chosen over all others identified in the Plan in terms of benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline, and feasibility?	3	3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>• 1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Project Description	2	Did the Work Plan provide a description of the circumstances that initiated the Project or Component, the criteria that triggered implementation of the Project, the process the Agency utilized to determine that conditions require Project or Component implementation, and criteria that would trigger Project or Component termination? Were page references to the Plan provided?	3	3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>• 1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Project Description	3	Does the proposal provide a brief description of the groundwater basin setting, beneficial uses, sustainability goal, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, and undesirable results? Does the proposal assess if and how groundwater users will be impacted upon implementation of the proposed project? Were page references to the Plan provided? <i>*A half point for each (i.e., groundwater basin setting, beneficial uses, sustainability goal, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, and undesirable results) is possible. The final score will be rounded up to the nearest whole number for the final score. No points will be awarded if page references are not provided.</i>	3	3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>• 1 - Marginally addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Project Description	4	Does the Project Description demonstrate the goals, objectives, and needs of the proposed Project or Component? How does the Project or Component meet those? If there are multiple Components, does it demonstrate how they work together as a whole to address the goals, objectives, and needs? Do the descriptive elements align with other planning documents such as IRWM Plans, SWRP, etc? <i>*Goals, objectives, and needs are worth a total of 1 point. *How the Project or Component meets the groundwater basin setting, beneficial uses, sustainability goals, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, and undesirable results is worth 3 points with 0.5 points addressed to each listed. *Goals, objectives, and needs of the Project or Component aligning with other planning documents is worth 1 point. No points will be given if not addressed. No points will be awarded if page references are not provided.</i>	3	5	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•5 - All aspects of the question are addressed, and backup documentation and/or explanation provided sufficient detail to justify claims.</li> <li>•4 - All aspects of the question are addressed; however, the backup documentation and/or explanation is lacking detail.</li> <li>•3 - All aspects of the question are moderately addressed; however, the backup documentation did not provide backup documentation and/or explanation to justify claims.</li> <li>•2 - Missing aspects of the question; however, backup documentation and/or explanation missing details.</li> <li>•1 - Outlined some aspects of the question and did not provide backup documentation and/or explanation to justify the claim.</li> <li>•0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Project Description	5	Was there a regional and Project map(s) depicting the site location, current conditions, Underrepresented Community, and benefitting areas? <i>*A point will be provided for each detail listed and can be depicted on one or multiple maps. However, the information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given for that particular map.</i>	3	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1 - Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Project Description	6	Did the applicant provide a map and narrative of current and historical land use(s) of the site and surrounding area? Did the applicant provide a description of current and historical groundwater and soil contamination issues at the site or in the vicinity of the Project site? <i>*A point for each map and description is possible. The description will be scored according to the defined scoring criteria; however, a score of 0 will be given if a map is not accompanying the description.</i>	3	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1 - Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>

# Prop. 68 PSP Scoring Criteria

Section Name	Q#	TABLE 9-APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA QUESTIONS	Attachment	Possible Points	Scored Points	Scoring Guidance
Project Benefits	7	Does the Project or Component build or help build soil organics that increase water infiltration, storage, and percolation on natural and working lands; provide improvements to soil health and the building of soil organic matter; or explicitly improve water infiltration, retention and storage using agricultural practices that build healthy soil?	3	2	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Project Benefits	8	<p>Will the Project or Component provide at least three quantifiable benefits (refer to Page 10)? Was an explanation of the benefits that are expected to be realized from the Project or Component provided, and how those benefits will be evaluated and quantified? Does one of the Project or Component benefits align with objectives and actions from other planning documents or State agency initiatives (e.g., Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plans, SWRPs, Water Resiliency Portfolio, Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Needs Assessment Report, California's Healthy Soils Initiative, Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Fund Expenditure Plan and Policy, the State Water Board's SAFER Program, and other Integrated Watershed Management planning efforts)? Does one of the Projects or Component benefits address a Proposition 68 preference? Does one address individual GSPs sustainability goals?</p> <p><i>•A minimum of 3 quantifiable benefits are required to obtain a score of 2 points if the benefits are well defined. To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation, with at least one benefit being from Proposition 68 preferences, one addressing the GSPs sustainability goal, and one addressing benefits of multiple planning documents.</i></p>	3	5	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•5- 4 (or more) quantifiable benefits with sufficient backup documentation and they align with other planning documents and State agency initiatives.</li> <li>•4- 3 quantifiable benefits with sufficient backup documentation and they align with other planning documents and State agency initiatives.</li> <li>•3- 3 quantifiable benefits without sufficient backup documentation but they align with other planning documents and State agency initiatives.</li> <li>•2- 2 quantifiable benefits with sufficient backup documentation and the benefits align with other planning documents and State agency initiatives.</li> <li>•1- 2 quantifiable benefits without sufficient backup documentation and do not align with other planning documents and State agency initiatives.</li> <li>•0- less than 2 quantifiable benefits are listed, or the benefits provided do not have Supporting documentation.</li> </ul>
Project Benefits	9	<p>Will the Project or Component positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells (groundwater contamination vulnerability, drawdown, etc.)? Was justification such as domestic well census results, water system maps, service area maps, etc. provided? Does the Project or Component help address the needs of the State Water Board's SAFER Program?</p> <p><i>•A reasonable explanation of how the Project or Component addresses issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells is expected to receive full points .</i></p>	3	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Project Benefits	10	Describe how stakeholders and the broader community will be engaged in the development and implementation of this project . Also, describe how these efforts will improve upon GSA stakeholder and community engagement efforts to date.	3	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>

# Prop. 68 PSP Scoring Criteria

Project Benefits	11	<p>Is the Project or Component located within an Underrepresented Community as defined on Page 77 Will the Project or Component benefit an Underrepresented Community? Were the Underrepresented Community(-ies) that the Project or Component will benefit identified? Did the Work Plan demonstrate how the goals and objective of the Project or Component will provide measurable benefits to the Underrepresented Community(-ies)? Was a description of outreach activities for Underrepresented Communities provided? Were the concerns and priorities identified from Underrepresented Communities or community representatives during stakeholder outreach activities identified? Were letters of support from the Underrepresented Community(-ies) or representatives of Underrepresented Community(-ies) provided?</p> <p><i>Zero points will be awarded if the applicant does not obtain support letters.</i></p>	3	4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•4 - Located within and solely benefits the Underrepresented Community; Underrepresented Community clearly identified; outreach activities included; needs of Underrepresented Community fully addressed; minimum support letters provided.</li> <li>•3 - Located within and solely benefits the Underrepresented Community; Underrepresented Community clearly identified; outreach activities included; minimum support letters provided; needs of Underrepresented Community not fully addressed.</li> <li>•2 - Not located within but solely benefits the Underrepresented Community; Underrepresented Community clearly identified; needs of Underrepresented Community moderately addressed; letters of support provided.</li> <li>•1 - Not located within but a minimum of 50% of the benefits are for an Underrepresented Community; Underrepresented Community clearly identified; needs of Underrepresented Community not addressed; letters of support provided.</li> <li>•0 - not located nor benefits an Underrepresented</li> </ul>
Project Benefits	12	<p>How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the State that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes?</p>	3	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>

# Prop. 68 PSP Scoring Criteria

Section Name	Q#	TABLE 9-APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA QUESTIONS	Attachment	Possible Points	Scored Points	Scoring Guidance
Technical Expertise	13	<p>Does the work plan identify the roles and responsibilities of the key personnel responsible for the completion of the Project or Component? Do the key personnel demonstrate the appropriate experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the Project? Were assurances given that the plans and specifications and construction will be prepared by or under the direction of a licensed professional geologist or professional engineer, as applicable? Did the applicant contact the California Conservation Corp (CCC) to obtain their services for the Project or Component and provide proof from the CCC?</p> <p><i>To obtain full points, you must submit a completed evaluation form from the CCC to demonstrate you reached out to them.</i></p>	3	3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 2 - Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or unclear</li> <li>• 1- Marginally addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Technical Expertise	14	<p>Have the key personnel Identified In Question 13 successfully completed a general obligation bond-funded project through a State grant program? If not, did the applicant provide a clear understanding of the expectations required to successfully complete a bond-funded grant?</p> <p><i>To obtain one point, applicant must answer question, but it is not necessary that the applicant have previously completed project with a State grant program. The question is posed to determine if applicant is awarded a grant that they have an understanding of oversight needed to ensure grant is successful.</i></p>	3	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1- Fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Technical Expertise	15	<p>Does the applicant have the legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property to implement the Project or Component? If not, does the applicant provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?</p> <p><i>The applicant must demonstrate legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property to obtain full points.</i></p>	3	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Technical Expertise	16	<p>Did the applicant provide a description of the legal authority required for the Project or Component, management action, and the basis for that authority within the Agency?</p>	3	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1- Fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Technical Expertise	17	<p>Did the applicant list all permits, easements, right of ways, CEQA documentation, resolutions needed, etc. for the Project or Component and the status of each?</p> <p><i>In order to obtain points, the applicant must describe the steps that are needed and the steps already taken to obtain the required permits; state whether the applicant reached out to the required permitting agencies (e.g. State Water Resources Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Board, US Army Corps of Engineers) to discuss the proposed project or component; describe the feedback received by the required permitting agencies; and provide a statement from the permitting agency regarding if the required permit(s) could be provided within the timeline allowed for the grant.</i></p>	3	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>



# Prop. 68 PSP Scoring Criteria

Section Name	Q#	TABLE 9-APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA QUESTIONS	Attachment	Possible Points	Scored Points	Scoring Guidance
Scope of Work and Deliverables	18	Does the Work Plan include an adequate description of any key decision points, milestones, or deliverables that could impact the Project or Component scope, cost, and schedule?	3	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1- Fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Scope of Work and Deliverables	19	Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed Project or Component? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified? <i>To obtain full points, a full description of each task and/or subtask should be provided. You cannot just list the task and expect to obtain points.</i>	3	3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•3- Fully addressed</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 and Deliverables	20	Does the Work Plan include a discussion of coordination with other entities, agencies, and/or organizations and a detailed description of the approach and practices the Project or Component is proposing to use and technical basis for approach?	3	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>

# Prop. 68 PSP Scoring Criteria

Section Name	Q#	TABLE 9-APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA QUESTIONS	Attachment	Possible Points	Scored Points	Scoring Guidance
Budget and Schedule	21	Does the Budget reflect the priorities and goals identified in the Project or Component description? Is it consistent with the priorities and goals? Is the Budget complete and reasonable to execute the Work Plan on the Schedule provided?	3&4	3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•3- Fully addressed</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 and Schedule	22	Does the Budget leverage fund with other private, Federal, or local fund sources? If not, does the Project or Component qualify for a local cost share waiver?	4	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1- Fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Budget and Schedule	23	Is the Grant Administration costs and the Construction Administration costs 10% and 15%, or less, respectively, of the overall grant funds requested?	4	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1- Fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Budget and Schedule	24	Were quotes, bids, engineer's cost estimates, or cost for a similarly completed project provided to justify the costs listed within the Budget?	4	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Budget and Schedule	25	Is the Budget and Schedule consistent with the Work Plan Scope of Work (e.g., tasks and subtasks outlined in the Scope of Work are also outlined in the same level of detail within the Budget and Schedule)?	3,4,&5	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 - Fully addressed</li> <li>• 1- Less than fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>
Budget and Schedule	26	Given the level of effort described in the Work Plan, does the Schedule seem reasonable?	3&5	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1- Fully addressed</li> <li>• 0 - Not addressed</li> </ul>



# Current Round 2 Timeline

- Round 2 Solicitation Opens Spring 2022 (March)
- Draft Award List out for Review Summer 2022
- Grant Award Final Fall 2022