PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	City of Patterson	**County**	Stanislaus
Project Title	Patterson/ Del Puerto Creek Groundwater Recharge and Water Resources Project	**Grant Request**	$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	$ 434,800.00

Project Description The Proposal will consist of a study needed to better understand the local groundwater situation in and around the City of Patterson by analyzing water quality data in the native groundwater basin and in imported surface water. An evaluation will be conducted on what the water quality constraints are for either the user of the native groundwater or the potential recipients of stored groundwater.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	4
QA/QC	2
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	26

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is addressed but not fully documented. The Applicant provides a copy of the GWMP for the Northern Agencies in the Delta-Mendota Canal Service Area as revised November 7, 2011, but does not include a signed copy of Resolution 2012-21 adopting the GWMP as evidence that it has been officially adopted.

- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant proposes to conduct studies to collect and define local groundwater characteristics within a described location, and identifies the goals of the project. The proposal demonstrates collaboration with Del Puerto Water District, Western Stanislaus Irrigation District, Patterson Irrigation District, Stanislaus County and Western Hills Water District, demonstrates a long-term need by meeting the listed objectives of the GWMP, and demonstrates that a definite and achievable amount of new knowledge will be defined through the proposed study. The new knowledge gained will be consistent with the five GWMP objective outlined. Although the study proposal will not include any facilities, it explains that facilities needed to implement the recommendations from the study will be funded primarily from the applicant from impact development fees.

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Work Plan describes in sufficient detail how the study will accomplish the GWMP's objectives through the proposal's nine tasks, is somewhat consistent with the Budget and Schedule, and the proposed tasks reasonably fulfill the objectives outlined in the proposal. However, the applicant does not present a sound strategy for evaluating progress and overall performance at each step of the proposal. The applicant does not devote a task to submitting quarterly progress reports and invoices to DWR. In addition, the applicant indicates (Tasks 1.5 through 1.7) that soil borings will be taken, but no assurances are provided that access to private property on selected properties will be granted. The proposal adequately describes that information gained will be disseminated both through a website and stakeholder meetings, and although the applicant describes a plan for programmatic CEQA compliance once a preferred alternative has been identified, it does not sufficiently address the CEQA needs of the proposed soil borings nor describe any needed permits for the proposed bore holes (Task 1.5).

- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Budget includes assumptions such as an average labor rate of $150 per hour and lists assumed number of hours

per subtask, but does not supply documents or sufficient narrative to conclude how the Budget's assumptions are realistic or cost effective. Other costs listed on the bottom of the Table 3 are not listed in the Work Plan or Schedule. The Applicant provides cost share and grant share broken down by tasks, but the source of the $184,800 match funds is not identified.

- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed but is not fully documented. The Applicant's Schedule includes timelines that are realistic for the work to be performed and mostly agrees with the sequencing in the Budget and Work Plan. The proposal presents appropriate detailed tasks defining how it was derived, and start and end dates were well within the PSP's designated time frame, However, the Applicant does not provide a basis for assurance that the City will be ready to proceed once funding becomes available, especially given that the applicant states that the City is short staffed at this time.

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant states that QA will be part of the project and that a plan will be written for the project, presumably after the grant is awarded. Although the QA/QC elements cited for inclusion seem reasonable as a first step to creating a QA/QC plan, the Applicant only provides a short outline that is non-specific to the data that will be collected for the project and defers the actual writing of a QA/QC plan to a later date. For instance, there should have been much more detail provided to describe procedures for data review and evaluation. Specific QA/QC procedures should have been included for the water quality sampling (Tasks 1.4 and 1.5), and specific QA/QC a procedures and standards for drilling of bore holes and permeability analyses should have been included. Lastly, there was no mention of professional qualifications of persons engaged with the project.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and not thoroughly documented. The Applicant briefly describes several water infrastructure grants the Applicant has obtained, as well as projects undertaken by partner agencies, but the Applicant does not supply any information in the narrative nor provides any back-up documentation that supports that they can successfully manage similar grant projects by meeting deadlines and budgets.