



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	City of San Buenaventura	<b>County</b>	Ventura
<b>Project Title</b>	Upper Ventura River Basin Surface Water/Groundwater Interaction Study	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 249,614.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 249,614.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal conducts a surface water/groundwater interaction study in the Upper Ventura River Basin in order to advance the development of a Groundwater Management Plan.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	0
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	3
Schedule	5
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>32</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is not addressed. Applicant states that the proposed study is located in the Upper Ventura River sub-basin where currently, there is no formal GWMP and further states that guidance policies in the form of Ordinance (Ventura County Well Ordinance sections 4813 and 4826) is in place as the primary framework for managing groundwater along the Ventura River. However, a copy of the well ordinance is not provided. In addition, applicant states that the proposed study is an essential step in a 5-step process outlined in advancing the development of a formal GWMP through the Groundwater Subcommittee created to plan and implement the study and ultimately the GWMP but does not include in the schedule a timeline for achieving this goal.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** This criterion is addressed and thoroughly documented. Applicant presents a clear and detailed discussion of the proposal and the benefits to groundwater management. Applicant further discusses the need for the study and the value of the knowledge gained and explains that datasets developed within the study will serve as essential inputs to basin-specific groundwater models. The proposed study is consistent with AB 3030 guidance on formalizing local groundwater and supports the development of a GWMP. The Outreach process that will be used to inform stakeholders is adequately described. The application adequately demonstrates the Ventura River Watershed Council will continue data collection utilizing the project after completion.
- **Work Plan:** This criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Applicant provides sufficient detail of activities that will be performed including deliverables for each task. The listed tasks should fulfill the proposal. An outreach process is in place to solicit participation and input from stakeholders and to disseminate information and outreach activities are included as part of the work plan. In addition, strategy for ensuring quality control and performance at each step is well discussed and incorporated in the task activities. Several of the proposed sites in the study are adjacent to or located on properties owned by participating agencies and applicant discussed how access will be obtained on private property if necessary. The study qualifies for an exemption under CEQA and the appropriate code is cited.
- **Budget:** This criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. Applicant presents a realistic and well detailed budget with reasonable assumptions. The basis of cost estimates are a combination of past experience on similar work and proposals from local consultants for comparable work. However, no documentation is provided in support of the consultant's quotes. Additionally, applicant states in the work plan under Task 2.1 that "the budget includes installation of 20 data loggers and weekly soundings at an additional 10 wells", but the budget is not consistent with the work plan because only the cost of collecting data from these instruments is included in the budget. It is not clear if these items are already installed.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Schedule:** This criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Applicant presents a reasonable schedule that spans 2 years beginning at PSP designated start time of April, 2013 and demonstrates readiness to proceed soon after grant award. Timelines for each task are realistic and agrees with work plan sequencing and budget. Potential obstacles are discussed as follows: “As part of the MOA, several municipal groundwater producers have already agreed to participate in the project. This guarantees access to the minimum number of groundwater wells.
  
- **QA/QC:** This criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. Applicant presents well-defined QA/QC measures that will be used including a quality assurance plan and standard operating procedures with flow measurements made using USGS standards in addition to weekly review of data and activities in effort to identify anomalies and make adjustments. Professional qualifications are only mentioned in general terms. The selected consultant will be required to have appropriate qualifications and relevant experience to perform the work. The QA/QC methods are well incorporated into the work on a task by task basis and should ensure high quality product is achieved. However, the application did not include any details regarding the qualifications or experience needed by whatever staff will be performing the work.
  
- **Past Performance:** This criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Applicant documents the various grants it has received from other state and federal agencies that are either just getting underway or ongoing with one grant completed on schedule and within budget. Applicant also documents performance on projects that are similar to the current proposal although these are not grant funded programs. Completion dates, end dates, status and amounts are provided.