



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Mission Springs Water District	County	Riverside
Project Title	Mission Creek Sub-basin 2012 Groundwater Study & Monitoring Well Construction Project	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 309,690.00

Project Description: The Proposal consists of a groundwater study to evaluate historic water movement, water recharge impacts, water quality, and other concerning water constituents, as well as the construction of monitoring wells near Mission Creek Fault for additional water quality data collection.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	2
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	27

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant submitted information describing that the Mission Creek and Garnet Hill Subbasins Water Management Plan (WMP) is in the process of being developed with the assistance of a Proposition 84 LGA grant and states that it is scheduled to be completed by October 15, 2012. The applicant also included an administrative draft of the WMP. Review of the WMP reveals that this plan substantially addresses characterization of the applicable groundwater basins and creation and implementation of Basin Management Objectives (BMOs). However, the applicant presents no information of a public notice of intention to prepare a GWMP or plans for adoption of the plan.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The applicant marginally addresses the criterion and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The application does not provide a complete and detailed description of the proposed groundwater study and construction of monitoring wells. Instead, the project description only provides a brief overview of what each of the two components consist of and does not clearly identify the goals of the proposed facilities. In addition, the applicant marginally demonstrated collaboration with other local public agencies with regards to the management of the affected groundwater basins by minimally discussing the ongoing Coachella Valley IRWMP (i.e., Desert Water Agency and Coachella Valley WD). No specific information is given regarding what new knowledge will be gained by the project, only that it will pertain to groundwater, aquifer parameters, a better understanding of long term regional groundwater trends, and an understanding of hydrogeology in the basin. No detailed rationale is provided for the proposed installation of monitoring wells, such as a preliminary location selection criteria or how the monitoring will be used to achieve the goals and objectives of a project. Only generalized statements are made regarding how more groundwater data will lead to better characterization and abilities to evaluate hypothetical impacts. No specific problem is described and, therefore, it is not possible to judge how the proposed project will improve the understanding, or lead to solutions, of a particular problem. Moreover, the applicant did not clearly explain how ongoing use of the projects would be funded once grant funds are expended, instead states that they have “the resources and commitment to implement the currently proposed project and to collect data into the future.” There is no indication as to where exactly the funds will be derived from.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Overall, the tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget. In addition, the tasks do relate to improving groundwater management including supporting the region's IRWMP; however, there is no discussion of how the projects support the IRWMP. The work plan is comprised of only a generalized description of conducting studies and hiring consultants to perform loosely defined activities.
- **Budget:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule, and presents cost share and grant share amount consistent with those two attachments. The proposal also identifies other sources of funding and how each task pertains to them. However, the application includes a budget table that does not provide an explanatory text or other cost details to determine if the costs are realistic or cost effective. It appears accounting errors exist in the Budget table provided. For example, the subtotals for the monitoring wells portion of the project does not add up to the values presented (i.e., Requested Grant Funding for Subtotal (b) is incorrect but the overall project total is correct). The applicant states that the project consulting fees are based on similar work items from previous projects but does not provided supporting documentation. The applicant does present a cost estimate from the consultant for the Groundwater Study work but they are only bulk cost with no details as to how the numbers were determined.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A description of the assumptions for the schedule (page 1 of Attachment 7) includes the statement, "MSWD has already obtained proposals from consultants required to perform the scope of services and is ready to execute agreements upon notice of award." In light of this stated assumption, it is unclear why 20 days are needed to advertise the monitoring well construction work. Activities listed in the schedule are not consistent with activities listed in the budget and work plan. Also, the duration for environmental CEQA determination (280 days) appears excessive.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides details about what QA/QC measures will be used for each task of the Groundwater Study and Monitoring Wells. As supporting documentation, the proposal provides detailed resumes of the consultants and individuals that would be performing the work.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The information provided described current DWR grant projects they are managing, as well as an US Army Corps of Engineers grant that was completed in 2009. While none of the supporting documentation fully supports the claims made about their ability to perform high quality work and managing funds, DWR staff were able to substantiate the claims made.