



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	City of San Bruno	County	San Mateo
Project Title	South Westside Basin Shallow Groundwater Study	Grant Request	\$ 249,660.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 254,660.00

Project Description: The Proposal improves the overall technical understanding of the shallow groundwater system in the South Westside Groundwater Basin, including improvements in the understanding of recharge to the water table, deeper aquifer system, and nitrate sources in the shallow and deep aquifer system through data collection and assessment.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	5
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	40

- **GWMP or Program:** The South Westside Basin GWMP was adopted by the City of San Bruno on July 10, 2012. The copy of the signed resolution from the City of Bruno was provided.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant provides complete and detailed project description that includes goals of the proposal, needed facilities, and area covered. Goals of the project are consistent with the goals of the GWMP. Long term need and merit of the proposed project are discussed. QA/QC measures are incorporated into the project. Applicant demonstrates that the achievable knew knowledge and improvement in groundwater management will be obtained. Collaboration with the other local public agencies with regards to the management of the affected groundwater basin is discussed. Ongoing use of the product including future funding is discussed also.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant provides a complete and detailed description of the proposed project including complete description of each task. Tasks successfully fulfill the objectives of the proposal and consistent with the budget and schedule. A strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project is discussed. No access to private property is required. The proposed project is considered exempted from CEQA. No permits are anticipated for project completion. Task 1, Public Outreach, specifically discusses how information gained from the proposed project will be disseminated to the public and stakeholders.
- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant provides budget that seems realistic and is consistent with the work plan and schedule. The additional sources of funding are identified and included in the budget table. The cost estimates includes labor hours and rates broken down by each task.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant provides the schedule that seems realistic and is consistent with the work plan and budget. The start and end dates (05/2013-01/2015) are within the PSP’s time frame. The applicant demonstrates that they will be ready to proceed when funding becomes available. The anticipated start date is May 1, 2013.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant presented well-defined QA/QC plan for the proposed project. The QA/QC measures are incorporated into the work plan and will be used in each task. Personnel qualifications are also discussed.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. For example: applicant demonstrated that they are capable of performing high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines. Applicant implemented similar types of project in the past which were completed on budget and within the LGA funding timeline. Applicant provided Grant Performance Evaluation which supports applicant's claim.