



August 7, 2025

The Honorable Scott Wiener
Chair, Senate Committee Budget
and Fiscal Review
1020 N Street, Room 502
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Jesse Gabriel
Chair, Assembly Committee on Budget
1021 O Street, Suite 8230
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gabriel Patek, Legislative Analyst
Legislative Analyst's Office
925 L Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Subject: Report to the California Legislature Regarding the State and Local
Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP) by AB 107**

Dear Senator Wiener, Assemblymember Gabriel, and Mr. Patek:

Please find enclosed the "Report to the California Legislature Regarding the State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP) by AB 107," pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 107, Provision 3, Section 2 of Chapter 22 (Gabriel, Budget Act of 2024). This report is to be submitted to the chairpersons of the budget committees of the Assembly and Senate, as well as the Legislative Analyst's Office.

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Legislative and Governmental Affairs, Deputy Director Yvonne Dorantes at (916)364-4525 or Yvonne.Dorantes@CalOES.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

NANCY WARD
Director

Enclosure:

Report to the California Legislature Regarding the State and Local
Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP) by AB 107



3650 SCHRIEVER AVENUE, MATHER, CA 95655
(916) 845-8506 TELEPHONE (916) 845-8511 FAX
www.CalOES.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE
REGARDING THE STATE AND LOCAL CYBERSECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (SLCGP) BY
AB 107

March 1, 2025

Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	3
2. SLCGP Overview.....	3
3. Grant Subrecipient Overview	4
4. Use of Funding	10
5. Summary of the Competitive Application Process and Determination of Awardees	10
6. Conclusion	13

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 107, Provision 3, Section 2 of Chapter 22 (Gabriel, Budget Act of 2024). Specifically, this bill requires the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) to provide a report to the chairpersons of the budget committees of both houses of the Legislature and the Legislative Analyst's Office on the State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP). This report shall include,

- 1) Grant recipients and the amount awarded to each recipient;
- 2) How the funding provided will be used;
- 3) How it was determined which entities would receive an award; and
- 4) How the amount each recipient would receive was determined.

The SLCGP was established by the State and Local Cybersecurity Improvement Act (Subtitle B of Title VI of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58), as specified in Section 665g of Title 6 of the United States Code). This report provides a general overview of the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 and FFY 2023 SLCGP and seeks to demonstrate its value to California state, local, and tribal governments. The information detailed below seeks to satisfy the reporting requirement due to the Legislature no later than March 1, 2025.

2. SLCGP OVERVIEW

A first of its kind grant program, the SLCGP appropriated approximately \$1 billion, nationwide, to be awarded over four years to help entities address cybersecurity risks and threats to information systems. Jointly administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), this program is designed to allocate funding where it is needed most – into the hands of local entities. In FFY 2022, \$183.5 million was made available nationwide under the SLCGP. FFY 2023 saw an increase, with \$374.9 million available nationwide.

At the time of this report, Cal OES, as the state administrative agency (SAA) for the SLCGP, announced \$22.6 million in FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 SLCGP grant funds. These funds were available to state, local, and tribal governments aimed at enhancing the state's resilience against cyber threats. Broadly, this funding is intended to support local governments, including school districts, special districts, and federally recognized tribes, in their efforts to protect their organizations and communities from cybersecurity risks and threats, and to recover from cyber incidents.

3. GRANT SUBRECIPIENT OVERVIEW

On July 31, 2024, in coordination with the California Department of Technology (CDT) and the California Government Operations Agency (GovOps), Cal OES Grants Management released two Competitive Funding Opportunities (CFOs) for the SLCGP; one specific to state agencies, and the other for local and tribal governments. Proposal submissions were accepted until Friday, September 27, 2024, at 11:59 PM PDT.

For a proposal to be eligible to compete for funding, the following conditions must be met:

- Meet the federal definition of “local government” in 6 U.S.C. § 101(13) or “tribal government” defined in 6 U.S.C. § 665(g)(a)(7).
- The government entity must be located in California or be an agency of the state of California.
- Submit proposal packages to Cal OES Grants Management State and Local Projects Unit no later than September 27, 2024, at 11:59 PM PDT.

The SLCGP requires a minimum of 80 percent of the federal award amount be passed to local units of government and a minimum of 25 percent of the federal award be passed to local governments in rural areas, as defined in the federal Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).

At the close of the submission period, Cal OES received 433 applications. This included 425 eligible and eight ineligible proposals. Only one proposal per applicant was eligible to receive funding; if multiple proposals were submitted by the same applicant, only the highest scoring proposal meeting the aforementioned criteria, was considered for funding. The tables below detail grant subrecipients and the amount awarded to each subrecipient. In total, 16 state agencies, 48 self-identified jurisdictions with a population over 50,000, and 49 self-identified jurisdictions with a population under 50,000 will receive SLCGP funding. Please note, in this report, “grant recipients” will be referred to as “subrecipients,” as Cal OES is the “recipient” of the SLCGP given their designation as the SAA.

Grant Recipients and Award Amounts – State Entities			
Applicant	Award	FFY22 Funding	FFY23 Funding
Allen Hancock Community College	\$125,525	\$41,423	\$84,102
Cal Prison Industry Authority: CPIA	\$150,000	\$49,500	\$100,500
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO)	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
California Department of Parks and Recreation (Proposal #1)	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
California Exposition and State Fair: Cal Expo	\$242,288	\$79,955	\$162,333
CSU Fullerton	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
CSU Long Beach	\$249,000	\$82,170	\$166,830
Department of Education	\$150,000	\$49,500	\$100,500
Emergency Medical Services Authority	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco	\$162,178	\$69,151	\$93,027
The Regents of the University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources	\$249,452	\$82,319	\$167,133
UC Riverside	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
UC San Francisco	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
UC Santa Cruz	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
UCLA	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500

Grant Recipients and Award Amounts – Local and Tribal Entities (Population More Than 50,000)			
Applicant	Awarded	FFY22 Funding	FFY23 Funding
Alameda County Office of Education	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Davis	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Glendale	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Los Angeles	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Manteca	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Mission Viejo	\$171,990	\$56,757	\$115,233
City of Pasadena	\$225,000	\$74,250	\$150,750
City of Pittsburg	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Riverside	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Sacramento	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Santa Rosa	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of Watsonville	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Costa Mesa Sanitary District	\$195,894	\$64,645	\$131,249
Cosumnes Community Services District	\$224,910	\$74,220	\$150,690
Foothill-De-Anza Community College District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Jurupa Community Services District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Livermore Area Recreation and Park District	\$234,030	\$77,230	\$156,800
Marin/Sonoma Mosquito and Vector Control District	\$216,000	\$71,280	\$144,720
Midway City Sanitary District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Modesto City Schools	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Monterey One Water	\$200,000	\$93,789	\$106,211
Orange County Mosquito and Vector Control District	\$85,000	\$28,050	\$56,950
Omnitrans	\$155,000	\$51,150	\$103,850
Otay Water District	\$249,964	\$82,488	\$167,476
Rancho California Water District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Reclamation District 900	\$54,572	\$18,009	\$36,563
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools	\$167,500	\$55,275	\$112,225
San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District	\$32,935	\$10,869	\$22,066
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	\$60,000	\$19,800	\$40,200

Grant Recipients and Award Amounts – Local and Tribal Entities (Population More Than 50,000)			
Applicant	Awarded	FFY22 Funding	FFY23 Funding
San Diego County Water Authority	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District	\$184,000	\$60,720	\$123,280
Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Santa Clarita Community College District	\$200,000	\$93,791	\$106,209
Santa Cruz Port District	\$129,120	\$42,610	\$86,510
Sonoma County Water Agency	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
South San Joaquin Irrigation District	\$220,000	\$72,600	\$147,400
Sutter County Superintendent of Schools	\$65,640	\$21,661	\$43,979
Tri-Dam Project 1	\$178,519	\$58,911	\$119,608
United Water Conservation District	\$247,500	\$81,675	\$165,825
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District	\$31,369	\$10,352	\$21,017
Vallecitos Water District	\$90,000	\$29,700	\$60,300
Ventura County Air Pollution Control District	\$47,250	\$15,593	\$31,658
Washington Township Health Care District	\$71,730	\$23,671	\$48,059
Water Replenishment District of Southern California	\$200,000	\$66,000	\$134,000
West Basin Municipal Water District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
West Valley Water District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Westlands Water District	\$247,500	\$81,675	\$165,825
Yorba Linda Water District	\$248,994	\$82,168	\$166,826

Grant Recipients and Award Amounts – Local and Tribal Entities (Populations Less Than 50,000)			
Applicant	Awarded	FFY22 Funding	FFY23 Funding
Alta Loma School District	\$50,000	\$16,500	\$33,500
Brawley Elementary School District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Cabrillo Community College District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Centinela Valley Union High School District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	\$248,000	\$81,840	\$166,160
City of California City	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
City of San Gabriel	\$219,470	\$72,425	\$147,045
El Dorado County Office of Education	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
El Dorado Hills Community Services District	\$201,000	\$66,330	\$134,670
Hidden Valley Lake Community Services District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
La Canada Irrigation District	\$168,013	\$55,444	\$112,569
La Habra Water District	\$216,349	\$71,395	\$144,954
La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
La Puente Valley County Water District	\$213,392	\$70,419	\$142,973
Laguna Beach County Water District	\$191,996	\$63,359	\$128,637
Las Galinas Valley Sanitary District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Liberty Rural County Fire Protection District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Linden-Peters Rural Fire Protection District	\$185,850	\$61,331	\$124,520
Madera County Superintendent of Schols	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Marina Coast Water District	\$215,002	\$70,951	\$144,051
McKinleyville Community Services District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Mission Springs Water District	\$246,100	\$81,213	\$164,887
Mokelumne Rural Fire District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Pauma Valley Community Services District	\$244,000	\$80,520	\$163,480
Phelan Pinon Hills Community Services District	\$128,214	\$42,311	\$85,903
Rainbow Municipal Water District	\$179,791	\$59,331	\$120,460
Ramona Municipal Water District	\$227,213	\$74,980	\$152,223

Grant Recipients and Award Amounts – Local and Tribal Entities (Populations Less Than 50,000)			
Applicant	Awarded	FFY22 Funding	FFY23 Funding
Resource Conservation District of Tehama County	\$248,435	\$81,984	\$166,451
Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District	\$248,316	\$81,944	\$166,372
Running Springs Water District	\$157,744	\$52,056	\$105,688
Sacramento County Office of Education	\$200,000	\$93,789	\$106,211
San Bernardino City Unified School District	\$176,620	\$58,285	\$118,335
Santa Fe Irrigation District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Sewerage Commission – Oroville Region	\$78,807	\$26,006	\$52,801
South Placer Fire District	\$100,000	\$33,000	\$67,000
South Tahoe Public Utility District	\$187,300	\$61,809	\$125,491
Southern Cascades Community Services District	\$67,555	\$22,293	\$45,262
Spalding Community Services District	\$75,278	\$24,842	\$50,436
Woodbridge Rural County Fire Protection District	\$120,015	\$39,605	\$80,410
Tahoe City Public Utility District	\$90,000	\$29,700	\$60,300
Three Valleys Municipal Water District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Trabuco Canyon Water District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Truckee Sanitary District	\$210,000	\$69,300	\$140,700
Vandenberg Village Community Services District	\$30,400	\$10,032	\$20,368
Washington Unified School District	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500
Waterloo-Morada Rural Fire Protection District	\$196,350	\$64,796	\$131,555
West Kern Water District	\$29,400	\$9,702	\$19,698
Yurok Tribe	\$250,000	\$82,500	\$167,500

4. USE OF FUNDING

The purpose of the SLCGP is to support the building or sustainment of cybersecurity enhancement projects. Funds awarded under SLCGP must be used to support elements and goals of the statewide cybersecurity plan, address high-priority cybersecurity gaps, and contribute to the entity's capability to prevent, protect, mitigate against, respond to, or recover from cybersecurity attacks. All projects funded through the SLCGP are required to address at least one or more of the following objectives:

Objective 1 – Governance and Planning: Develop and establish appropriate governance structures, as well as plans, to improve capabilities to respond to cybersecurity incidents and ensure continuity of operations.

Objective 2 – Assessment and Evaluation: Identify areas for improvement in state, local, and tribal cybersecurity posture based on continuous testing, evaluation, and structured assessments.

Objective 3 – Mitigation: Implement security protections proportional with risk (outcomes of Objectives 1 and 2), using the best practices as described in "Element 5" of the required 16 elements of the cybersecurity plans listed in the IIJA, and those listed on page 14 of the NOFO.

Objective 4 – Workforce Development: Ensure organization personnel are appropriately trained in cybersecurity, proportional with their responsibilities as suggested in the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education.

Each proposal approved for funding met one or more the aforementioned conditions. However, to ensure cybersecurity vulnerabilities are not unnecessarily exposed, this report does not include a detailed breakdown of each individual project/proposal.

5. SUMMARY OF THE COMPETITIVE APPLICATION PROCESS AND DETERMINATION OF AWARDEES

As the SAA, Cal OES oversees and administers SLCGP funds according to Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) requirements. However, before any entity, SAAs included, could apply for SLCGP funding, the IIJA required a statewide cybersecurity plan be developed and approved by CISA. Within that statewide cybersecurity plan, a mechanism to determine the allocation of funds must be formed. Cal OES, inclusive of the California Cybersecurity Integration Center (Cal-CSIC), chose to leverage existing resources, creating a subcommittee of the California Cybersecurity Task Force (CCTF) – the Cybersecurity Investment Planning Subcommittee – in order to meet this requirement.

Following the development of the Cybersecurity Investment Planning Subcommittee, Cal OES Grants Management, in coordination with the California Cybersecurity Integration Center (Cal-CSIC), used two competitive funding opportunities to determine funding. In August 2024, during the proposal submission period, Cal OES presented four online webinars for prospective applicants. These webinars provided information to prospective applicants about SLCGP programmatic requirements, reviewed eligibility criteria for each of the CFOs, allowable costs under the grant, walk through the proposal requirements and scored elements, give an overview of the evaluation and funding determination process, provide helpful resources, and answer questions from participants. These webinars were attended by a total of 323 participants.

After determining eligibility, applications were read and scored against all other applications. Simply, funding is awarded to the highest ranked proposals. Evaluation of the proposals is based on six scored criteria, totaling a specified number of possible points. These scoring categories broadly cover alignment, impact, maturity, gaps, budget, milestones, and population, if it is applicable. The "Fiscal Year 2024-25 State and Local Cybersecurity Grant – Local and Tribal Governments (SL) Competitive Funding Opportunity" and "Fiscal Year 2024-25 State and Local Cybersecurity Grant – State Agency (SG) Competitive Funding Opportunity" clearly detail each step of the competitive process.

Cal OES followed the scoring criteria in the FY 2024 SL CFO, which stated that applicants meeting the federal definition of a rural area as described in the NOFO would be ranked against others in this category until the federally mandated rural pass-through threshold is met. After, proposals from applicants in this category would be ranked against all other eligible proposals.

In compliance with the federal NOFO, the CFO published by Cal OES specifically states that "proposal must be aligned to one or more of the SLCGP objectives, and at least one of the 16 cybersecurity plan elements." Moreover, the CFO details that the alignment scoring criteria "is based on how many and to what degree the associated elements are adopted, especially the eight best practices listed in the California State Cybersecurity Plan." Applicants should have considered the SLCGP priorities and requirements referenced in the FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 NOFOs and the SLCGP California State Supplement, during the development of their project proposals.

After determining eligibility, proposals were evaluated by a team of cybersecurity and grants experts. Each question was assigned a point value and the applicant's response to each question was evaluated on the following criteria:

- **Absent:** The response does not address the specific question, or a response was not provided.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The response does not completely address the question. The information presented does not provide a good understanding of the applicant's intent. The response does not adequately support the proposal or the intent of the program.
- **Satisfactory:** The response addresses the question and provides a good understanding of the applicant's intent. The response adequately supports the proposal and intent of the program.
- **Above Average:** The response is above average and provides a clear and detailed understanding of the applicant's intent. The response presents a persuasive argument that supports the proposal and the intent of the program.
- **Excellent:** The response is outstanding, with clear, detailed, and relevant information. The response presents a compelling argument that supports the proposal and the intent of the program.

In addition to evaluating and assigning a point value to the applicant's response to the programmatic narrative questions, the submitted budget table and milestone on the Notice of Interest (NOI) form was evaluated and assigned a point value.

The rater scores were averaged and ranked numerically. Proposals are only evaluated numerically. Applicants that met the definition of a rural area as defined in 49 U.S.C. § 5302 were scored and ranked against proposals from other applicants in this category until the 25 percent federally mandated rural pass-through threshold was met. Subsequently, remaining applications in this category were scored and ranked against all other proposals.

Final funding decisions were made by the Director of Cal OES. The funding decisions are based on the ranked score of the proposal, consideration of priorities or geographical distribution specific to this CFO, and prior negative administration and programmatic performance, if applicable. In turn, the tables above detail each awardee and their amounts to support their ongoing cybersecurity efforts.

Scores were rendered from five evaluation teams. Based on results of the score, the Cal OES Grants Management team proposed to fund the top 113 applicants. In total, 16 state agencies, 48 self-identified jurisdictions with a population over 50,000, and 49 self-identified jurisdictions with a population under 50,000 will receive SLCGP funding.

6. CONCLUSION

With the cyber threat landscape constantly shifting and changing, the SLCGP supports a wide variety of cybersecurity initiatives. From implementing cyber governance, to assessing and evaluating systems and capabilities, mitigating prioritized issues, and overall enhancing California's cybersecurity workforce, this funding will be a crucial asset for California communities throughout the state. California has taken nation-leading steps to increase its cybersecurity resiliency. Through funding programs such as the SLCGP, state and local entities can continue their commitments to keeping communities safe as cyber threats continue to evolve.