



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Municipal Water District of Orange County	<b>County</b>	Orange
<b>Project Title</b>	Lower San Juan Basin Groundwater Yield Enhancement Study	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 325,000.00

**Project Description:** This project evaluates feasible management approaches and brackish/saline groundwater recovery projects to enhance basin supply.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	2
Schedule	2
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>22</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. The applicant reports that the San Juan Basin Authority is in the process of updating its 1994 “Groundwater Management and Facility Plan” with the development of a GWMP. The application does not include documentation of the 1994 plan. However, the application does include a consultant’s progress report on the development of the GWMP, dated July 2012. The schedule does not reference the completion date of the GWMP.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. Although the application provides detailed descriptions of some of the components of the proposed project, the application does not provide a clear, organized description of the overall project. Although the application describes the location of the well field (page 5), the application does not provide a description of all of the locations for each of the project components, the location(s) of the affected area(s), nor a map that clearly identifies this information. For the most part the proposal described the long-term need and merit for of the components of proposed study, particularly the SOCOD project and storm water recharge. The project description explains that the proposed study is a part of the implementation of the current Groundwater Management and Facility Plan and the IRWMP for the San Juan Basin. However, because the details of the actual activities to be performed for this project are not clear it is difficult to determine if a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge will be developed. The application is sponsored by the Municipal Water District of Orange County in cooperation with the San Juan Basin Authority, which is a JPA and consists of four member agencies. The project description lists coordination with the National Marine Fisheries Service and other resource agency programs on fisheries restoration portion of the proposal. The work plan does specify that the agency’s public affairs department will provide project information to stakeholders and the public. However, the description of the project does not otherwise discuss collaboration with other local public agencies, stakeholders, or the public with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin. The application provides no information on how the ongoing use of the products of the proposed project will be funded once grant funding is expended.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The level of detail of the work plan is insufficient to function as the scope of work for a contract agreement. The plan does not allow the reviewer to understand the level of effort of the work to be performed to substantiate the cost estimates in the budget. The work plan describes each the task in sufficient detail to determine what will be done, however not enough information is provided to determine what the product will be. The relationship between the tasks is not clear. Descriptions of field work lacks specific detail, such as identification of how many sites will be sampled. Task 6 indicates that field work and lab work would be required but does not explicitly describe field or lab work. The tasks that involve fieldwork provide no discussion of compiling with CEQA, obtaining permits, or fulfilling any other applicable regulatory requirements. The application does not discuss or provide a plan for complying with CEQA, obtaining permits, or fulfilling any other applicable regulatory requirements. The work plan does not present a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project. The description of work products is limited to a notation at the end of each Task description that a Technical Memorandum will be produced. No work product is identified for Task 3. Only one technical memo is identified for Task 2, the largest, most complex task, which is composed of 4 subtasks and comprises 50% of the budget (\$125,000). The only other work progress and performance documents are contained in a list of reports at the conclusion of the work plan, which are describe as “Quarterly Progress Reports, Newsletter, Invoices, Draft Report, and Final Report.” The application does relate to improving groundwater management, yet does not reference how it ties to the GWMP and the region’s IRWMP.
- **Budget:** The criterion is minimally addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete and insufficient. The budget provides a lump sum for each task listed in the work plan and in the schedule. There is no cost breakdown for Task 2, which is budgeted at \$125,000 and is subdivided into 4 subtasks in the work plan. The application does not substantiate the reasonableness or logic for using a lump sum basis of estimate. There is no detail or supporting information that allows the reviewer to understand how the budget estimate was developed. No labor categories, hourly rates, labor time estimates, and subcontractor quotes were provided. There are numerical inconsistencies in the budget. For example, the introduction to the budget (Overall Project Budget) identifies \$25,000 of in-kind services and discusses supporting and related work in the amounts of \$60,000, \$500,000 and \$440,000. However, none of these amounts correspond to the amount “Non-State Share” (\$75,000) that is listed in the budget table. In addition, the Grant Funds for Task 2 in the table is \$125,000 but the total is \$150,000 even though no cost-share is shown.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is minimally addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete and insufficient. The schedule lists the same tasks as the work plan and budget tasks, but no information is provided on the subtasks. The schedule does not indication relationship between tasks or subtasks. There are no milestones, reports, or deliverables noted in the schedule. The schedule only lists the total duration of each task. No start or end dates or sequencing of tasks are provided in the schedule to indicate that the project will be completed within the PSP designated time frame other than a statement in the narrative that “overall work would be completed by June 2014.” No information is provided to indicate how the schedule was derived. Given the lack of detail in the budget, it is not possible to determine if the timelines are realistic for the work to be performed.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The application identifies appropriate QA/QC measures but lacks details and specifics about how they will be accomplished. The application provides a general statement that the project will receive engineering management and technical oversight. The application provides a general statement that the project will be reviewed by a technical advisory committee, composed of staff from participating agencies, and outside experts, as deemed necessary. The application states that the project manager that has been selected for the proposed project is an engineer with 45 years of professional experience and has managed a number of grants funded by DWR, EPA, and USBR. No specific details regarding personnel qualifications or the QA/QC review processes for plans, designs, reports, data, field methods, or field sampling are discussed.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant claims to have received numerous grants since 2001 with successful completion on schedule. However, the application does not document the performance or successful completion of previous grant-funded projects and does not include any documentation that demonstrates that they can do work that is similar to the project proposed in this application. The documents submitted with the application do not fulfill the requirements for the Past Performance documentation. The applicant has provided two documents that are only address eligibility for the grant application (listed below).
- DWR certification of the applicant’s self-certification statement for Urban Best Management Practices, with is an eligibility requirement for receiving water management grant or loan funds.
  - A certification for compliance with water metering requirements for funding applications, issued by the California State Water Resources Control Board, the California Department of Water Resources, and the California Department of Public Health.