



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Kern County Water Agency Improvement District No. 4	County	Kern (portion of)
		Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
Project Title	Improvement District No. 4 Groundwater Monitoring Well Installations	Total Project Cost	\$ 275,000.00

Project Description: The Kern County Water Agency Improvement District No. 4 proposal constructs monitoring wells in an area adjacent to groundwater banking projects, oil refining interests and the Kern River. The data collected will be incorporated into the District’s semiannual monitoring program and CASGEM monitoring plan.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	0
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	2
Work Plan	4
Budget	3
Schedule	2
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	18

- **GWMP or Program:** The application does not contain any information that shows that a GWMP has been adopted for the basin. The applicant submitted other documents in Attachments 3.2 (Report of Water Conditions), 3.5 (Water Quality Report 2011), but these do not constitute a functional equivalent to a GWMP. In addition, there is no indication that they plans to prepare and adopt a GWMP in the future.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant describes their intention to construct three monitoring wells to track changes in contamination plumes near Brimhall and Coffee Roads, but is not clear what the goals of the proposal are and what facilities will be needed to implement the proposal. The proposal demonstrates collaboration with Rosedale in regards to their Joint Use Groundwater Recovery Program but does not attempt to explain collaboration that is specific to the proposed project. The Applicant does not attempt to explain a long-term need or merit for the proposed project, and does not describe how a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management will be obtained. In addition, because no GWMP or equivalent has been adopted, the Applicant is unable to provide consistency between new knowledge and the goals and objectives within such a document. Finally, the proposal does not attempt to explain how ongoing use and monitoring of the wells will be funded once grant funding is expended.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant’s Work Plan does not sufficiently describe what the project is or what the product will be. There is inadequate discussion of what the current grant application is requesting for in terms of how it fits in with management for the groundwater basin. There is no mention of how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties. The Applicant does not state how the project supports the goals and objectives of the GWMP or a functional equivalent. The WP is not consistent with the Budget or Schedule, and does not itemize by subtask the subtasks contained in the Budget or Schedule. In fact the WP, Budget and Schedule use non-comparable formats of task/subtask structures. The Applicant does not describe in sufficient detail the water quality sampling frequency and analyses that will be conducted, why it is necessary, and what is hoped to be learned from the effort. The applicant describes that the work site is owned by the Agency and thus private property access is not of issue, and the applicant supplies a copy of the grant deed for the property. The applicant sufficiently explains a plan to comply with CEQA, and provides a Subtask to obtain permits from the local Environmental Health Department and an encroachment permit necessary to drill the three wells.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Budget does not include sufficient details and assumptions that are realistic, documented, and cost effective in meeting the proposal's objectives. For example, the Budget narrative states that cost estimates for the Budget are based on "work completed to date, construction costs estimates from contractors, equipment suppliers and estimated hourly effort for project management, oversight of well construction, data analysis, report preparation, and quality assurance and quality control," but the information provided in the subcontractor quotes do not clearly support the specific cost line items indicated in the Budget Table (Attachment 6.2). The subcontractor quotes are for various depth and construction alternatives, so it is impossible ascertain the reasonableness of the costs shown in the Budget Table. In addition, actual labor time and hourly rates are not discerned in the narrative or in the Budget Table. The totals shown in the subcontractor quotes (\$288,572.50 for three direct rotary monitoring wells (as stated in the Work Plan)) plus \$71,599 for professional services, are inconsistent with those shown in the Budget Table, which shows a total cost of \$275,000. The Budget is not consistent with the Work Plan or Schedule, for instance, no costs are shown for the services of a professional geologist as described in the Work Plan.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Schedule includes timelines that seem realistic for the work to be performed but it does not agree with the Work Plan or Budget. The applicant did not present appropriate detailed tasks defining how the Schedule was derived. The tasks are shown to take longer than two years to complete. Finally, the inclusion of several preliminary tasks not included in the Work Plan or Budget implies that the applicant will not be ready to proceed once grant funding becomes available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is less than addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Applicant does a good job of describing the QA/QC for the well construction activities but fails to supply procedural assurances relating Task 3 or Task 4. For example, a QA/AC plan for water quality monitoring, or any discussion of review of data and the quality of reports submitted to DWR is missing. Submitted water quality assurance manuals as attachments are nonspecific to the project.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed, but not fully documented. The Applicant states that they have established experience with grant funding and that they have managed a treated water capacity expansion project and performed the work on time and within budget. However, they provide no back-up documentation to substantiate this.