



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Placer County Water Agency	County	Placer
Project Title	Martis Valley Monitoring Well Installation Program	Grant Request	\$ 249,922.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 274,922.0

Project Description: This project proposes to select locations, install and monitor three new depth-discreet monitoring wells in the Martis Valley Groundwater basin. The new wells proposed by this project meet the requirements that have been established for inclusion in the Martis Valley Groundwater Monitoring Program and supplement data being compiled for the updated Martis Valley GWMP.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	5
Schedule	3
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	36

- **GWMP or Program:** Applicant describes Resolution No. 11-13, which declares PCWA’s intent “to prepare adopt, and implement an updated Martis Valley GWMP” (resolution included). Resolution includes statement: “Whereas, the Agency adopted its current Martis Valley Groundwater Management Plan on October 6, 1998,” which is evidence of GWMP adoption. Updating of the Plan is underway (scheduled to be adopted by March 2013) and is not the project being proposed by the grant application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, and provides relevant support as necessary, including: a complete, detailed description of the proposed project, including project goals, the needed facilities, and their location. Additionally, applicant clearly describes the quality and usefulness of the information that will be obtained, using technically feasible methods; and explains how ongoing use of the products derived from the proposed project (installation of three new monitoring wells to monitor shallow groundwater) will be the responsibility of the three agencies’ involved with the project. Additionally, applicant explains their collaboration efforts with other local public agencies within the groundwater basin (including the Stakeholder Working Group (SWG), Truckee-Donner Pubic Utilities District (TDPUD), and Northstar Community Services District (NCSD)); and how the project supports the goals and objectives of the GWMP (including “Manage groundwater to maintain established beneficial groundwater uses.”
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, including a detailed discussion of work being proposed, what the product will be, a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project, and how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the various stakeholders and other interested parties. The Work Plan is consistent with the budget and schedule, and includes tasks that both reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal and relate to improving GW management. Details for CEQA compliance and the acquisition of required permits were described. Applicant anticipates that the three wells will be located on public lands.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, including: providing a detailed budget table (that includes labor categories, hourly rates, labor time estimates, and subcontractor quotes) that is consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule; and provides explanatory text detailing how the budget estimate was developed (which includes: using experience on similar projects, and by receiving verbal Requests for Bids from drilling, equipment rental, laboratory, and land surveyor subcontractors).

- **Schedule:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Applicant does not describe a readiness to proceed when funding becomes available, as required by PSP (although a project start date that is within that specified by the PSP is indicated); 2) Applicant does not “Explain how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule...” as required by PSP. Applicant does provide a timeline that appears realistic for the work to be performed, is consistent with the work plan and budget, and is within the designated time frame specified in the PSP.

- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant demonstrates that appropriate and well-defined QA/QC measures will be implemented for each task, including: Contracting with professionals who are appropriately licensed and have expertise in the work being proposed; applying proper review and oversight of reporting and documentation activities; and using standardized methodologies for construction and monitoring activities.

- **Past Performance:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Although applicant provides several examples of various projects, they do not consistently discuss whether or not the projects (let alone examples of specific tasks) identified were “completed within the time allotted and within the budget provided,” as required by the PSP; and 2) Documentation was not provided to support the past performance claims described (including the successful completion of projects).