



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Sacramento Central Groundwater Authority	County	Sacramento
Project Title	Sacramento County Groundwater Authority Basin Management Objective Threshold Development Recharge Mapping Project	Grant Request	\$ 249,780.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 318,780.00

Project Description: The Proposal merges available data to map the spatial distribution of recharge sources to the Central Basin, conducts a scientific field study analyzing which portions of the Basin are recharged from surface water courses, and creates thresholds for groundwater levels to further improve groundwater and recharge management.

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 Applicant attaches a copy of their formally adopted February 2006 GWMP. A copy of the meeting minutes containing the motion and approval to adopt the GWMP on November 8, 2006, is provided.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant supplies a complete description of the proposed project in which they intend to address two specific long-term goals included in their GWMP. The first is to develop thresholds to better manage GW levels. The second is to improve understanding of the basin’s recharge characteristics to develop better land-use and water management decisions. In addition, two specific goals for the proposed project are set, and a map of the location of the area and the needed facilities is offered. No new facilities will be required for the project. The application demonstrates that collaboration will be implemented specifically through a web portal which will offer a means of communication to inform other public agencies and stakeholders about the proposed project and to disseminate reports and other pertinent data. The applicant implements BMO 2 (to develop specific groundwater threshold levels within all areas of the basin) and BMO 4 (protect against any adverse impacts to surface flows of nearby rivers), it thereby addresses the long-term need and merit for the project. Also, through the development of the two BMO’s demonstrates that a quantity of new knowledge will be achieved. Finally, the Applicant explains that future use of the information gained from the project will be incorporated in ongoing biennial reports and that further refinement will be made as needed to update the hydroDMS, and that ongoing updates of the model will be funded by SCGA.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant’s Work Plan (WP) adequately describes how the goals and objectives in the proposal’s Project Description will be broken down to specific tasks. In addition, there will be a task devoted to outreach and two tasks for aspects of grant administration. The tasks are sufficiently consistent with the Budget and Schedule. Additionally, Task 2 and Task 3 will reasonably fulfill the outlined objectives and also directly relate to the GWMP’s Best Management Objectives. The Applicant presents a sound strategy for evaluating progress through Tasks 4 and 5, and the deliverables set through all the tasks. Task 1 is dedicated to disseminate information gained by the proposed project to the public, stakeholders and other interested parties. The Applicant indicates no access to private property is required because access will involve access to existing sampling wells owned by SCGA member agencies. The applicant explains that because the proposed project involves only feasibility and planning studies using existing monitoring wells, the proposed project is considered exempt from CEQA, and furthermore, no permits are required.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The Applicant's Budget provides estimated number of hours and hourly rates for each subtask to be paid for with grant funds, but does not provide the equivalent level of detail for the \$69,000 portion to be paid with cost share, indicating only that the uniform hourly rate (\$125/hour) for agency staff is used to derive the cost-share amounts (and thus from which the number of hours can be derived). The Applicant does not indicate agency class or professional level within the organization to perform each subtask. In addition, the Applicant does not offer sufficient detail in how they estimated the \$5000 direct cost associated to Task 3.2 (Recharge field study). For example, how many analyses at what cost will be conducted?
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant's Schedule includes timelines that are realistic for the work to be performed and agrees with the sequencing in the Work Plan and Schedule, and presents appropriate detailed tasks defining how the Schedule was derived. Start and end dates were within the PSP designated two year time frame. Finally, the applicant indicates that SCGA will be ready to proceed once funding becomes available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant's quality assurance program included well-defined project-specific data quality objectives and appropriate QA/QC measures that are integrated within the Work Plan. For example, subtask 3.4 consists of a verification of the groundwater model which is described in some detail in the Work Plan. Names and personnel qualifications of staff (but not for SCGA staff) who will be assigned to the project are presented.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Upon award of a DWR 07/08 LGA grant, the Applicant indicates that it completed the project on time and within budget. In support of the claims of successful past performance, the Applicant supplies both a positive Performance Evaluation and Closeout Letter.