



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Kings River Conservation District	<b>County</b>	Fresno
<b>Project Title</b>	Assessing Groundwater Quality Impacts for the McMullin On-Farm Flood Capture and Recharge Project in the Kings Basin	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 250,000.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal assesses nitrate and salt fluxes to groundwater for the McMullin On-Farm Flood Capture and Recharge Project; develops predictive models for groundwater flow; and recommends steps to manage groundwater levels and quality in the lower Kings Subbasin.

**Evaluation Summary:**

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	10
Budget	3
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>37</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The Kings River Conservation District (KRCD) prepared, and on June 14, 2005 adopted, an updated GWMP compliant with the requirements of CWC Section 10753 and which includes the DWR recommended components listed in CDWR Bulletin 118. Further, the District is the approved local monitoring entity for the Kings and Tulare Lake sub-basins under the CASGEM Program. A copy of the GWMP and Resolution 05-15 providing proof of official adoption, are included in the application.
  
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Project Description generally addresses the requirements of the PSP. Table 1 summarizes the project with respect to the goals from the PSP. The application contains a complete, detailed description of the proposed project including reason for the project, the goals and objectives of the project, needed facilities, and area covered. However, although the proposal clearly states the current overdraft situation of the groundwater basin, the relevancy of the proposed project to the goals and objectives of the GWMP is not discussed. A map showing proposed monitoring well locations and the KRCD region would be helpful. The objectives are listed and each one explained. Long term funding is accounted for in the project description (page 10). Collaboration is described not specifically with other local public agencies but in the context of connection with other past and ongoing research and demonstration projects. A discussion of the on-going use of the groundwater monitoring wells and how their continued use will fit into KRCD’s future budgets is included on page 10.
  
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. 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. Tasks are described in detail and the applicable deliverables are listed after each task description. The work plan is consistent with and supports the Budget and Schedule. The tasks fulfill the objectives of the proposal. The Applicant provides sufficient assurance that access to the proposed monitoring well location will be granted. Evaluation of progress and performance of the tasks is explained. A diagram of the proposed monitoring well is included. The planned environmental compliance for the project was only vaguely addressed as an “appropriate level of CEQA review of the proposed sites will be conducted.”



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Budget:** This criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Budget is consistent with and supported by the Work Plan and Schedule. 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. However, costs for well construction are based on verbal quotes with no documentation. The Task numbers are numbered consistently with the Schedule and Work Plan but rolled up to task, with no subtask breakdown. The cost for required reporting is not adequately detailed in the budget, only that "All other administration activities related to project will be provided in-kind and will not be reported in invoice submittals." The budget includes \$15,271 to pay for university tuition for a graduate student (GSA) who will be working on the project, but these costs are not directly related to the project, and thus appear ineligible for grant funding. The budget also includes \$27,519 in salary for the GSA, but it is not clear how much work directly related to the project the GSA will provide, for example, in number of hours for sample collection and laboratory analysis. The budget does not appear to have identified sources of funding other than from the District, which will provide these costs in-kind, but does not attempt to itemize their cost as required to fully understand the project budget.
- **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 timeline appears to be realistic for the work to be performed and flows logically from one task to the next. The description and rationale for the schedule is presented and seems reasonable, with potential delays taken into account. The applicant states that they will be ready to proceed with the project by July 2013 if funding is approved.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. A water and soil sampling QA/QC protocol was included (QAPP attachment 2) and referred to and summarized in the application itself. Procedural assurances, personnel qualifications, and standardized methodologies were described.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides a summary of work successfully completed that was comparable to the proposal and backup information including a DWR Grantee Performance Evaluation documenting that the work was completed.