



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Western Municipal Water District	County	Riverside
Project Title	Construction of Three Monitoring Wells in the Arlington Groundwater Basin	Grant Request	\$ 231,151.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 231,151.00

Project Description: The project locates, designs, and constructs three monitoring wells at key locations within the Arlington Basin. Wells gather groundwater level data, analyze impacts of groundwater pumping and used to conduct groundwater recharge pilot testing.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	5
Schedule	5
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	35

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is less than fully addressed because the GWMP for the basin encompassing the project is complete but will not be adopted by Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) until September 2012, after the final application filing date.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The applicant provides a complete detailed description of the proposed projects including goals of the proposal, necessary facilities, location description, and the affected area. In addition, the proposal demonstrates long-term need and merit for the proposed projects. Additionally, the proposal demonstrates that a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management will be obtained. The project proposes to install three groundwater monitoring wells (Project 1) to assess the impacts of proposed modifications to the Arlington Desalter facility and the project description includes clear and concise rationale for each well site in relation to the proposed groundwater artificial recharge sites and a potential phase II groundwater extraction well field for the desalter. In addition, the project description describes a second project (Project 2) goals and objectives of assessing benefits and impacts of various potential alternate groundwater recharge facility configurations. Project 2 includes appropriate groundwater modeling activities that will be performed to simulate groundwater levels and water quality responses to the potential recharge sites. A recharge pilot test at one of the most promising facilities is proposed, which seems logical to meet the objectives of Project 2. The applicant explains how ongoing use of the monitoring wells and recharge pilot test of the proposed projects will be funded once grant funds are expended. The proposal describes the quality and usefulness of the information that will be obtained, ensuring this information to be technically feasible.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed documentation is incomplete and sufficient. The applicant describes the task in sufficient detail to determine what will be completed and what will be the end product. Overall, the tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget, and can reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal. In addition, the tasks do relate to improving groundwater management but the applicant did not directly correlate it to the GWMP and the region’s IRWMP. The proposal presents a strategy for evaluating progress and performance for the overall proposed projects at each step. Tasks are presented in a logical sequence and task inter-dependencies are well described. The proposal adequately explains a plan for complying with CEQA, obtaining permits, and fulfilling any other applicable regulatory requirements.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by well-presented documentation. Rationale for the proposed budget is presented with some rationales given in the scope of work. A detailed breakdown of the project costs is included with rates and hours of professionals provided. The applicant did submit a budget table that was formatted like Table 3 of the PSP and provides explanatory text. The budget is consistent with the work plan and schedule, and presents cost share and grant share amounts consistent with those two attachments.
- **Schedule:** The applicant fully addresses the criterion with thorough and well-presented documentation. The timelines appear reasonable for the work to be performed. In addition, the proposal does present appropriate detailed tasks defining how the schedule was derived and that the project is able to proceed when funding becomes available. Furthermore, the start and end dates appear to be within the PSP-designated time frame.
- **QA/QC:** The applicant does not fully address the criterion and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant's only QA/QC is that all the work will be done by qualified personnel. The proposal does not provide well-defined specific-data quality objectives and measures. The applicant does cite that professionals performing the work will have proper certifications and licensures.
- **Past Performance:** The applicant does not fully address the criterion and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant describes three grants they managed or have been part of, including two DWR grants funded by Proposition 50. However, the proposal does not provide any supporting documentation and only provides inferences of the relative success of meeting project budgets and schedules.