

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Upper Kings Basin IRWM Authority	Amount Requested	\$ 8,734,000
Proposal Title	Kings Basin Water Authority IRWM Implementation Grant	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 10,437,645

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal includes five projects: (1) Fresno Irrigation District – Southwest Groundwater Banking Project; (2) Laguna Irrigation District Recharge Basin 11; (3) Bakman Water Company Water Supply Reliability and Conservation Project; (4) City of San Joaquin Water Supply Reliability and Conservation Project; and (5) – City of Kerman Residential Water Meter Project.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	10/10
Budget	4/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	24/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	5/5	Program Preferences	10/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			70

PROJECT SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The application does not include maps although references are made in the text and captions included to show where maps were intended. The lack of maps showing project locations and features made it difficult for reviewers to fully understand the feasibility of implementing each project.

BUDGET

The budgets for all the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the categories are not fully supported or lack detail. The applicant provides detailed budget breakdowns, and hourly rates; and indicates that costs are determined from similar projects, providing a canvass of bids for a similar past project. However, supporting documentation that adequately justifies other direct costs, specialist costs, and sub consultant costs, is not provided.

SCHEDULE

The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction of at least one project no later than October 2014. All projects are scheduled to begin construction before October 2014.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The applicant identifies and defines monitoring targets that are measurable and appropriate for the benefits claimed, and identifies measurement tools that will effectively monitor project performance.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits and is fully supported by well described benefits and documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. The applicant provides references to well organized documentation that supports each claim made in the narrative. The technical analyses are appropriate for the claimed project benefits.

BENEFITS AND COSTS ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. The proposal includes five projects. Quantified benefits of two recharge projects (projects 1 and 2) are estimated as the local value of additional surface water supply, plus any lift benefits. The applicant provides information on recent water sales to establish the unit benefit value. The reviewer notes that some of the water captured and recharged may otherwise have recharged groundwater or been usable in absence of the project. Also, some of the relatively high transaction values may not be relevant to the likely users of the recharged water. Non-monetized benefits include water quality, flood damage reduction, groundwater sustainability, and habitat creation. Both projects appear to provide a high level of benefits, assuming that the water used for recharge would otherwise have no value in other uses. Development costs for the two recharge projects appear to be consistent with budget information provided in Attachment 4.

The other three projects (projects 4, 5, and 6) install water meters in DACs and would improve water supply and quality from existing municipal wells. Benefits to water meter installation are claimed as significant water use savings, but it is not clear that volumetric pricing would be implemented in all three of the projects. Without volumetric pricing, the savings from water meters alone cannot be assured. Avoided alternative cost analysis is provided for the wellhead treatment and well rehabilitation components. Non-monetized benefits for the three DAC projects include public health and safety, groundwater sustainability, and water quality. Reviewer has some concern about unit benefit values, and the physical quantities of water saved are not well supported in all cases. However, even with these issues, the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits relative to costs.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that six program preferences and seven statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty and adequate documentation for 11 of the preferences claimed: (1) Include Regional Projects or Programs; (2) Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs or Projects; (3) Address Critical Water Supply or Water Quality Needs of Disadvantaged Communities; (4) Effectively Integrate Water Management with Land Use Planning; (5) Drought Preparedness; (6) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (7) Climate Change Response Actions; (8) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (9) Practice Integrated Flood Management; (10) Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality; and (11) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.