INTERVIEW PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Proposition 50 Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Supplemental Funding Grant Program, July 2010

Applicant	Upper Kings Basin Integrated Water Management Authority	**Amount Requested**	$3,568,500
Proposal Title	Application for Proposition 50 IRWM Supplemental Funding	**Total Proposal Cost**	$4,465,000
		Recommended Award	$2,099,868

Proposal Summary

The proposal contains two projects. Project 1-Fresno Irrigation District proposes to install a well to enhance its recovery capability at the Jameson Pond percolation site. The well would increase the net recovery capacity from 3,000 acre-feet/year (AFY) to 4,500 AFY. Project 2-The City of Fresno proposes to install 5,000 residential water meters. The City of Fresno is mandated to install, by January 2013, water meters on its 110,000 connections.

Presentation/Interview Score (based on criteria and standard presented in Table 2 of PSP)

Element	1 (a) - Concept Project Proposal Overview	1 (b) - Benefits & Technical Feasibility	1 (c) - Need & Consequences	2 - Question & Answers	Total (Max possible score=50)
Score	4	12	12	15	43

Evaluation Summary

Element 1 (a): Concept Project Proposal Overview

The applicant provided a good overview of the projects and their connection to the region's IRWM planning process. Specifically, the work plan, schedule, and budget were clearly conveyed to the reviewers. However, some of the graphics presented were unclear.

Element 1 (b): Benefit and Technical Feasibility

The benefits of the projects were clearly described. Project 1 benefits include: increased water supply of 1,500 AFY; improved water supply reliability; reliable dry-year water supply to prevent loss of permanent crops; and reduced competition for water among FID water users, especially during droughts. In addition, the proposed operation of Project 1 leaves, on an annual basis, 10% of recharged water within the aquifer to mitigate critical overdraft conditions within the groundwater basin. However, the water supply benefit to the City of Clovis could have been better explained. Project 2 benefits were well explained and fairly large in magnitude as 10% of current water usage would be reduced. The project would support local and regional water supply; improve water reliability through conservation; and improve the water management system through measurement automation. The applicant clearly conveyed the technical feasibility of both projects has been met during the planning stage of project development. Furthermore, as Project 1 is an expansion of existing facilities, the applicants conveyed that they have a solid understanding of the hydrogeology and design elements necessary to complete a successful project.

Element 1 (c): Need and Consequences

The need for both projects were deemed high in urgency as the San Joaquin River Settlement, fishery requirements, and sustaining agriculture within the region has required the applicant to continue to broaden their water supply portfolio with additional conjunctive management and conservation type projects. However, the consequences of Project 2 not receiving funds was not clearly explained.

Element 2: Question and Answers

The applicant’s answers to the standard questions were concise, clear, and adequate. The applicant’s answers affirmed they met the essence of IRWM when developing, vetting, and ultimately proposing multi-benefit projects.