



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Inyo-Water Department, County of	County	Inyo
Project Title	Groundwater Monitoring Wells in Middle Amargosa, California, Pahrump, and Mesquite Groundwater Basins	Grant Request	\$ 249,949.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 249,949.00

Project Description: The proposed project sites, installs, and develops eight monitoring wells. After construction, each monitoring well will be sampled for geochemical constituents and be equipped with a pressure transducer and data logger.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	2
Schedule	1
QA/QC	1
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	21

- **GWMP or Program:** The County has adopted three documents that together function as an equivalent GWMP. The three documents are Groundwater Ordinance (adopted 1998), Resolution 99-43 (adopted 1999), and Inyo/Los Angeles Long Term Water Agreement (filed in 1997).
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The goal of this project is to establish a network of monitoring wells in the southeastern region of Inyo County. A detailed description of the project, project goals, background, and project needs were provided giving way to demonstration of the long-term need for and merit of the proposed project. No details provided as to what type of analyses will be done or what methods would be used on this type of project. Collaboration was also meekly addressed in regards to other local agencies and stakeholder who the applicant does not outright mention. Lastly, no specifics were provided for ongoing use of monitoring of this project beyond, "...will be used in ongoing studies of groundwater resources in the region..." and no funding mechanism was mentioned for who would continue to pay for monitoring efforts once grant funding was expended.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. Sound background and purpose were presented for the proposed project. However, four tasks were laid out but lacking appropriate detail. For example, Task 1 – Permitting and Pre-field activities: this task omits discussion on a plan for environmental compliance (CEQA/NEPA). The applicant does not cite any applicable exemptions or appropriate sections of code. Task 4 does not go into any detail regarding what kind of any analyses will be done at the monitoring wells, this task states that information obtained from the project will go into a well construction report. Sound strategy for evaluation progress at each step of the project was not presented. Lastly, deliverables for assessing progress and accomplishments were not provided throughout the tasks. There is mention of a well construction report and a letter report summarizing network operation and analyses of observations but no mention of what they will be used for or who they are going to?



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. For example, explanatory text allowing the reviewer to understand how the budget estimate was developed was not provided. Some explanation for the budget can be relayed back to the tasks listed in the work plan. Hourly rates and labor categories were provided; however, it was unclear as to who was doing the work, a consultant or Inyo County. Lump sums were provided without explanation. There was inconsistency with the budget vs. work plan as was not listed as such but looks like subtasks were provided in the budget that were not in the work plan. Many of the tasks had a line item called “Unitemized Misc Expenses” with no explanation. Overall, a budget was provided with no explanation to allow the reviewer to understand the cost basis behind the estimates provided in the budget or any way to understand the reasonableness of the budget.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The schedule provided is basically a four line summary schedule of the four task provided in the work plan with only start and end dates. No explanatory text was provided, except some minor notes per task but not enough detail to give the reviewer insight on how: the schedule was derived, how the applicant would be ready to proceed once funding is secured, or how the applicant would resolve obstacles should any come up during the period of the project. Also, there is no mention of the CEQA documentation that will be completed.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The applicant provides a bulleted list of general summarizations of how they will comply with a Quality Assurance Program. No process was given for how the applicant will review quality of reports, data, and or analyses. Personnel qualifications for those working on the project were not provided. Details for types of standardized methodologies, construction standards, and types of lab analyses were not provided. Overall, the applicant did a poor job of demonstrating to the reviewer that appropriate and well-defined Quality assurance Control measures will be used in each task; rather a very broad description of quality assurance was provided with no detail.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant provided a table that showed two grants completed with DWR and submitted supporting documentation in the form of a performance evaluation for one of the grant-funded projects. An actual description or summary of past projects was needed to allow the reviewer to evaluate whether the applicant can show similarities of past projects to the current one potentially being grant-funded and needed to show specific examples of how tasks were completed within the time allotted and within the budget provided.