



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

<b>Applicant</b>	Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency	<b>County</b>	Ventura
<b>Project Title</b>	Ojai Groundwater Basin Inflow/Outflow Study	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 181,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 181,000.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal measures surface water inflow to the Ojai Basin and measures outflow along San Antonio Creek. This data helps to quantify and supplant indirect measurements of inflow to the basin used in previous studies, as well as provide key information to deduce the annual recharge to the basin and bracket groundwater extractions or other uptakes.

### Evaluation Summary:

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

- **GWMP or Program:** The GWMP was adopted by the Board of Directors of the Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Authority (OBGMA) on June 28, 2007 as evidenced by Resolution No. 2007-6, included in the application. Attachment 3, Status of the Groundwater Management Plan, includes a summary of the GWMP and progress made in implementing it. Also attached to the application was the full GWMP.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** This criterion is addressed and thoroughly documented. The study is consistent with and supports the goal set forth in the GWMP to improve understanding of basin hydrology. Collaboration with other agencies regarding management of the basin is discussed and applicant outlines the outreach process that will be used to inform stakeholders. OBGMA is comprised of multiple local agencies including the Ojai Water Conservation District, City of Ojai, Casitas Municipal Water District, Golden State Water Company, and mutual water companies. Ongoing monitoring and data gathering activities from the installed instruments after the project will be included in the applicant’s annual budget from extraction fees levied on pumpers.
- **Work Plan:** This criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. Applicant provides sufficient detail of activities that will be performed but deliverables for each task are not clearly identified. In addition, the methodology for ensuring progress and performance is not sufficiently discussed and the process for disseminating information though well described in the project description is not included as an activity in the work plan. There is no mention of preparation of quarterly reports in the work plan, although it is included in the budget and schedule. Otherwise, the listed tasks should fulfill the proposal. The applicant states that encroachment permits will be obtained from appropriate agencies for the proposed installation locations, all of which are on public right-of-way. Because the proposal is effectively a study, there are no anticipated CEQA obligations.
- **Budget:** This criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. Applicant presents a budget that is consistent with the work plan and schedule but supporting documentation is insufficient. For example, the basis of the estimates of cost for gage purchases and labor for installation are not provided. Similarly, the breakdown of the 190 man-hours used in Task 2 is not provided and a lump sum amount of \$3,000 is allocated for website update which was not included in the work plan or explained anywhere in the application. In addition, Task 5 - Reporting, includes 25 monthly OBGMA reports at \$200/each (total: \$5,000). Monthly reports seem excessive for the requirements of the grant. Generally, it is difficult to determine the reasonableness of the estimates because the breakdown presented is inadequate.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

---

- **Schedule:** This criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. The schedule is inconsistent with the work plan and budget. For example, two of the report types under Task 5 are not included under Task 5 in the work plan (the design report and the quarterly reports). Also, the website update included under Task 5 in the budget is not indicated in the schedule. Otherwise, applicant presents a reasonable schedule beginning at PSP designated start time of April 2013 and demonstrates readiness to proceed soon after grant award.
  
- **QA/QC:** This criterion is addressed and thoroughly documented. All work will be conducted under direct supervision of the Project Manager, a licensed hydrogeologist, with experience in in-stream flow monitoring. Applicant presents well-defined QA/QC measures that will be used including standard operating processes, protocols and guidelines that are relevant to project task including multiple layers of technical reviews of work product and adherence to relevant USGS series of manuals on Techniques and Methods and the use of a certified professional for oversight of the work to be performed.
  
- **Past Performance:** This criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Applicant documents successful completion of a previous grant received from DWR showing the grant was completed on schedule and within budget. The attached Past Performance Evaluation on the 2008 LGA (4600008195) indicates the grantee completed the project on time and under budget and provided all required deliverables including quarterly reports and overall performance was described as “very satisfactory.”