



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	West Basin Municipal Water District	<b>County</b>	Los Angeles
<b>Project Title</b>	Water Quality Monitoring Wells Project	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 246,319.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 258,317.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal installs two monitoring wells in the West Coast Basin Barrier to monitor water quality and the interaction of recycled water in the groundwater basin.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	4
Schedule	3
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>34</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The project is located in the West Coast Basin which is an adjudicated groundwater basin managed by the Water Replenishment District Proof of adjudication is provided in Appendix A of the application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant proposes to install two new monitoring well along the West Coast Sea Water Intrusion Barrier in addition to its one existing well to better understand the interaction of injected recycled water with groundwater and thus allow for quick response to potential water quality issues. The project is in agreement with the goals and objectives of the adjudicated basin to protect and preserve water quality and mitigate sea water intrusion. The benefits and value of new knowledge gained are well explained and collaboration with other local and state agencies is well discussed. Additionally, applicant provides a detailed discussion on the outreach/education process that will be used to inform stakeholders and the public. Ongoing use of the project will be sustained through increased O&M budget.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Project deliverables are not clear or well organized. For example, Task 7 – Project Deliverables for Assessing Progress and Accomplishments: This task is not a full accounting of all project deliverables. For instance, missing is a reference to the draft and final Well Construction Data Report, as well as the DWR Driller’s well completion report, which are described under Task 5.5. Either Task 7 should include all project deliverables, or, each Task should clearly identify what deliverables are included for that task; and 2) Project deliverables are not sufficient for some tasks (Task 8 – Construction Outreach). Otherwise, applicant adequately addresses this criterion, including a Work Plan that is consistent with the budget and schedule, and includes tasks that both reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal and relate to improving GW management.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Budget:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. A reduced score is based on the following: Applicant does not adequately explain the “10% administrative fee that is applied to direct expenses and contractor costs” for Tasks 1 and 5 in the Budget table. This administration “fee” is in addition to the administration costs applicant accounts for in Task 1 (Project Administration), the task itself (Task 1) is “4.6% of the total project budget”; 2) Task 5 includes \$10,000 in site restoration fees, but provides no explanation to substantiate these lump sums; 3) Task 5 includes \$1,275 allocated to mileage but does not provide an explanation for what these costs cover; and 4) The costs for tasks 6 and 7 are supposedly included in Task 5, however, from the breakdown provided, it is not clear this is the case. Otherwise, applicant adequately addresses this criterion, including: a budget that is generally consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule, and does provide a detailed budget breakdown (that includes labor categories, estimated labor hours, hourly rates, and expenses) for most Tasks. A copy of the drilling contractor quote is provided and is consistent with the budget table and the work being proposed.
  
- **Schedule:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Applicant presents a schedule that starts and ends within the time frame stipulated in the PSP, however, the timescale shown in Fig. 7.1 over the duration of the project is confusing; 2) The timeline for submission of mandatory progress and final reports to DWR is not included in the schedule; 3) The timing of various activities under the Construction Outreach task is not indicated; and 4) Applicant does not explain how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule, or explain how the schedule was derived, both elements required by the PSP.
  
- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. A reduced score is based on the following: 1). Applicant does not discuss what QA/QC measures will be implemented for Task 8 - Construction Outreach. Otherwise, for other tasks, applicant adequately presents the procedural assurances and QA/QC measures that will be used, including the use of experienced professionals and industry standards for health and safety, construction, data and laboratory analyses. In addition, the QA/QC procedures specified in Attachment 8 are consistent and incorporated, as appropriate, into the project work plan as required by the PSP.
  
- **Past Performance:** 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: demonstrating, through performance on past projects, the capability to perform high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines for similar types of projects; and provides specific examples for projects that were completed on time and on budget. Documentation in support of successful completion of past projects is provided, and includes a Notice of Completion Letter documenting the completion of a \$9 Million dollar project funded by Proposition 13, and a Notice of Project Completion from the SWRCB for a Water Recycling Facility FS.