



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Applicant	Yucaipa Valley Water District	County	San Bernardino
Project Title	Development of the Yucaipa Groundwater Management Plan	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 330,000.00

Project Description: The project prepares and develops the Yucaipa Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP). YVWD prepares the GWMP for the Yucaipa Groundwater Basins to promote sustainable and reliable management.

Evaluation Summary:

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

- **GWMP or Program:** The Proposal is for the development of a Ground Water Management Plan, thus no GWMP or equivalent was formally adopted by the submittal date. The Proposal intends to complete and adopt the GWMP by November 2014.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less-than fully addressed and documentation and logical rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The application provides a complete detailed description of the proposed project including goals of the proposal and the affected area. In addition, the applicant demonstrated collaboration with other local public agencies with regards to the management of the affected groundwater basin. The proposal partially demonstrates that a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management will be obtained that is consistent with the development of goals and objectives of a GWMP. However, the section titled, Quality and Usefulness of GWMP, only paraphrases what the section should address, rather than how the project addresses certain groundwater management needs of the basin. Because the applicant states that the basin is technically in a state of overdraft and concisely provides a summary of the water balance of the basin, it appears that a strong understanding already exists for groundwater conditions and that external constraints limit the ability to derive meaningful benefits from implementing basin management objectives.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed but documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The application describes the tasks in reasonably sufficient detail to determine what will be done and what the product will be. Overall, the tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget, and do relate to improving groundwater management. The proposal states that this project is not expected to need access to private property. The proposal clearly explains why the project is exempt from CEQA, obtaining permits, and fulfilling any other applicable regulatory requirements. However, subtask 3.1, Groundwater Model Construction and Flow Model Calibration, appears insufficient because it does not provide any description of how the groundwater flow model will be developed and tested. The description for Subtask 3.4 suggests that limitations for the flow and solute transport model may exist, which calls into question the model’s appropriateness for running transient predictive scenarios. The general lack of detailed description of the groundwater modeling efforts prevents the reviewer’s ability to determine if the modeling effort is sufficient enough to achieve the goals of the project. The last sentence of Subtask 8.1 states, “A tentative Table of Contents is provided on the following page.” However, no Table of Contents is provided.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

- **Budget:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule. The proposal also identifies other sources of funding and how each task pertains to them but does not provide where those sources are coming from. No justification is provided for using only relatively high labor rate personnel for the entire project.
- **Schedule:** The applicant fully addressed the criterion with thorough and well-presented documentation. The timelines seem to be realistic for the work to be performed and agree with the sequencing presented in the work plan and budget. The proposal does present appropriate detailed tasks defining how the schedule was derived and shows that the project will be able to proceed when funding becomes available from the start date being used. The start and end dates appear to be within the PSP designated time frame.
- **QA/QC:** The applicant fully addressed the criterion with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides well-defined specific data objectives and details of appropriate QA/QC measures for each each task. The QA/QC is consistent with what is presented in the work plan.
- **Past Performance:** The applicant fully addressed the criterion with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant demonstrated that they are capable of performing high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines by providing supporting documentation from past USBR grant performances.