

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program*

### *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011*

**Applicant** City of Fortuna

**Amount Requested** \$3,394,652

**Proposal Title** Rohner Creek Flood Control and Riparian Habitat Improvement Project

**Total Proposal Cost** \$6,901,764

#### PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project will construct a 1,740 acre foot detention and recharge basin in a former mining pit, and will improve nearly a mile of an existing stormwater channel. The project will recharge 2,800 acre feet of storm water and an identical amount of recycled water for total recharge of 5,600 acre feet during an average rainfall year.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Points Possible
Work Plan	<b>9/15</b>	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	<b>12/12</b>
Budget	<b>3/5</b>	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	<b>6/12</b>
Schedule	<b>1/5</b>	Program Preferences	<b>6/10</b>
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	<b>4/5</b>		
<b>Total Score (max. possible = 64)</b>			<b>41</b>

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rational. Some tasks are of inadequate detail and do not demonstrate that the Proposal is ready for implementation. Work Plan provides an introduction that includes goals and objectives of the proposal; however, a clear project description is not provided. The scientific and technical information is not entirely completed and thus does not fully support the feasibility of the Work Plan. For example, the Work Plan states, on page 3, “The City is in the process of completing Task 6, Final Hydrological and Hydraulic Model Development, which will result in calibrated hydrologic and hydraulic model of Rohner Creek and up to six feasible alternatives for flood reduction.” Also, on page 9, it states that “once the alternatives discussed above are evaluated, they will be summarized in a letter report that will provide the City the information needed to determine which set of alternatives should be considered for final evaluation and concept development.” A listing of permits and their status including CEQA compliance is provided. The Applicant

has provided maps showing the project locations. Appropriate submittals, including quarterlies and final reports, are discussed.

### **Budget**

The Budget has detailed cost information and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the Budget categories is not fully supported and lacks detail. For example, the Budget does not show a breakdown of costs for quarterly reports, annual and final reports (sub-tasks 3.1-3.4). Additionally, the applicant states that they are still in the process of developing project alternatives therefore, it is difficult to determine the scope of the project and adequacy of the Budget information.

### **Schedule**

The Schedule indicates construction will not begin until at least 12 months after the anticipated grant award date October 1, 2011. Additionally, while Task 12 is listed as “Permitting”, in the Work Plan and the Budget, “Permitting” is listed as Task 13 in the Schedule. There are two tasks in the Schedule listed as “Task 13.”

### **Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures**

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Some of the project goals do not include Outcome Indicators. For example, Outcome Indicators for the project goals “Improving water quality in Rohner Creek and the downstream water bodies” and “Reduced potential for seismic event related change in flood damage” are blank. No explanation is provided for why these Outcome Indicators are not addressed.

### **Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits**

High levels of flood damage reduction and water supply benefits can be realized through this proposal, based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. The analysis is well supported and documented. Benefits are high even after adjustments to the final discounted values. Seismic retrofit benefits are also described but not quantified in dollars.

### **Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits**

Average levels of water quality and other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis was partially lacking and supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits are described as reduced sediment and habitat improvements, but no studies are cited nor quantitative analysis presented.

### **Program Preferences**

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within Hydrologic Region, Address Critical Water Supply or Water Quality Needs of Disadvantaged Communities within the Region, Environmental Stewardship, and Demonstrate an Integrated Approach to Flood Management. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.