

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District	Amount Requested	\$ 1,433,960
Proposal Title	2013 Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Protection Proposal	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 2,283,960

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal includes two projects with the following benefit types: water supply and water quality. The proposal consists of two projects, (1) Packwood Creek Recharge Project and (2) Well 15 Water Quality Project.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	4/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	12/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	7/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			46

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. An abstract, status, maps, and tabulated overview of both projects are included in the application, but they lack detail. It is unclear where the project write-ups start and which parts are related to the given project in order to determine deliverables. The status of the conceptual design for Project 2 is unclear. It is described as complete on page 37 and not yet complete on page 42. The applicant states that there is synergy and linkage with “the most critical issues that are facing the Kaweah Region (page 11)”, but these issues are not specified in the application. There is no reference to whether the projects are consistent with the basin plan. Also, there are no data management activities described in the work plan.

BUDGET

The budgets for both of the Projects in the proposal have detailed cost information and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the budget categories are not fully supported or lack detail. The applicant indicates that Project 1 is scalable if partial funding is available. The hourly rate is based on total hours on some tasks, but there is no backup documentation or description for the actual source. The presentation of the total

costs on pages 100 and 101 is inconsistent. Total hours per classification are provided for some costs, while no hour breakdown is provided for other costs. The average hourly cost method of determining how many project hours are required is inadequate for estimating project total hours required.

SCHEDULE

The schedule corresponds with the tasks in the work plan and budget, is reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction for both projects before October 2014. The proposed timeline is appropriate and reasonable for the tasks outline in the work plan. The schedule corresponds with the tasks in the work plan and is easy to understand. The required components of the schedule attachment are addressed.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The section states that monitoring will be consistent with existing monitoring formats and policies in the Kaweah Delta WCD GWMP (see page 116) but these formats are not summarized or described and it is unclear how some measurement tools effectively track performance. For example, on page 117 output indicators include amount of water recharged and depths to groundwater and outcome indicators include hydrographs showing less decline, with no direct linkage described (e.g. is less decline due to less water use, conjunctive use, or recharge) and no metrics or details in the measurement tools and methods portion. Also, some information on the groundwater monitoring program conducted by the City of Visalia is not included, specifically the location of wells in relation to the structures anticipated.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects and physical benefits are not well described. HEC-RAS, design documents, and seepage analysis documents are included. However, some linkages to technical justification criteria are not clear. For instance, it is stated that 350 cubic feet per second will be the maximum design flow rate (page 97), but it is not explained how this amount was determined. The “improved and dependable water quality” benefit is claimed (page 19) but is only supported by volume (acre-feet), not any water quality parameters. It is not clear how seepage estimates by the South Australian government are applicable to this proposal. Table item number 8 “Site Integration” has a quantity of 6, but no units/items associated to provide a frame of reference.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Benefits of both projects are monetized using an avoided alternative cost approach. Project 1 is compared to costs of an alternative constructed recharge facility with equal capacity, and that has a Present Value cost of \$3.1 million. However, the applicant does not establish that the alternative recharge facility would be required in absence of the proposed project. Non-monetized benefits of the recharge project are described as including beneficial use of floodwater, drought preparedness, and preservation of local groundwater resource.

An avoided alternative cost approach is appropriate for Project 2 because California Department of Public Health has determined that a water quality violation must be addressed. Applicant presents a statement of cost-effectiveness showing a least-cost alternative to the proposed project that is higher cost. The benefits of Project 1 are not appropriately established and quantified. Reviewer cannot verify or accept that benefits would exceed the project’s unit cost of over \$350 per acre-foot. The smaller well rehabilitation project provides good justification for its claim of cost-effectiveness.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that two program preferences and five statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. The applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for the seven Preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; (3) Drought Preparedness; (4) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (5) Climate Change Response Actions; (6) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; and (7) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.