



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation District	County	Butte
Project Title	Identification and Evaluation of Groundwater Recharge in Butte County	Grant Request	\$ 249,472.96
		Total Project Cost	\$ 249,472.96

Project Description: The proposed project creates a county-wide map identifying areas based on their groundwater recharge potential. The purpose of this map is to provide technical assistance to local land management planners to fulfill obligations to protect groundwater recharge areas.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	2
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	28

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported with the submittal of the 2004 GWMP and resolution of county adoption. The Butte County Board of Supervisors adopted the Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation GWMP on September 28th, 2004 with Resolution No. 04-181.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The application includes a detailed description of the proposed project including the goals of the project, needed background information, and location and area affected. The level of detail was sufficient to determine that the proposed project is technically feasible. Although a detailed summary of the Butte County GWMP Project was given it was not made clear how collaboration would take place with other local public agencies with regard to the project, other than a general statement at the end of the section on page 9. It was not made clear in the project description how a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management would be obtained beyond the models already described.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The work plan is consistent with the budget and schedule. The tasks fulfill the objectives of the proposal as stated in the Project Description and work plan. Progress evaluation and deliverables are listed after each task. The applicant does not sufficiently support how the three primary tasks identified in the work plan relate to one another in terms of work-flow, critical path and dependencies. Also, there was no indication or assurance that access to private property would be granted for Task 3. Permitting requirements were not discussed. There were no specifics in the tasks as to how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties.
- **Budget:** . The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. The budget is consistent with the work plan and schedule; however, there is limited explanatory text and supporting information for the basis of the labor costs with no labor categories or descriptions. Additionally, there is inadequate information to substantiate the reasonableness and logic of the lump sum estimates provided. The budget table did not provide information on any other funds or cost share.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The timelines in the schedule did not appear to be realistic for the work to be performed. The schedule does not show where the dependencies are between Tasks 1, 2 and 3. There is significant overlap between Tasks 1.1 and 2.1, even though according to the Work Plan, Task 2.1 builds on Task 1.1. Assumptions used to develop the schedule were not provided. It is not clear why there is a nine month delay in the middle of Task 1. There were no details on Task 3.4 and associated risk to project duration. The schedule categories and subcategories are consistent with the Work Plan and Budget,

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete. Personnel qualifications are not described and procedural assurances are vague (e.g. “the development of the countywide groundwater recharge map will be brought to the Water Commission at key junctures for comment and input”). No standardized methodologies are described for possible water analyses. No discussion is provided for an existing QA/QC plan, field sampling methods, or sample collection protocols.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. The applicant provided a summary of previously completed projects that are comparable to the proposed project. However, no narrative text regarding performance in terms of budget or schedule was included as requested in the PSP. Backup information is included in the form of a Department of Finance Audit Report for two of the projects which showed that the work was successfully completed. However the Report cited some inadequacies regarding tracking of staff hours.