



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Santa Barbara County Fire Department	County	Santa Barbara
Project Title	Protection of Downtown Santa Barbara Drinking Water and Surface Water Quality by Implementation of Cleanup Prioritization	Grant Request	\$ 215,558.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 215,558.00

Project Description: The Proposal protects drinking water and surface water by prioritizing cleanup and closure of contaminated sites that are polluting shallow groundwater and pose a risk to public health.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	0
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	2
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	22

- **GWMP or Program:** There was no proof of adoption of the UWMP or IRWMP (as an equivalent GWMP) or other proof to show that the City is intending to adopt a GWMP within 2 years.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The proposal explained the need for the project and its goals and objectives as they relate to protecting drinking water and surface water. The proposal demonstrated the quality and usefulness of the information that will be obtained. The proposal does not address how ongoing use of the products will be funded after grant funds are expended nor did it explain how often and under what mechanism the data management systems will be updated and maintained. Based on the information in the application, it is not clear that the project is achievable, since no estimates were provided about the amount of data that needed to be entered. In addition, it is unclear that the project will improve selection of cleanup sites, since the development of new ranking criteria and prioritization of cleanup sites may be redundant with agency mandates (e.g. RWQCB, DTSC) or superfluous because of them. Although the application briefly mentioned collaborating with other agencies on the conceptual model (p. 13), few details were given.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The work plan is sufficient to function as a scope of work. Most of the tasks contain a list of work items to be performed. The work plan did not identify a strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project. The project management task (task 7) does not include budget and schedule management or tracking and does not demonstrate an understanding of the project management requirements of the project and grant. The work plan describes how information will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies and other interested parties through meetings, the GAMA/Geotracker interface and distribution of reports. However, there is no mention of where the bibliographic database will be stored or whether it will be shared. Environmental compliance and permits are not mentioned and likely do not apply.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant is requesting \$215,558 in grant funding with no cost share for the project. Table 1-B provides details on the breakdown of costs for each task. Consultant hourly costs were averaged and based on 2012 Standard Rate Sheets, but this data was not provided. Similarly, documentation of other staff hourly rates was not provided. Travel, printing, and postage costs were allotted for the consultant, but not for Santa Barbara County Fire Department staff. This implies that County staff do not plan to travel to outreach meetings, even though Fire Department staff will be overseeing the project. It is unclear how agency participation in the project, in particular by the RWQCB and DTSC will be funded. For example, DTSC and RWQCB are required to participate in Task 3.2, Compare Ranking and Develop an Action Plan, but there is no mention of how their participation will be funded in the Work Plan or budget. The “Basis of Budget Estimate” narrative does not include a description about assumptions made to develop the budget for Task 1, such as an estimate of the amount of data that needs to be entered. Administrative tasks, included in Task 7, Project Management, amount to 6.7 – 9% of total budget and there is no justification provided for >5% of total.

- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The tasks presented in the schedule somewhat match those in the budget and work plan. Some tasks like Task 4 have subtasks broken out in the schedule, whereas in the work plan, the single title reflects what will be done. There was no narrative provided with the schedule to discuss how obstacles will be resolved to keep on schedule or to explain how the schedule was derived. The schedule does not indicate when quarterly reports would be submitted though the narrative in the work plan stated that they would be submitted in accordance with the agreement terms.

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed. The project will be managed by Fire Department personnel and consultants to be hired will be a licensed PG or PE.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. Project submitted as evidence of past performance were not performed by the applicant, but by the County of Santa Barbara and include two Prop 84 grants which are currently in progress (one planning and one implementation) and one Prop 50 grant from SWRCB. Websites for these grants provided little information about performance, such as whether projects are on schedule and within budget.