

# FOX CANYON GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AGENCY



## MEMORANDUM

---

**Date:** May 2, 2022  
**To:** Operations Committee  
**From:** Kim Loeb, Groundwater Manager  
**Subject:** Item D – Water Supply and Infrastructure Projects

### Introduction

Water supply and infrastructure projects can increase the sustainable yield of the basins and provide supplemental water to help bring the basins into sustainable management while minimizing pumping reductions. The Board tasked the Operations Committee to develop recommendations for the criteria, guidelines, and policies for vetting, adding, and prioritizing projects to be considered for funding and implementation.

### Background

Prior to passing of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), the Agency was restricted from participating in water supply and infrastructure projects by its enabling legislation. This restriction was lifted with the adoption of Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) and a finding of necessity by the Board in December 2019.

During development of the GSPs, the Board tasked the Operations Committee with developing a process for selecting projects for inclusion in groundwater modeling of future sustainable yield estimates. The Operations Committee conducted a series of seven meetings in 2018 to develop criteria for project evaluation and a checklist for project proponents to submit. The Operations Committee meetings were well attended by stakeholders and the Board approved the list of projects selected through the Operations Committee's process at the August 29, 2018, meeting.

Further discussion on projects occurred when the Agency received professional facilitation services from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) in 2020. The facilitator held 12 meetings with stakeholders from the Oxnard and Pleasant Valley (OPV) basins through December 2020. An ad hoc projects committee was formed as part of that process which identified and recommended a suite of projects to be modeled by United Water Conservation District (UWCD) with the groundwater model used for the OPV GSPs.

In October 2021, DWR announced a solicitation for funding for Round 1 its Sustainable Groundwater Management (SGM) grant program for critically overdrafted basins with a very short timeframe for submittal of applications. Agency staff compiled potentially eligible projects from the GSPs, the OPV stakeholder process, and solicited additional projects from agencies within the OPV basins. For Round 1, DWR required applicants to conduct a self-evaluation of their projects using DWR's scoring criteria. The OPV stakeholder ad hoc projects committee was reconvened to evaluate and finalize the scoring for the proposed projects. The Board approved adding the recommended projects to the GSP Annual Reports for the OPV Basins and submitting the grant application at the January 26, 2022, meeting.

In anticipation of DWR releasing a solicitation for Round 2 SGM Grant funds in the latter part of 2022, Agency staff solicited submittal of projects that may meet SGM Grant eligibility from the larger water purveyors in the Las Posas Valley (LPV) Basin. These and other projects identified by staff were added to the GSP Annual Report for the LPV Basin for the purpose of grant eligibility at the March 23, 2020, meeting.

### **GSP Project Selection**

As discussed above, projects were selected for inclusion in the GSPs through an Operations Committee process. For inclusion, projects needed to meet the checklist feasibility requirements in GSP Emergency Regulations Subarticle 5, which are summarized in the following list:

- Implementation trigger (if applicable)
- Description of public notice process
- Summary of permitting and regulatory requirements
- Status and implementation timetable
- Expectation and evaluation of benefits
- Explanation of how project will be accomplished (e.g., reliance on other jurisdictions)
- Legal authority
- Estimated cost and description of funding plan
- Uncertainty assessment

The Operations Committee began the process in February 2018. The Committee worked with Agency staff and stakeholders to develop criteria for project evaluation and a checklist for project proponents to submit. The criteria for inclusion in modeling included:

1. Sufficient project information is available for evaluation and modeling;
2. Project increases sustainable yield, or reduces groundwater demand;
3. Project implementation is planned within 20 years;
4. Meets the GSP Emergency Regulations project criteria;
5. There is an agency proponent for the project; and
6. Funding for the project is identified.

A “GSP Project Evaluation Checklist” was developed to be completed by project proponents to provide information for evaluation of submitted projects (attached as Item D-1).

### **DWR Grant Scoring Criteria**

Grant programs have specific evaluation criteria. The DWR SGM Grant Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) included ten “Application Evaluation Criteria” questions (attached as Item D-2). Agency staff prepared a “GSP/ DWR SGMA Grant Project Summary Checklist” for solicitation of projects to be considered in Round 1 (OPV Basins) and Round 2 (LPV Basin) based on the original GSP checklist (attached as Item D-3) and a “Supplemental Project Questionnaire for SGM Grant Application Project Evaluation” (attached as Item D-4). The checklist and questionnaire were submitted by the sponsoring agencies; the specifics of the submitted projects were not independently verified.

### **Goals, Guidelines, and Policies**

Numerous projects have been identified through the processes described above proposed by multiple sponsoring agencies. Significant funding will be required to implement the projects needed to bring the basins into sustainable management while minimizing pumping reductions. Agency staff understands the Board intends to develop a Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) list prioritized on clearly articulated Board-approved principals and criteria.

The goal of this Operations Committee meeting is to begin discussion of development of the recommended criteria, guidelines, and policies for vetting, adding, and prioritizing projects for the CIP list.

**Next Steps**

Committee to discuss the next steps in the process, need for additional meetings, and agenda for the next meeting.

Attachments: Item D-1 – GSP Project Evaluation Checklist  
Item D-2 – DWR SGM PSP Application Evaluation Criteria  
Item D-3 – GSP/ DWR SGMA Grant Project Summary Checklist  
Item D-4 – Supplemental Project Questionnaire for SGM Grant Application Project  
Evaluation

**Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency  
GSP Project Evaluation Checklist**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Project Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Description** \_\_\_\_\_

**Purpose of Project** \_\_\_\_\_  
 Water supply, infrastructure, water quality, etc.

**Implementation Trigger** (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

**Groundwater Basin** \_\_\_\_\_

**Location** \_\_\_\_\_

**Sponsoring Agency** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<b>REVIEW</b>
----------------------------	---------------

<b>Sustainable Yield</b>	
Annual increase in Sustainable Yield (AF/year)	
Sustainability indicators addressed (sub component of increase in SY)	
Project has benefit in impacted area of basin	Yes / No
<b>Technical</b>	
Construction feasibility	Yes / No
Appropriateness of location	Yes / No
Ability to accomplish purpose	Yes / No
Life expectancy of project (for 50-year sustainable management modeling)	
Level of uncertainty	High / Med / Low
<b>Environmental</b>	
CEQA/NEPA type and status (timing)	
Will project likely be permitted? / Consistent with environmental regs	Yes / No
Sensitivity of location	
<b>Political</b>	
Consistent with adopted jurisdictional plans	Yes / No
Consistent with planning agency regulations	Yes / No
Stakeholder support	Yes / No
<b>Permitting</b>	
Permits required	
Status / time required	
Likelihood of project being permitted	High / Med / Low
<b>Construction</b>	
Time table to implement	
<b>Operation and Maintenance</b>	
Description	
<b>Funding</b>	
Total capital cost	
Capital cost per AF/year produced	
Annual cost	
Annual O&M cost per AF	
Funding source(s) - credible funding source	
Likelihood of project being funded	High / Med / Low
Timeline to secure funding	
<b>Project Status</b>	
<b>Estimated Time to Project Completion</b>	

Please note that the review questions outlined in Table 7 may be reworded, combined, or separated. SGM Grant Program staff may make clarifying or editorial changes to the scoring criteria following approval. SGM Grant Program staff may also make changes to Table 7 depending upon language outlined in future appropriations and legislative requirements. **Table 7 is subject to change depending on the final preparations of the review questionnaire.** No substantive changes will be made to the evaluation criteria and scoring scheme.

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"> <li><i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i></li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 – Fully addressed</li> <li>3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or 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 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"> <li><i>To obtain full points, 3 or more quantifiable benefits must be identified and fully supported with backup documentation.</i></li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4- At least three 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 supporting 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	<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"> <li>4 – Fully addressed</li> <li>3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or 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	<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"> <li><i>To obtain full points, a minimum of three comment letters are required from the Underrepresented Communities.</i></li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 – Interested parties included on decision-making committees and fully engaged/involved in all aspects of the Project or 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	<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"> <li><i>The information should be clear and easy to read. If not, the point will not be given.</i></li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. • <i>No points will be given if a map(s) is not provided.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3- Project 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 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>
General	7	How does the proposed Project or Component address the Human Right to Water (AB 685 Section 106.3)? How will the Project or Component support the established policy of the 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"> <li>• 4 – Fully addressed</li> <li>• 3 – Mostly addressed, with minor details not included or 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? • <i>No funds will be awarded without clear justification for the proposed tasks/subtasks.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 – Fully addressed</li> <li>• 2 – Mostly addressed</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. • <i>Local cost share is not required but necessary to obtain full points.</i>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 – Consistent and feasible</li> <li>• 0 – Not consistent and feasible</li> </ul>
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				
<b>Total Points Overall Project:</b>				
<b>TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED:</b>				<b>\$</b>

**Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency**  
**GSP / DWR SGMA Grant Project Summary Checklist**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION			
<b>Project Name</b>			
<b>Description</b> (Include benefits provided, communities served, measurable objectives, minimum thresholds, plan implementation timeline and feasibility )			
<b>Purpose of Project</b> (Water supply, infrastructure, water quality, etc. )			
<b>Groundwater Basin</b>			
<b>Location</b>			
<b>Sponsoring Agency</b>			
EVALUATION CRITERIA			REVIEW
Initial Screening for DWR SGM Grant Round 1 (See Draft PSP for more info )			
Does the project provide additional groundwater recharge using surface water, stormwater, or recycled water?	Yes	No	
Does the project prevent or clean up contamination of groundwater that serves as a source of drinking water?	Yes	No	
Does the project support water supply reliability, water conservation, or water use efficiency and water banking exchange and reclamation?	Yes	No	
Does the project involve geophysical investigations to identify recharge potential, early implementation of existing regional flood management plans that incorporate recharge, or complement efforts to provide for floodplain expansion to benefit groundwater recharge or habitat?	Yes	No	
Regional and project map depicting site location, current conditions, and benefitting areas included?	Yes	No	
Does the project benefit an Underrepresented Community (-ies)?	Yes	No	
Does the project benefit an SDAC(s)?	Yes	No	
Will the project positively impact issues associated with small water systems or private shallow domestic wells?	Yes	No	
Can the project be completed in early 2025 with all completion reporting and final invoicing completed no later than June 2025?	Yes	No	
Is the project scalable? Can the project be completed if only partial funding is received?	Yes	No	
Sustainable Yield			
Annual increase in Sustainable Yield (AF/year)			
<i>Sustainability indicators addressed (sub component of increase in SY)</i>			
Chronic declines in groundwater levels / change in storage	Yes	No	
Seawater intrusion	Yes	No	
Groundwater quality	Yes	No	
Land subsidence	Yes	No	
Surface water / groundwater interaction	Yes	No	
Project has benefit in impacted area of basin	Yes	No	

### Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency

<b>Technical</b>			
Construction feasibility	Yes	No	
Appropriateness of location	Yes	No	
Ability to accomplish purpose	Yes	No	
Life expectancy of project (for 50-year sustainable management modeling)			
Level of uncertainty	High	Med	Low
<b>Environmental</b>			
CEQA/NEPA type and status (timing)			
Will project likely be permitted? / Consistent with environmental regs	Yes	No	
Sensitivity of location	High	Med	Low
<b>Political</b>			
Consistent with adopted jurisdictional plans	Yes	No	
Consistent with planning agency regulations	Yes	No	
Stakeholder support	Yes	No	
<b>Permitting</b>			
Permits required			
Status / time required			
Likelihood of project being permitted	High	Med	Low
<b>Construction</b>			
Time table to implement			
<b>Operation and Maintenance</b>			
Description			
<b>Funding</b>			
Total capital cost			
Capital cost per AF/year produced			
Annual cost			
Annual O&M cost per AF			
Funding source(s) - credible funding source			
Likelihood of project being funded	High	Med	Low
Timeline to secure funding			
<b>Schedule / Timing</b>			
Project Status			
Estimated Time to Project Completion			
<b>PROJECT CONTACT</b>			
Agency / Organization			
Contact Name			
Phone Number			
Email			
Date Submitted			



**Supplemental Project Questionnaire for SGM Grant Application Project Evaluation**

Please complete Table 1 and Table 2, below.

In Table 1, please provide information on tasks you propose completing as part of your project, along with associated start and end dates, and budget estimates by task:

**Table 1**

<b>Proposed Tasks</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
<i>(Provide 1 sentence to 1 paragraph description including any deliverables, for each task below. Examples are provided, but customize (delete, modify, add) as necessary to reflect actual planned tasks)</i>	<i>(Actual or anticipated start date)</i>	<i>(Note: all tasks must be done by March 2025 so grant closeout can occur by June 2025)</i>	<i>(Only costs incurred after December 17, 2021 are eligible as a project cost)</i>
Project Management:			
Permitting and Easements:			
Design and Specifications:			
Environmental Documentation:			
Construction/Implementation:			
Monitoring/Assessment:			
Stakeholder Outreach:			
Other [please specify]:			
Other [please specify]:			

In Table 2, please provide information on your proposed cost share and grant amount requested:

**Table 2**

<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>Cost Share</b>	<b>Grant Requested</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>
<i>(Should match total costs shown in Table 1)</i>	<i>(Please specify proposed cost share amount. Note: There is no cost share requirement, but 1 additional point is awarded for projects providing 5% or more of total project cost)</i>	<i>(Please specify requested grant amount. Should equal Total Cost less Cost Share.)</i>	<i>(Please provide the following information: 1. Minimum grant amount that you would accept for implementing your project under this grant program. 2. Please explain whether your proposed cost share is available/certain.)</i>