



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	City of Upland	<b>County</b>	San Bernardino
<b>Project Title</b>	Evaluation of Potential Uses of Recycled	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
	Water for Groundwater Recharge and	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 277,000.00
	Conjunctive Use Opportunities		

**Project Description:** The Proposal manages groundwater supplies and increase local water availability by conducting a feasibility study to analyze the technical and regulatory issues of extensions of a recycled water system and recharge of recycled water, as well as potential impacts to down gradient groundwater purveyors.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	4
Budget	2
Schedule	2
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>22</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported with the 1978 Basin Adjudication.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant does a good job discussing the long term need and merit of the project, but does not address future financing and implementation or collaboration with stakeholders. Although the project is a feasibility study and does not require maintenance or monitoring, the applicant should have discussed how the findings of the study would be used. The project description lacked clarity and detailed descriptions.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is marginally addressed. Applicant does not address all the criteria as required in the PSP. The work plan is not Agreement-Ready and does not provide sufficient detail that would allow the reviewer to determine how the proposed task would fulfill the objectives of the proposal. The tasks are not detailed enough to determine level of effort, potential issues or how the task is to be accomplished; the tasks are objectives with deliverable documents. The applicant did not address CEQA requirements and project administration. Also, it is unclear how this information will be disseminated to the public, Regional Water Quality Board and stakeholders.
- **Budget:** The criterion is marginally addressed. Documentation is not provided and there is no breakdown of the costs into task direct expenses, labor, or subcontractors. The budget does not provide the source of the non-state share.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is marginally addressed. The project is scheduled to be completed within two years as required by the PSP, but the schedule does not actually demonstrate how long each task will take because start dates per task are not provided. Due to the lack of details in the work plan used to describe the individual tasks, one cannot tell if the schedule is realistic or able to equate the schedule to the proposed budget. How the applicant derived the schedule is not discussed nor is how obstacles and delays will be overcome.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is less than fully addressed, and not fully documented. The applicant provides personnel qualifications for experience and expertise, but does not document the QA/QC for model calibration.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed, and not fully documented. The applicant provides examples of past performance but it is not clear what the applicant's role was in the projects. Based on the information provided in the application, it is difficult to assess the city's performance on schedules, budgets, and project management. The documentation does not provide evidence for high quality work performance, management of funds and meeting deadlines. The applicant should have provided a narrative that discussed the issues with the subcontractor that are noted in the quarterly report and how the applicant managed the issues and moved along with the project.