



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Tulare Irrigation District	<b>County</b>	Tulare
<b>Project Title</b>	CASGEM Information Update and Dedicated Monitoring Well Installation Project	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 310,145.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal develops a dedicated monitoring well location report that will determine a density of monitoring wells and identify 5 monitoring wells to be installed. Designs and specification will be developed for each of the wells and utilized to acquire a monitoring well contractor.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	6
Budget	5
Schedule	5
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>34</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** Tulare Irrigation District Resolution No. 12-06 certifies that a Groundwater Level Monitoring Program has been in place since 1949 which includes groundwater level data analysis, historical trend assessment, and groundwater contour mapping. Pursuant to Tulare Irrigation District Resolution No. 10-12, a GWMP was first adopted in 1992. The latest GWMP was adopted in 2010.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Project Description addresses all of the requirements in the PSP. The applicant includes a complete, detailed description of the proposed project, including the goals and objectives of the project, needed facilities, and area covered. The objectives are listed and how each one is needed to meet the project objective of developing a system to economically manage the conjunctive use of surface and groundwater within the District (see Attachment 4, p. 1 – 3). The objectives are generally adequately detailed, the Applicant demonstrates collaboration with other local public agencies with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin, and shows that public participation will be facilitated (Attachment 4, p. 4). The District indicates it will continue to maintain and monitor water levels in the dedicated wells as part of the CASGEM reporting program.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Work Plan is consistent with and supports the Budget and Schedule. The Work Plan includes a near complete and detailed description of the work to be completed and the related products, yet does not identify specific deliverables for each task. The proposed tasks sufficiently relate to improving groundwater management and support the related GWMP. The Work Plan does not include sufficient information for evaluating progress and performance of the project. The Work Plan sufficiently addresses any needs for access to private property, compliance with CEQA, and other regulatory requirements, where applicable. The Work Plan does not include a description of how interested parties, stakeholders, and the general public can obtain information and results of the proposed project.
- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The supporting information for the basis of the monitoring well installation estimate includes rationale for hourly rates and hours spent on tasks, which seem reasonable based on the work plan description and past experience with similar projects. The budget task headings and subheadings correspond with the Work Plan and Schedule. The proposed Budget includes sufficient details to support a cost-effective means to meet project objectives. A narrative is included that summarizes how the Budget estimate was developed. Cost share and grant share amounts are included for each task and are consistent with and supported by the Work Plan and Schedule.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **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 Schedule includes realistic timelines for the work to be performed. The applicant provides appropriate and sufficient detail for each task timeline and defines how the Schedule was derived. The start and end dates of the project are within the designated time frame. The applicant describes when they expect to proceed with the project when grant funding becomes available, and identifies known obstacles or expectations for delays.
  
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The Quality Assurance Program lacks well-defined project-specific data quality objectives and appropriate QA/QC measures for each relevant task. The QA/QC plan is consistent and partially incorporated into the project work plan.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but not fully documented. The Applicant provided a summary of six past projects, only three of which have been completed. For two projects the applicant indicates that they were completed on time and on budget, whereas for some of the others, the environmental review process and scheduling conflicts within the District resulted in delays in completing the projects. However, no corroborating evidence from the grantor agency on satisfactory grant performance was provided.