



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Newhall County Water District	County	Los Angeles
Project Title	South Saugus Formation Groundwater Resources Monitoring Project	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 628,795.00

Project Description: The Proposal identifies activities to collect subsurface data to define the horizontal and vertical extent of perchlorate contamination in the Saugus Formation that are threatening NCWD production wells. The Project constructs a deep monitoring well to provide geologic, hydraulic, and water quality data.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	5
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	38

- **GWMP or Program:** Newhall County Water District (NCWD) adopted a GWMP (AB3030) for its retail service area in 1996 via Resolution No. 1996-12 (resolution provided).
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, and provides relevant support as necessary, including: a complete, detailed description of the proposed project, including project goals and any needed facilities (the installation of one multi-level monitoring well). Additionally, applicant clearly explains their collaboration efforts with other local public agencies within the groundwater basin (with much coordination being done through an entity called the Santa Clarita Valley Water Committee); how the project supports the goals and objectives of the GWMP; describes the quality and usefulness of the information that will be obtained (primarily, data on the horizontal and vertical extent of perchlorate migration in the northwestern portion of the Saugus Formation), using technically feasible methods; and explains how ongoing use of the products derived from the proposed project (including water level and water quality monitoring) will be funded after grant funds are expended.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, including a detailed discussion of work being proposed, what the product will be, a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project, and how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the various stakeholders and other interested parties. Also, CEQA compliance and private property access needs were discussed. As described, CEQA compliance is anticipated to be through a Class 4 and Class 6 CEQA exemption. Well installation is planned on an undeveloped land parcel owned by the City of Santa Clarita (City). Applicant anticipates obtaining an easement from the City and does not anticipate problems (based on “success in the past obtaining easements for similar projects”); however, applicant does offer further assurances, that in the event that the public property is not available, they will coordinate with private land owners to obtain legal access to a well site (“as it has done previously without issue”). Task 1 of the work plan includes Well Siting and Agency Coordination.
- **Budget:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant addresses all the required elements of this criterion, including: providing a detailed budget table (that includes labor categories, estimated labor hours, hourly rates, and expenses) that is consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule. A copy of the drilling contractor quote is provided and is consistent with the budget table and the work being proposed.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Schedule:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, including providing: a detailed realistic schedule showing the timeline for each task shown on the work plan and budget; an explanation of how the schedule was derived; and assurances that the project will be ready to proceed when funding is secured. Applicant provides the required information in the form of detailed explanatory text as well as a graphic chart.

- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant demonstrates that appropriate and well-defined QA/QC measures will be implemented for each task, including: Using staff with appropriate qualifications that are appropriately licensed and/or experienced in the work being proposed; assigning a QA/QC manager responsible for fully implementing the QA/QC plan (which includes: bid package review, well permit review, drilling contractor submittal review, groundwater sampling QA/QC); senior level and project stakeholder review as appropriate (including Final Well Installation Report review); standardized well development, groundwater sampling and analytical procedures; standardized soil logging procedures (Unified Soil Classification System); and implementing a drilling fluid program (developed by a drilling fluids specialist). In addition to the detailed QA/QC procedures specified in Att. 8, QA/QC measures are consistent and incorporated, as appropriate, 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. The applicant provides two recent and relevant examples of their performance on similar types of construction projects: the construction of a drinking water well (\$600 K budget) and the construction of a disinfection facility with pipeline improvements (\$2 M budget). While applicant notes that the latter project was completed on schedule and within budget, and that the former projects was completed just under budget, there is no indication of whether or not the project was completed on schedule (as required by the PSP). Additionally, no documentation is provided to back up applicant's claims of task, schedule or budget performance.