



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Deer Creek & Tule River Authority	<b>County</b>	Tulare
<b>Project Title</b>	DCTRA Historical Groundwater Assessment and Report	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 164,787.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 164,787.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal completes a historical Groundwater Assessment Analysis and Report of the DCTRA basin to meet two Basin Management Objectives: groundwater basin understanding and information dissemination. The Proposal gathers information for analysis and reporting to better manage groundwater.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	8
Budget	4
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>33</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant Deer Creek and Tule River Authority (DCTRA) formally adopted a GWMP first in March 1995. DCTRA has subsequently revised and adopted updated GWMPs in July 2005 and in May 2012. Applicant provides minutes from the May 2012 adoption meeting.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is not addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The description of the project lacks detail so that the goals of the project and how the project achieves those goals could not be determined. Collaboration between local public agencies with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin is not well defined or demonstrated, only that project results will be posted to a website and presented at the DCTRA Board Meeting. The ongoing use and update of the groundwater database will be funded as part of planned future DCTRA GWMP Annual Reports which have been budgeted for by the DCTRA.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Tasks are consistent with the Budget and the Schedule. The Tasks improve groundwater management in the Basin by supporting the highest priority BMO in the GWMP – Groundwater Basin Understanding. However, there is no description as to why the project won't need environmental permits or to have CEQA compliance to complete the project. As the Project will only compile existing groundwater data, there should be no need to access private property for this phase. However, there may be a need for private property access while establishing the Surveyed Control Network. Although the Work Plan states that existing wells within the DCTRA network will be used for the Network to avoid private property access problems, no other proof such as a letter or agreement between DCTRA and individual land owners is included.
- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. For example, the Budget includes labor categories, hourly rates, and an estimate of hours for each task. However, each task also includes a subtask titled "Reimbursable Costs" that contains a lump sum amount. There is no basis for the lump sum. It is initially assumed to be a dollar amount; however, the lump sum amount is added to the hourly time estimate in the sub-total making it unclear. Also, there is a fixed DCTRA Administration Cost of 5% applied to each task which is not explained or broken down by hours or labor categories. This Administration Cost is on top of the Administration Fees applied to each task, which further questions the purpose of the cost.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The starting date is 04/01/2013, and the ending date is 03/14/2014; both are within the PSP allowed range. The Schedule shows timelines for each of the sub-tasks shown in the Budget. It appears that the applicant will be ready to proceed when the funding becomes available.
  
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides well-defined QA/QC measures that are consistent and included in the work plan. QA/QC measures are broken into two categories, project procedural/management and project technical QA/QC. A list of the personnel qualifications of the primary members of the Project Team is included. There is also a discussion of how the groundwater level and quality data compiled from local agencies will be checked and validated.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant describes how it has administered and worked on a previous grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) to improve wildlife habitat at a groundwater recharge facility along Deer Creek. The proposal has a table of NFWF grant financial reporting data including actual expenses which exceeded NFWF budget allocations. There is no explanation of why the exceedance occurred or whether it was approved by NFWF. Also, the applicant provides very little detail on how the project was completed within a fixed time frame (only “The project finished on time.”). For supporting documentation applicant includes an Itemization of Grant Funds for the Project and the Project Final Accounting Ledger. However, these documents do not provide adequate support of claimed performance. The applicant notes that they received a Certificate of Environmental Achievement from the National Awards Council for Environmental Sustainability for the design work done on the project.