



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District	<b>County</b>	Humboldt
<b>Project Title</b>	Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District Groundwater Study	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 249,952.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 261,552.00

**Project Description:** The Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District (HBMWD) proposal develops a Groundwater Study which includes mapping of bedrock, updating and refining a previously developed groundwater model with new information and data, and completing a final evaluation to determine the potential yields from specified Collectors to develop recommendations for Collector replacement options.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	8
Budget	4
Schedule	4
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	2
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>29</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** HBMWD has prepared a GWMP, and it was approved by the HBMWD Board of Directors on December 8, 2005 (Resolution number 2005-12). The GWMP and HBMWD resolution are included in the application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Project Description contains good information on the proposed project area including the goals of the project and area covered and lists four items that this proposal will address per PSP Requirement 1. However, it is not clear what one or more of the tasks are attempting to do. For example, the data which need to be collected or what type of mapping would be involved when mapping bedrock. The Work Plan calls for monitoring well installation, but it was not mentioned in the Project Description. No details are given on what tasks are going to be undertaken after project completion. Collaboration was not specified per PSP Requirement 2. Although it was stated in very general terms that additional data would be obtained consistent with goals and objectives of the GWMP per PSP Requirement 4, there was no supporting detail. There was no detail for supporting ongoing use of the monitoring wells per PSP Requirement 5.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The tasks and subtasks in the Work Plan are detailed enough to serve as the scope of work for the agreement and show that the project is technically feasible. Project deliverables are given within the subtasks. However, one or more of the tasks listed in the Project Description was not discussed satisfactorily in the work plan section. The Work Plan is consistent with and supports the schedule and the budget at the Task (but not subtask for budget) level. The task relationship to the GWMP goals is discussed. Progress evaluation is discussed in the form of project deliverables – deliverable reviews or reports and in Task 6. Work would be done in the vicinity of the HBMWD but it is not clear if private property access would be required. CEQA compliance is adequately covered but potential for stream alteration or other permitting does not appear to be.
- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. There was general explanatory text for the basis of the estimate but no supporting information for hourly rates or hours spent on Task 3 Groundwater Modeling (except review), which is the largest task cost-wise in the project. The Task numbers were numbered consistently compared with the schedule and the work plan at the task level but not delineated by subtask.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule categories and subcategories are consistent with the work plan and budget. The timeline from one task to the next flows logically. The start and stop dates are within the PSP timeframe. However the short description and rationale for the schedule is somewhat sparse, with no explanation as to how obstacles or potential delays would be accounted for per the PSP instructions.
  
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Procedural assurances and personnel qualifications were described in a generalized and broad sense. There were no well defined QA/QC specific to tasks or subtasks. A registered engineer was specified as a QA/QC officer but not a registered geologist or hydrologist for potential in-stream work. No QA/QC protocols were described for Task 3 Groundwater modeling, a large portion of the project.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant provided a list of work performed with no information as to how the work was performed, whether it was completed, or whether deadlines or budgets were met. Most of the projects listed were not similar to the proposed project. In the case of the 2006 LGA, there wasn't any mention of what the grant was used for.