



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District	County	Los Angeles
Project Title	Main SG Basin Data Management Platform and Integrated GW Surface Model	Grant Request	\$ 242,760.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 242,760.00

Project Description: This project develops a Main SGB Data Management Platform, a web-based database management system, and the Main SGB Integrated Groundwater Surface Water Model.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	6
Budget	4
Schedule	5
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	30

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough 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:** This criterion is fully addressed but not thoroughly documented. The proposal is to develop an all-inclusive, web-based, basin-wide Data Management System (DMS) and an integrated 3-D groundwater/surface water flow and transport model (Model) to improve coordination and collaboration among the basin’s water management agencies and stakeholders. The applicant describes background, overarching goals, and long-term needs for the project as well as the basin. The proposed project will enable stakeholders to access and share data and to analyze groundwater conditions basin-wide with a common set of tools. The proposed project will provide a mechanism to improve the coordination between the multiple entities that share the management responsibilities of the basin, resulting in new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management, consistent with the goals and objectives of the groundwater management program. The application states the project will include collaboration with other local public agencies, which are responsible for water management in the basin. The application also states that the project will include a training session once the DMS and the Model are completed. However, the application does not describe the collaboration process; it does not provide sufficient documentation describing specifically how other agencies will participate in project design, development, and training. The application also did not describe the process for disseminating project information to groundwater users, stakeholder, and the general public. Ongoing use and maintenance of the DMS and the Model will be funded by the Watermaster from water fees.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete and insufficient. The tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget. The proposed tasks do not reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal as presented in the project description. The scope of work described in the work plan is incomplete and insufficient to achieve the stated objective. For example, Task 1 only describes including data from the Watermaster and the Water Quality Authority. The work plan does not mention consolidating the collections of data maintained by any of the other local agencies discussed in the project description or coordinating with other agencies in the design process. If the DMS does not include data from other local agencies and is designed without input from other local agencies and, it is not clear how the DMS will meet basin-wide needs. Task 2, model construction, does not include any initial collaboration, planning, or design with the other local agencies that are identified in the project description. If the basic framework and design of the Model is developed without input from the local agencies, it is not clear how the Model will function as a common tool to meet regional water-management needs. The work plan does not present a complete plan for evaluating progress and performance for all of the steps of the proposed project. While the methodology that will be used to ensure quality control and performance is discussed for Task 1. Task 2 does not mention of QA/QC in most of the sub-tasks, except for the review of draft model documentation report, which occurs near the completion of the task. Task 3 does not discuss QA/QC. The task activities for collaboration and public outreach process are insufficient. Task 3 is allocated from a budget of \$26,100 for Public Outreach, Training, and Meetings, but also states that most public outreach activities will be conducted under another contract. Regardless of the source of funding, a work plan for this component of the project is required. Because the project proposes to create common tools, incorporating basin-wide data from multiple agencies in the DMS and developing a multi-use Model for regional water management, coordination and collaboration with other local agencies would be a necessary component of the project. Task 3 does not provide sufficient details to evaluate how this component of the project would be accomplished.
- **Budget:** This criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The budget is consistent with the work plan and schedule. The budget includes a summary of costs for each work plan task and a cost-breakdown table that details hourly rates, costs, and labor categories for each subtask. However, the basis of the labor hours used in the cost estimates is not clear. For example, subcontractor quotes are not included and an adequate breakdown of the hours is not provided to support the estimates. No funding match is included in the budget. The project description and work plan states that public outreach for the project (Task 3) will be conducted under another contract but the budget does not identify the other source of funding or the amount of funding for this work.
- **Schedule:** The schedule is fully addressed and provides thorough and well-presented documentation. Applicant presents a reasonable schedule that spans 17 months and falls within the designated timeframe in the PSP. The schedule contains realistic timelines for each task and agrees with work plan sequencing and budget. The application discusses how the schedule was derived and demonstrates readiness to proceed once funds become available.
- **QA/QC:** The application criterion is less than fully addressed and is incomplete and insufficient in documentation support and logical rationale. The application identifies personnel qualifications, and identifies QA/QC procedures for data entry, acquisition, and interpretation. The application identifies QA/QC procedures including ASTM standards for the development of the Model. However, the proposed conceptual model omits the hydrogeology (aquifer parameters), which is essential to the development of a sound groundwater flow and solute transport modeling analysis and a key component of a conceptual model, as described in ASTM D5447, which is cited in the application. QA/QC measures are not appropriately incorporated in the work plan, especially for Task 2.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and 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.