



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Napa County	County	Napa
Project Title	Napa County Groundwater/ Surface Water Monitoring Facilities to Track Resource Interrelationships and Sustainability	Grant Request	\$ 248,948.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 295,548.00

Project Description: The Proposal installs up to six shallow, dual-completion groundwater monitoring facilities adjacent the Napa River. The wells are used for groundwater elevation monitoring, water quality sampling, and comparison to relative known surface water data.

Evaluation Summary:

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

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Napa County does not have an adopted GWMP, however it has adopted the Napa County Groundwater Conservation Ordinance with is the County’s GWMP-equivalent program. The program was adopted in 1999, and then amended on August 7, 2007. The application states that the ordinance fulfills the role of an alternative GWMP-equivalent program as described in the LGA application guidelines.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application contains a complete detailed description of the proposed project which includes implementing groundwater and surface water monitoring to characterize the interrelationship between these water resources in Napa County. The proposed project will improve groundwater management and is consistent with the GWMP-equivalent goal of maximizing the long-term beneficial use of the county’s groundwater resource. The applicant intends to collaborate with other local public agencies which include the City of St. Helena, Napa County RCD, Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and Napa County Department of Public Works to manage the groundwater basin. Collaboration with other local public agencies is addressed. The long-term need and value of the project is also described. The applicant clearly demonstrates throughout attachment that new knowledge and improvement in GW management will be the result of this proposed project (page 9 has some specifics). An explanation of ongoing funding is included.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Each work item is described in great detail and the tasks support each of the GWMP’s. The tasks fulfill the objectives of the proposal and are consistent with the schedule and budget. Quarterly Status Reports will be submitted to document progress throughout the project along with several other deliverables such as maps, cross-sections, and other reports. The applicant states that all wells constructed for the proposed project will be sited on public property and preliminary site visits have already been performed. Information gained from this project will be disseminated to Napa County’s GRAC, DWR, and to the public through websites, newsletters, and possibly a countywide groundwater Outreach and Education Plan. The application states that appropriate well construction permits will be obtained through the County before well construction begins. The applicant also states that CEQA coverage is not applicable to the proposed monitoring activities related to this project. A strategy for evaluating progress/performance, along with various deliverables is included throughout this section of application. Private property access consent is not an issue as all wells will be on public property.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed but less than fully supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application includes details and assumptions that are realistic, documented, and cost effective in meeting with the proposal's objectives. The proposed budget is also consistent and supported by the schedule and work plan. The application includes a detailed table showing grant-requested costs, cost share, and total costs for each component of the proposed project as well as identifies other sources of funding and provides supporting documents. However, with respect to the drilling contractor's costs, the initial test hole drilling cost is stated at \$100 per foot while the total cost for this line item infers a \$60 per foot cost (\$36,000 for 600 feet). This calls the validity of the driller's quote into question.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough documentation and logical rationale. The grant application includes a timeline for each work item and appears to be realistic. The schedule also agrees with the work plan and budget. The schedule shows that the proposed project will start and end within the allotted time frame. The application provides explanatory text defining how the schedule was derived and provides assurance that the project will be ready to proceed once funding becomes available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application states that all work will be performed and/or reviewed by Professional Engineers or Geologists. All reports, data, and lab analyses will be reviewed and standard methodologies such as following ASTM and USCS standards will be used. Water samples will be sent to a certified laboratory for analytical water quality testing after following proper handling techniques. Techniques for interpreting and understanding project data may include general statistical comparisons, analysis of spatial statistical relationships, and analytical modeling.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application demonstrates that Napa County is capable of performing high quality work, can manage funds, and meet deadlines for similar type of work. Examples of similar work include a 2008 LGA grant funded project, a restoration project, and installation of groundwater monitoring wells. The applicant submitted an LGA performance evaluation form and a groundwater monitoring well installation report for supporting documentation.