



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District	County	Los Angeles
		Grant Request	\$ 149,000.00
Project Title	Upper District Groundwater Replenishment Project	Total Project Cost	\$ 149,000.00

Project Description: The Proposal develops a site-specific, three-dimensional groundwater model to support the design, regulatory permitting, and management of an Indirect Reuse Replenishment Project near Santa Fe Dam in the San Gabriel Valley.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	4
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	29

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed with complete and sufficient documentation and logical rationale. The proposed project lies within the Main San Gabriel groundwater Basin, which is an adjudicated basin. The basin judgment was entered on January 4, 1973 and amended on August 24, 1989. The management of the local water resources within the basin is based on the provisions of the adjudication. A copy of the 1989 amended judgment is included in the application
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant proposes to develop a site-specific groundwater flow model to support the design, regulatory permitting, and management of a proposed recharge project, the Indirect Reuse Replenish Project (IRRP), in the main San Gabriel Basin that will utilize recycled water. The application provides a description and map of the area to be modeled and the location of the IRRP facilities. The application also presents a description of the proposal and explains how it will support the “Supplemental Water” objective of groundwater management of the adjudicated basin. The application explains the long-term need for groundwater recharge, the benefits to groundwater management, and the value of new knowledge to be gained. The application states that the development of the proposed model and the management of the affected groundwater basin will include collaboration with other local public agencies and that the implementation of the IRRP includes a public outreach program. However, the application does not sufficiently document how the local agency will collaborate with other local public agencies or how the project information will be disseminated to the public. Ongoing use and maintenance of the model will be funded from revenue from the sale of imported water and recycled water from the IRRP once grant funding is expended.
- **Work Plan:** This criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. The tasks outlined are consistent with budget and schedule in the proposal. Applicant provides sufficient details of the work to be done, including the deliverables. The application presents a sound strategy for evaluating progress but not for evaluating performance at each step of the proposed project. For example, the methodology for ensuring quality control and performance at each step is not discussed or incorporated in the work plan task activities relating to how information gained will be disseminated to the public and other interested parties, other than stating that “meetings and presentations will be scheduled throughout the timeline to discuss progress and make decisions regarding model assumptions and required deliverables”. The proposed project does not identify any activities that would require access to private property or identify the need for CEQA, compliance with CEQA, obtaining permits, or fulfilling any other applicable regulatory requirements.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** This criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. The budget is consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule. The budget includes cost breakdown showing hourly rates for seven labor categories and subtasks discussed in the work plan. However, the basis of the labor hours and rates used in the cost estimates are not explained or supported with documentation. In addition, the classification of staff performing the tasks are not provided thereby making it difficult to determine the reasonableness of the rates employed. Application includes a limited discussion of assumptions and explanatory text to allow the reviewer to understand how the budget estimate was developed. The total cost for Task 5 of the budget summary table (\$12,100) does not correspond to Task 5 of the detailed budget table (\$20,123); however, the total project budget for both tables is the same.
- **Schedule:** This criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The schedule agrees with work plan sequencing and budget and demonstrates readiness to proceed once funds become available. The applicant states that they will be ready to proceed by April 2013. Although the applicant did not present any discussion on how the schedule was derived, the details and timelines appear to be realistic for the work to be performed. The applicant presents a schedule that spans 12 months but did not indicate the start and end dates in the schedule. However, the start and end dates are within the 2-year PSP designated time frame.
- **QA/QC:** This criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The applicant states that appropriate and well-defined QA/QC measures will be used but did not identify the procedures for each task. However, applicant presents procedural assurances that will ensure quality product is achieved. The application discusses appropriate Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) measures for the development of the model, including the selection of a well-documented, widely used groundwater model code (MODFLOW), application of a standard model-development process, comparison of model results to groundwater measurements (calibration), and personnel qualifications.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed but documentation is inadequate. The applicant describes four previous projects: two surface-water supply construction projects, and a 2010 Urban Water Management Plan Update, which were grant-funded, and a pollution control project, which was self-funded. The applicant states that these projects were completed within budget and on schedule. The applicant also included their quarterly reports to the funding agencies for the construction projects. The applicant did not discuss quality of the work or the performance of the projects. The applicant did not provide documentation to support their claims; they did not submit any independent verification of performance that originated with the funding agencies.