



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	West Valley Water District	County	San Bernardino
Project Title	Sentinel Well Project	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 549,500.00

Project Description: The Proposal installs the Sentinel Well for surveillance monitoring purposes to provide enough time to initiate mitigative measures to prevent contamination from reaching the water supply well, Rialto Well No. 6.

Evaluation Summary:

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

- **GWMP or Program:** The project is located in an adjudicated groundwater basin governed by the 1961 Rialto-Colton Decree and the 1969 Western Judgment.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Project Description adequately describes what the project will be (e.g., installation of a groundwater “sentinel” monitoring well). The objectives of installing the monitoring well are intended to enable operation of Rialto Well #6 which has been inoperable due to significant Perchlorate groundwater impact and to meet a DPH requirement for reoperation (97-005 surveillance criteria). The technical adequacy of the project is also in question since Perchlorate is already characterized as 10-100 times the maximum allowed for publicly supplied drinking water.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The project activities are well described with sufficient detail and are consistent with the budget and schedule. Monthly subcontractor reports and quarterly DWR reporting are presented as a strategy for evaluating progress (Project Management). However, there is no apparent stakeholder involvement for project progress status and oversight. In addition, it is not adequately presented how the sentinel well will add to more efficient operation of the Supply Well No. 6. The applicant is actively pursuing access to private property church vacant lot. The plan does adequately explain CEQA and permitting requirements.
- **Budget:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The design of the groundwater monitoring well investigation and installation work appears overly robust relative to acquisition of groundwater quality and level data. Based on the budget amounts (\$549,500 for one 850-foot-deep monitoring well), the budget assumptions are not a cost-effective means of gathering single point groundwater level and quality data that is needed to meet the project goals and objectives.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed and but not thoroughly documented. The schedule is presented in adequate detail that is consistent with the work plan and is within the PSP 2-year time allotment. However, in the summary provided, it is mentioned that the schedule includes 'float' which seems unnecessary. For example, 30 days are allowed for pilot borehole drilling and an additional 30 days are allowed for well installation. However, the driller’s quotes states that only 25-days are needed for both of these tasks, which seems adequate. The plan calls for multiple people to be assigned to the project that could enable several of the tasks to be done in parallel with others to reduce the project time.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and complete documentation and logical rationale are provided. For example, The QA/QA document cites multiple standards appropriate to well construction activities including: National Contingency Plan and CDHP standards, DWR Well Standards, OSHA requirements, and CEQA requirements.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and logical rationale are insufficient or incomplete. The documentation includes information on past project change orders with adequate justification. However, some details on past schedule and budget performance were missing from the attached project status reports (Exhibits A and B to Attachment 9, Past Performance). The missing documentation includes the originally planned schedules for both projects and the original budget on one of the projects (Exhibit A).