



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Kings County Water District	<b>County</b>	Kings
<b>Project Title</b>	Kings County Water District Regional Groundwater Monitoring Project	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 279,045.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal installs 5 nested monitoring wells to improve groundwater monitoring capabilities. Water quality sampling will be conducted as part of the project.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	5
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>39</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The Kings County Water District (KCWD) originally prepared a Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) in 1993, revised it in 2001 and again on June 2, 2011 to comply with amended Sections 10753 and 10795 of the California Water Code. The updated GMP also addresses recommended components for a GMP described in Appendix C of DWR Bulletin 118 (2003 Update). The updated Groundwater Management Plan was adopted on June 2, 2011, and is provided in Exhibit 3.2 of the application. The proof of adoption is Resolution 2011-1, provided as Exhibit 3.1 in the application. The GMP covers the entire area within the boundary of KCWD.
- **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, needed facilities, and area covered, also represented on figures 4.3, and 4.4. Project need was adequately described, including Exhibit 4.3, a KCWD groundwater monitoring program report. Collaboration with other local public agencies is also presented in the application (Section 4.3, Public Outreach). The level of geological, hydrological, and technical detail is sufficient to determine that the proposed project is feasible. Sufficient information on how the proposed wells would be incorporated into the GWMP groundwater monitoring funded using maintenance funds was presented to determine that the project would be funded after grant funds are expended. A discussion of the new knowledge to be obtained by this project is included in Section 4.5. The project objectives were listed and explained clearly and in detail including maps and well locations.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The goals and objectives are listed in Section 5.2. The tasks 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 work plan is consistent with and supports the budget and schedule. The tasks fulfill the goals and objectives of the proposal. The applicant has described in sufficient detail what will be done and what the product will be. Public outreach is described in Task 1 for contacting and keeping the public and local landowners apprised of the project and to solicit feedback. Public outreach is also described in Task 5.9 “Information Dissemination.” Well design and construction is described in Tasks 2 and 3 with sufficient detail for a scope of work. Evaluation of project progress and assessment of accomplishments are described in sufficient detail in Tasks 4 and 5. Access to the proposed monitoring well locations is described in Task 5.8. One monitoring well is on land owned by KCWD and the other four on road right-of-way owned by the County, and the Applicant states that previous experience for similar projects indicates the County will grant the needed encroachment permits. No access to private property will be required. CEQA permitting issues were discussed in Section 5.6 and based on the applicant’s project experience, and the applicant expects that the project will qualify for Class 3 “Small New Facilities” exemption and a Class 6 “Information Collection” Exemption. Project deliverables are clearly stated in Section 5.5. A discussion of how information gained from the project will be disseminated is included in Section 5.9.
- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The budget generally includes details and assumptions that are realistic, documented, and cost effective in meeting the proposal’s objectives. 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 workplan. Construction costs are itemized and appear reasonable. Estimates for the cost of well construction are based on construction costs from 2011. The Budget explains that well drilling and construction costs can vary considerably depending site conditions, which cannot be known precisely until drilling commences. Therefore, the estimate of well drilling and construction costs, although not precise, appears to be reasonable.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The schedule categories and subcategories are consistent with the work plan and budget. The applicant presents appropriately detailed tasks defining how the schedule was derived. 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 being accounted for. The proposed start and end dates are within the required PSP time frame. The required Deadline for completion of the project is April 1, 2015, leaving a 7-month buffer to accommodate any unforeseen delays. The applicant states that it will be ready to proceed with the project on April 1, 2013, if funding is awarded.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. A detailed QA/QC plan was provided. Data quality objectives pertaining to data collection, accuracy, precision, sample representativeness, and comparability were described in detail. Standardized methodologies are described. An organization chart and qualifications of personnel involved with the QA/QC plan is provided. A water and soil sampling QA/QC protocol is referenced (Appendix E in Exhibit 3.2 of the application).
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The applicant provides a summary of work successfully completed that was comparable to the proposal and demonstrated that KCWD is capable of performing high quality work on similar projects. However there is no backup documentation, e.g. letters, performance evaluations, or final reports, from these previous projects supporting these summaries.