



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	<b>County</b>	San Bernardino
<b>Project Title</b>	Prado Basin Habitat Sustainability Program	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 400,000.00

**Project Description:** The proposed project implements an adaptive management study on the Prado Basin, constructs and installs 8 groundwater monitoring wells, and performs on-going data collection.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	4
Budget	1
Schedule	1
QA/QC	1
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>17</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. Although the applicant documents the October 27, 1999 adoption of a provisional report (Phase I) of an “Optimum Basin Management Plan” (OBMP) - the Chino Basin’s equivalent of a groundwater basin management plan – pursuant to a Judgment entered in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Bernardino, no documentation is submitted to verify that this plan was finalized and adopted.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant explains that the project is needed to ensure that the Peace II Agreement actions will not adversely affect the Prado Basin riparian habitat. The project will document riparian changes and groundwater elevations through time. However, the application does not explain how the proposed project will support the goals and objectives of the OBMP, only that the proposed project fulfills requirements for a program that is part of the OBMP. The application provides no discussion of the information to be obtained or the technical feasibility of the collection methods. The text indicates that the locations of the proposed wells are shown on the maps provided; however, the proposed well locations are not clearly identified. Opportunity for stakeholder collaboration appears to be limited to agency participation in the project committee; the proposal does state how information will be disseminated to other groundwater users or to the public.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. For example, the “Adaptive Management Study” includes eight factors but does not provide sufficient detail on how data will be collected. The “Monitoring Wells” section includes a CPT survey but does not specify how many CPTs will be performed or what information will be gathered. The map of proposed wells does not clearly identify the eight wells proposed in the work plan or the locations for the CPT. It is difficult to determine if the tasks are consistent with schedule and budget due to lack of detail. No strategy is presented for evaluating progress and performance, except that draft well plans will be presented to stakeholders and permitting agencies prior to drilling. The applicant does not provide assurance that access for well installation can be granted as it is unclear as to whether well locations are public or private. There is no discussion of environmental compliance.
- **Budget:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The budget provides no basis for how the budget estimate was developed. There are no labor categories, hourly rates, labor time estimates, or subcontractor quotes. The budget is not broken down by task and no assumptions are noted. No administration costs are listed and the Budget states that cost-shares (in-kind services) cannot be quantified. Also, neither the basis nor purpose of the contingency fund is explained.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Schedule:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The schedule provides a list of sequential dates and corresponding activities (e.g., “May 2013 – Review Proposals”) for each of the two tasks but lacks any other details. The schedule fails to indicate the duration of activities, the starting and ending dates, and the relationships between activities. The application provides no information describing how the schedule was developed. No explanation is offered to describe how obstacles would be resolved to keep the project on schedule, such as obtaining land owner access or obtaining permits.
  
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. Standard Operating Procedures for Groundwater Measurements is the only QA/QC document submitted with the application. Although some QA/QC issues related to well installation are mentioned in the work plan, no QA/QC plan was submitted to address well installation, which is a major component of the project. No personnel qualifications or any other QA/QC documents are presented.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed but not thoroughly documented. The applicant reports receiving grants from DWR in the past, but has not received LGA grants in the past five years. The application provided a list of previous projects, including an Urban Best Management Grant in 2009. The applicant has a dedicated Grants Administrative Division. However, the applicant does not provide documentation that demonstrates successful past performance.