



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	City of Rio Vista	County	Solano
Project Title	City of Rio Vista – Groundwater Monitoring and Study	Grant Request	\$ 190,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 190,000.00

Project Description: The Proposal installs monitoring devices to measure water quality and subsidence of the local aquifer, to collect and evaluate data from these devices and to improve groundwater management for their Urban Water Management Plan update.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	0
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	2
Work Plan	2
Budget	1
Schedule	1
QA/QC	1
Past Performance	0
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	7

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion for the status of the groundwater management plan (GWMP) was not met. Although the grantee states that an adopted GWMP exists, no proof of adoption is provided and the draft document that is provided is not a GWMP. There is no clear indication that a GWMP is being developed.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion for the project description is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete. The project description lacks goals, description of the affected area, and identification of collaboration with other public agencies. The long-term need and merit of the project is also marginally addressed. There is no discussion of the ongoing use of the GWMP once it is complete. The application also fails to address how ongoing funding, if needed, would be obtained once grant funding is expended.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion for the work plan is minimally addressed and not documented. The tasks are not sufficiently detailed nor connected to the GWMP and IRWMP. The application describes what work will be performed to reach the goal of updating their Urban Water Master Plan. No strategy for the progress and performance of the GWMP is described. There is no explanation of how the information gained will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties. The work plan also fails to provide deliverables for assessing progress and accomplishments such as quarterly and final reports.
- **Budget:** The criterion for the budget is minimally addressed with no documentation. There is no budget narrative included to explain the budget and no assumptions are presented. The budget is not supported by the work plan as both are extremely vague regarding the work that is to be included in each task. There is no supporting documentation provided to explain how the costs have been derived. The grand total doesn't add up correctly; therefore, their grant request exceeds their project cost.
- **Schedule:** The criterion for the schedule is minimally addressed and not documented. The schedule shows no end dates; therefore, there is no way of evaluation if this is a realistic schedule. The application fails to address how the schedule was derived, how obstacles will be resolved, no timeline of adopting an updated GWMP, and whether or not the project will be ready to proceed when funding is secured.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **QA/QC:** The criterion for the QA/QC is minimally addressed and not documented. There is no mention of how the quality of data collection will be ensured, whether or not field sampling plans exist, or the methodology of the approach. Review processes are not addressed regarding reports, data, or lab analyses. The application states that the consultant that will be used has an in-house soils and materials testing laboratory run by registered civil engineers which is certified and accredited; however, no documentation supports that claim. Also, the application states a conceptual model may be created, but fails to address any QA/QC information regarding the proposed model.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion for the grantee's past performance was not met. The PSP specifically stated this section is intended to address the past performance of the applicant and NOT of the consultant. The application lists several projects that the consultant performed rather than projects performed by the applicant. Two of the five examples of past performance do include projects for Rio Vista, but the application does not address management of funds or meeting deadlines by the applicant.