

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GRANTEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
 DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
 CONJUNCTIVE WATER MANAGEMENT BRANCH
 Rev5/04

		AGREEMENT NUMBER 4600004078	AMENDMENT NUMBERS
DEPARTMENT Water Resources	GRANTEE'S NAME AND ADDRESS Kings River Conservation District 4886 E. Jensen Avenue Fresno, CA 93725		
DIVISION Planning and Local Assistance			
EVALUATOR'S NAME Tom Lutterman			
PROJECT TITLE North Fork Group Potential Recharge Site Exploration	AGREEMENT EXPIRATION DATE May 15, 2007		
1. TOTAL AGREEMENT AMOUNT INCLUDING AMENDMENTS \$249,410	GRANTEE DEPARTMENT (if different than grantee's name)		
2. DESCRIBE THE WORK THAT WAS IN THE PROJECT WORK PLAN.			

The project was to implement actions defined in the adopted groundwater management plan, including monitoring existing recharge facilities; conducting feasibility studies and field investigations to design and locate new facilities; creating an inventory of the available distribution and conveyance facilities; and, improving regional monitoring.

The study proposed to provide new knowledge and data for purposes of engineering additional recharge basins and other potential conjunctive use operations.

3. WAS THE WORK PERFORMED?

NO - If no, explain why YES - if yes, explain how the work met the specific problem, administrative requirement, or program need for the project.

- All proposed work was completed within the terms of grant agreement with some modifications to the scope: including about 45 borings (including hollow stem auger and CPT) as opposed to 14 (including deep mud rotary soil borings, CPTs, and monitoring wells) in the original scope of work.
- All work was completed within the term of the agreement.
- Project budget was exceeded due to the expanded scope of work. Grantee assumed all cost overruns.
- Project objectives and work scope were met. The assessment of sixteen (16) prospective groundwater recharge basins was completed.

4. DID THE GRANTEE FULFILL ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE AGREEMENT?

NO - If no, explain why YES - if yes, explain how the work met the specific problem, administrative requirement, or program need for the project.

- Final Reporting requirement was met.
- Quarterly reporting requirements were met.
- Invoicing requirements were met.
- KRCD staff and the North Fork Group members associated with the contract were cooperative throughout the project life.

As a consequence of this study, KRCD has a greater understanding of the local geology and suitability of specific sites for groundwater recharge.

5. EMPLOYEE TO BE CONTACTED REGARDING GRANTEE PERFORMANCE Thomas Lutterman	6. TITLE Engineering Geologist	7. TELEPHONE NUMBER (916) 651-9263
8. EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE 	9. TITLE Engineering Geologist	10. DATE 8/16/2007
		11. TELEPHONE NUMBER (916) 651-9263

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GRANTEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
 DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
 CONJUNCTIVE WATER MANAGEMENT BRANCH
 Rev5/04

		AGREEMENT NUMBER 4600003161	AMENDMENT NUMBERS 0
DEPARTMENT Water Resources	GRANTEE'S NAME AND ADDRESS Kings River Conservation District		
DIVISION Local Planning and Assistance	4886 E. Jensen Avenue		
EVALUATOR'S NAME Ilene Wellman-Barbree	Fresno, CA 93725		
PROJECT TITLE Kings Basin Coordinated Groundwater Management Plan	AGREEMENT EXPIRATION DATE May 1, 2005		
1. TOTAL AGREEMENT AMOUNT INCLUDING AMENDMENTS \$220,000	GRANTEE DEPARTMENT (if different than grantee's name)		

2. DESCRIBE THE WORK THAT WAS IN THE PROJECT WORK PLAN.

The proposal was to develop a coordinated groundwater management plan. One of the main goals of groundwater management was a balanced groundwater supply. In order to achieve this goal, the overall plan will enhance the existing AB3030 groundwater management plans. Data from historical monitoring will be gathered, current monitoring will be assessed, and basin management objectives will be established.

3. WAS THE WORK PERFORMED?

NO - If no, explain why

YES - if yes, explain how the work met the specific problem, administrative requirement, or program need for the project.

Kings River Conservation District formed a Basin Advisory Panel to steer the development of the updated groundwater management plan. The boundaries of the plan were expanded beyond the original defined groundwater management areas A, B and C to include neighboring districts and water related entities. The groundwater management plan become a uniform plan with combined regional goal as well as defined local goal for each of the water management areas. The updated plan was drafted to be in compliance with Water Code §10750 et seq.

4. DID THE GRANTEE FULFILL ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE AGREEMENT?

NO - If no, explain why

YES - if yes, explain how the work met the specific problem, administrative requirement, or program need for the project.

The groundwater management plan was adopted by Kings River Conservation District Board on June 14, 2005 after a public hearing.

5. EMPLOYEE TO BE CONTACTED REGARDING GRANTEE PERFORMANCE Ilene Wellman-Barbree	6. TITLE Water Resource Engineer	7. TELEPHONE NUMBER 916-657-5053
8. EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE <i>Ilene Wellman-Barbree</i>	9. TITLE	10. DATE 7/15/05
		11. TELEPHONE NUMBER