



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	County	San Joaquin
Project Title	Recharge of the Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Using Recycled Water	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 250,000.00

Project Description: The Proposal creates a study to determine the potential for using recycled water to recharge the groundwater basin either through direct or in lieu recharge in the San Joaquin Groundwater Basin.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	3
Schedule	4
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	34

- **GWMP or Program:** Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Management Plan was adopted on September 22, 2004. A copy of the resolution to adopt the plan is included in the proposal.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant provides the complete and detailed description of the project that includes goals of the proposal. The goals of the proposal are consistent with the goals of the GWMP. Applicant demonstrates collaboration with other local public agencies with regard of the management of the affected groundwater basin. The long-term need and merit of the proposed project is discussed. Applicant demonstrated that the achievable new information and improvement in groundwater management will be obtained as a result of this project. The ongoing use of the project is discussed.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant provides a complete and detailed project descriptions that includes background information and detailed tasks description. The tasks are consistent with the budget and schedule and fulfill the objectives of the proposal. The evaluation of the progress and performance of the project is addressed in the Task 1 – Project Management. The dissemination of information gained by the proposed project is discussed in Task 2.3 – Farmer/Public Workshops. Technical memorandums will be submitted to DWR at the completion of each task. No private property access agreements are necessary. CEQA permits and other permits are not necessary in this stage because this is just a feasibility study.
- **Budget:** The criterion is less then fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example: applicant provides budget that seems realistic and is consistent with the work plan and schedule. The estimated fees are provided for the main consultant and two sub consultants. However, the hourly rates and hours to support estimated fees are only provided for the main consultant. The estimated fees for sub consultants are provided as a lump sum and are not explained or supported by the documentation. The table is very hard to follow.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. For example: applicant provides a schedule that seems realistic and is consistent with the work plan and budget. The start and end dates of the project are with the PSP designated time frame. Applicant demonstrates that they will be ready to proceed when the funding becomes available. The project is expected to start in April 2013. However, the schedule does not include reporting deliverables, such as Quarterly Reports and Final Report.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. For example: the Quality Assurance program includes well-defined project specific data quality objectives and appropriate QA/QC measures. The QA/QC measures are incorporated into the work plan. Major elements of the QA/QC plan include aggressive public outreach, experienced professional team, and internal procedures. The professional qualifications of the personnel are discussed. Organization chart is included. However, some of the description was not specific and lacking details. Applicant did not define some of the terms they used, such as an open process, adoptive approach.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less then fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example: applicant described two projects of which one was completed on time and budget and the other one is currently being implemented and is on schedule. However, further detail and explanation was needed in regards to how they performed high quality work, managed funds, and met deadlines. In addition, applicant did not provide any documentation to support their claim, such as grant evaluation form or similar type of documentation.