



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	City of Palmdale	<b>County</b>	Los Angeles
<b>Project Title</b>	Amargosa Creek Recharge Project – Groundwater Monitoring and Modeling	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 366,082.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal consists of installing and developing a monitoring well, creating and implementing a groundwater management plan, and developing a groundwater model for the Antelope Valley Basin.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	6
Budget	4
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>33</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The City of Palmdale is part of the Antelope Valley Regional Water Management Group and has adopted the GWMP component of the AV IRWMP. A signed resolution, Resolution CC 2008-007, was provided that shows the City adopted the GWMP on January 16, 2008.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant is proposing three elements in this proposal – installation of a monitoring well, development and implementation of a groundwater monitoring plan, and development of a groundwater model. The data to be collected from the monitoring well will be used to gather data on the movement of water across the fault system in the upper 100 to 150 feet of the aquifer. A description of the goals, location, and project is provided. The applicant plans to work with the USGS to continue the monitoring of the well and implementation of the program after the funds are expended. The City has forecasted the project in its Capital Improvement Plan for continued implementation of the program. The applicant demonstrates an achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management that is consistent with the goals of the GWMP. The applicant will collaborate with USGS, AVIRWM group, and AVSWCA in this project. Progress will be shared at AVIRWM meetings. The proposed monitoring well is close to existing multiple-completion monitoring wells constructed in earlier phases of this project. It is approximately ¼ mile to the nearest existing monitoring well, Site 3. The application does not clearly explain what new information the proposed well will provide that the existing monitoring network cannot. Furthermore, the following discrepancies in the project description are noted: AVSWCA is not a designated Monitoring Entity (ME) as stated in the proposal (although it has submitted an ME notification); monitoring sites on Figure 3 are mislabeled and missing from the legend, and Figure 3 legend text “collected as part of this study” appears to refer to a previous phase.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The work plan is consistent with the budget and schedule. The well will be located on City property so access is not an issue. Permits will be obtained from the County of Los Angeles and County Department of Public Health for the drilling and construction of the proposed well. Applicant discusses the EIR impacts resulting from the project. However, there is a statement under Well Construction, a section that follows the Work Plan tasks, that states “The existing well at Site 3 will be redeveloped as part of the well construction. Monitoring transducers will be installed at three sites for the collection of data.” These activities are not mentioned as part of the project in the project description and are not included in any of the Work Plan tasks. There is no explanation provided about why Site 3 needs to be redeveloped or why the existing monitoring sites need new equipment. The application is inconsistent in describing the fault as “inferred,” “interpreted,” or “documented.” For example, the application says the fault is “documented” in Task 4 and then “inferred” at the bottom paragraph of Task 4.
- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The budget table is consistent with the work plan and schedule. The funding match and grant funded portions are presented in three tables. The estimated costs for Tasks 4, 5, and 6 are provided by USGS in a draft letter that included a narrative explaining all assumptions. The budget is presented by task, with cost share broken out. The total project cost is \$366,082 and non-state funding is \$116,082. The City will provide \$31,082 and USGS will provide \$85,000 of the non-state funding. However, the draft letter from USGS states that USGS will contribute \$72,200 for Tasks 4, 5, and 6. This is different than the amount shown in the tables, which shows USGS contributing \$85,000.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The schedule presented looks reasonable and is consistent with the budget and work plan. The project is ready to proceed and expected to start on April 1, 2013. The start and end dates fall within the PSP designated time frame of 2 years. A discussion is presented regarding time needed to obtain permits.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. A copy of the QA/QC manual from the USGS is provided. The manual provides guidance on measuring groundwater levels. The applicant states that a copy of the chapters from the National Field Manual for the collection of Water-Quality Data was included in the proposal, but it was not found in either the application nor uploaded in BMS. The resumes of USGS staff were included and demonstrate their expertise for performing and overseeing the work. Of the three USGS staff presented, one is a licensed engineer and the other two are hydrologists.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed but not thoroughly documented. The applicant received one Prop 1E grant from DWR which is in the process of being executed. The applicant has been working with the USGS since 2008 through various phases of this recharge project. A copy of the abstract detailing the project is provided, but there is no documentation to demonstrate past performance with the USGS through the other phases.