



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	County	Los Angeles
Project Title	Groundwater Monitoring Wells Installation Project-Symlar Basin	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 1,724,329.00

Project Description: The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power proposal investigates the extent of groundwater contamination affecting the Mission Wellfield. The project also results in the installation of two monitoring wells adjacent to the wellfield.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	28

- **GWMP or Program:** The proposed project is located within the Sylmar adjudicated basin which is part of the Upper Los Angeles River Area (ULARA) watershed. Applicant has provided the final Court Judgment as proof of adjudication in Attachment 3 of the application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Application proposes to construct, develop, and sample groundwater monitoring wells within the Sylmar Basin near the Mission Wellfield to investigate the extent of TCE contamination. The project description is inconsistent with the work plan and it is unclear what work being proposed is to be funded by grant share. According to Attachment 4, two new wells will be constructed; however, applicant indicates in Attachment 5 that only one well will be included for grant funding. Application does not include a long-term monitoring plan for the well(s), but rather states “If needed, an on-going monitoring program for the two new wells will be designed after the completion of this Project.” As one of the objectives for the project is that the wells act as “sentinels” for groundwater contamination, it seems likely that a monitoring program would be necessary. Applicant did not sufficiently discuss an outreach process in place to inform stakeholders and the general public about the project. Also, information describing how the applicant collaborates with other local public agencies with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin was not found.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For the project scope of work, applicant provides only high level tasks for the work being proposed (Task 1- Planning, etc., Task 2 - Well 1 Construction; Task 3-Well 2 Construction). This lack of sub-task breakdown does not allow for a clear understanding of the specific tasks to be completed under each main task, what the product or deliverable will be, and does not clearly present “a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project” as required by the PSP. The applicant describes the CEQA and permitting processes that will be undertaken, however, these tasks are not found in the schedule and budget. The work plan is confusing in its presentation; specifically, it is not clear which tasks are included “in order to provide DWR with a complete picture of the Project” (Tasks 1 and 2), and which task(s) are being proposed that will be included for grant funding (Task 3). Under Task 3, applicant does not present the work included under this Task, nor the deliverables, but rather states “Subtasks under Task 3 are identical to those described...for the first well (MI-MW-01)”. Basic well construction details are not described in Att. 5, but rather, the reader is directed to Figure 4 “for the general well design details....” The PSP for this criterion specifies that “the level of detail must be sufficient for the work plan to function as the scope of work for the agreement....,” which this work plan clearly does not achieve.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. While estimated costs are provided at the Task level, including personnel type, hours and rates, an adequate break-down of estimated costs associated with individual work plan sub-tasks is not provided. As such, it is not possible to determine if the costs support the work being proposed. For example, no break-down of costs are provided for Task 1 (Specification Development, Bid, Award, Permitting and Planning, Att. 6 budget table, Task 1), and a budget is simply provided for all tasks included within Task 1. Similarly, no break-down of costs are provided for Task 3 (Well Installation, Att. 6 budget table, Task 3), which at a minimum, should indicate the costs associated with the sub-tasks that are described in the work plan (well construction, development, sampling and reporting activities). The basis for the estimates provided (laboratory, drilling contractor, salaries and wages) was not found (i.e., are estimates derived based on experience with similar projects, contractor quotes, etc.).
- **Schedule:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Application does not describe a readiness to proceed when funding becomes available (although the timeline is within that specified by the PSP), explain how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule, or, explain how the schedule was derived, all elements required by the PSP. While detailed sub-tasks are identified for many tasks shown in the schedule, the timelines for some key tasks and deliverables are not included, such as obtaining environmental permits, CEQA documentation and mandatory quarterly and final reporting to DWR. Also, Tasks and Sub-tasks shown in the schedule are not entirely consistent with the Work Plan or Budget.
- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Application demonstrates that appropriate and well-defined QA/QC measures will be implemented for each task, including: Sampling and Analysis Plans, Site-specific health and safety plans, Traffic Control Plan, Wet weather Erosion Plan, Well Development Work Plan, Drilling Mud Management Plan, and Site Plan and Waste Management Work Plan (At.5, pg. 5). Additionally, the proposed work will be completed by qualified contractors, under the supervision of experienced licensed professionals. Further, QA/QC measures identified in Att. 8 are incorporated into the project work plan, as required by the PSP.
- **Past Performance:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Although application provides several examples demonstrating extensive prior experience implementing similar projects, they consistently omit whether or not the project was “completed within the time allotted and within the budget provided,” as required by the PSP. Although applicant is completing a previous LGA awarded contract, they do not “provide assurances that they are in compliance with the terms of the grant agreement, including up-to-date progress reports,” as required by the PSP. One project example provided was not performed by the applicant (TJ-MW-06), as required by the PSP. Also, Many projects examples included fall beyond the five year cut-off specified for this criterion.