



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Palmdale Water District	<b>County</b>	Los Angeles
<b>Project Title</b>	Littlerock Creek Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project (LCGRRP) Feasibility Study	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 1,897,969.00

**Project Description:** The proposal consists of determining the feasibility of recharging imported water and recovering the recharged water via a recovery well field adjacent to the Littlerock Creek project area. The study includes developing facility and operating plans, prepares cost options, completes an initial environmental study, and assesses the feasibility of LCGRRP.

**Evaluation Summary:**

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>30</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Antelope Valley IRWM Plan was adopted by members of the RWMG, including the applicant, as an equivalent GWMP. Resolutions to adopt the IRWMP and (equivalent) GWMP were included as attachments. The IRWMP was adopted by PWD under Resolution 08-1 on 1/23/2008 and the GWMP under Resolution 08-2 on 1/23/2008.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The project description demonstrates the long-term need for and merit of the proposed project. The basin has been subject to long-term overdraft and subsidence, and has been in the process of adjudication since 1999. The litigants are discussing a range of groundwater banking projects and the current project would assess the feasibility of one of four projects proposed by the PWD for recharge and recovery. The application demonstrates the collaboration as among numerous parties. Public outreach efforts to inform the public about the proposal will be made via public workshops and a website. Additionally, the results of the investigation will be disseminated to all litigants in the ongoing AV adjudication and participants in the AV IRWM. PWD is committed to funding a significant portion of the study with non-state monies and will continue to fund the project after the grant funds are expended. A table depicts how the project is consistent with the objectives of the IRWMP.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The work plan provides sufficient detail about each task to understand what will be done and what the products will be (most of the tasks follow up with task reports that will be presented to stakeholders and interested parties). The tasks are consistent with the budget and schedule and relate to improving groundwater. The proposal states that the applicant may need potential agreements with some private landowners to enter their properties to conduct various surveys (biological, cultural resource, geologic, and geophysical). The work plan states, “We anticipate the need for permits from LA County and potentially agreements with some private landowners to enter their properties...”. However, no assurances about gaining access are given in the proposal. Consultants will be contracted with PWD to conduct the various surveys associated with CEQA and to prepare the paperwork and documentation for CEQA.
- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. A summary and detailed budget is included, with a breakdown by task, hours and direct costs. Subtasks provide adequate detail. Some information is lacking: sub-consultants fees are lumped (for example, sub fees for CEQA subtasks are \$30,000 each); assumptions about travel and direct costs are not given; and hourly rates are not explicitly shown. The line item table appears to have some errors: 7.1.4 & 7.2.1 list hours but no costs. The budget tasks are consistent with the work plan and schedule. The applicant is requesting \$250,000 in grant funding for Task 6: Assess the Groundwater Response of Each Alternative. The remaining costs will be covered by Palmdale Water District. The total project cost is \$1,897,969. A 10 percent contingency was added to the budget that will be covered by PWD.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The tasks and subtasks presented in the schedule match those presented in the budget and work plan. The schedule shows that the project is ready to be started in April 2013 and will be completed April 2015. There was no discussion of how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule and no explanation of how the schedule was derived. Some of the tasks presented in the schedule do not appear to follow the progression noted in the work plan. For example, Task 4 states that data required for review of basic hydrogeologic information is to be collected and compiled in Task 5.2, which will be completed before Task 4 starts. In reviewing the schedule, Task 5.2 commences in 2014 whereas Task 4 commences in 2013. In addition, the hydrogeologic data (resistivity, surface deformation, fate/flow barriers) collected under Task 4 could be used to improve the model. However, the model “baseline” will be updated and recalibrated under Task 6 before the new hydrogeologic data will be ready. No dependencies are mapped between Task 4 and 6.
  
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. A listing of standardized methodologies to be used for construction standards, soils analyses, and lab analyses is provided. However, it is not clear whether PWD or consultant will be doing the work.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant has worked on various projects since 1994. However, there was no discussion of whether the projects were completed on schedule and on budget. No supporting documentation was provided to show that the agreements were completed satisfactorily.