PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Fresno Irrigation District	**County**	Fresno
Project Title	Groundwater Recharge Measurement Improvement Project	**Grant Request**	$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	$ 250,000.00

Project Description: The project estimates the infiltration rate and provides more accurate measurement of the volume of water recharge at District owned basins.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	4
Schedule	4
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	37

- **GWMP or Program:** The Fresno Irrigation District (FID) Board of Directors adopted the Fresno Area Regional GWMP on January 25, 2006 with Resolution No. 2006-03. A copy of the resolution has been included in Section 3 of the application as Exhibit 3.1, and can also be found in Appendix B of the Ground Water Management Plan, also included with Section 3. FID has a groundwater management component in the Upper Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP), which encompasses the FID. The cover page and table of contents of the Upper Kings River Basin IRWMP is included in section 3 of the application as Exhibit 3.3.

- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The application contains a complete, detailed description of the proposed project including the goals of the project (Section 4.3), location of each basin anticipated to be improved (Figure 5), and a prioritized listing of the basins which would receive measurement capabilities (Table 1). The level of detail is sufficient to determine that the proposed project is technically feasible. The goals are clearly spelled out on p. 4-14. Project need was adequately described in Section 4.6. The Project is specifically mentioned in the Applicant's GWMP and is consistent with and supports the goals and objectives of the GWMP. There is an extensive list of outreach efforts for informing groundwater users, stakeholders, and the general public on pp. 4-23 to 4-25. Finally, there is a reasonable explanation of how ongoing use of the products derived from the proposed project will be funded after grant funds are expended (p. 4-28).

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The tasks and subtasks in the work plan are detailed enough to serve as the scope of work for the agreement and show that the project is technically feasible. The tasks fulfill the objectives of the proposal as stated in Section 5.2. The Work Plan has a list of items to be performed under each task (pp. 5-1 to 5-5) which is consistent with the budget and schedule. Project deliverables are given after each of the tasks. The scope of the proposal, project purpose, goals and objectives, are listed and Figure 5 in the Project Description section is referred in the Work Plan for project location information. There is a good discussion of how the Work Plan will comply with CEQA and environmental permits that may be required on p. 5-8. Private access to the proposed monitoring well locations is not required as project locations are on FID facilities. On pp. 5-6 to 5-7, the Work Plan presents a sound strategy for evaluating progress for each of the three main tasks. The applicant discusses how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties, in Sub-Task 3.3 and on p. 5-6.

- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. There is explanatory text and supporting information for the basis of the estimate including rationale for hourly rates and hours spent on tasks. The Task numbers are numbered consistently compared with the schedule and the work plan. Construction costs are itemized and appear reasonable. However, not included in the cost estimate are administrative costs such as: meetings with consulting engineers, the FID Board, the TAC, and other water agencies; and review of project submittals, even though they are described in the Work Plan. .

- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The schedule categories and subcategories are consistent with the work plan and budget. The timeline from one task to the next flows logically. The description and rationale for the schedule is presented and seems reasonable, with potential delays taken into account. However, the Schedule has a single "Construction of Improvements" task but no detailed sub-tasks. Thus it is not clear whether each recharge basin be upgraded sequentially from 10/2013 to 02/2014 or upgraded simultaneously.

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. Procedural assurances and personnel qualifications are described. Although ASTM and AWWA standards will be used for the materials, no standardized methodologies were described as part of a QA/QC plan for other elements of the project, e.g., details of the groundwater measurement readings and reporting requirements, etc.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides a summary of work successfully completed that is comparable to the proposal. Backup information is included in the form of a DWR Progress Report for an active LGA project which showed that much of the work was successfully completed.