

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant City of San Marcos

Amount Requested \$6,079,129

Proposal Title

City of San Marcos-San Marcos Creek Floodway Improvement Project

Total Proposal Cost \$12,158,258

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The project addresses flooding, water supply, water quality, and other issues within San Marcos Creek, a perennial stream channel located adjacent to the City of San Marcos's downtown district. The intent of this proposal is to contain the 100-year storm flows within the channelized area of San Marcos Creek so that disadvantaged areas adjacent to the creek are removed from the floodplain. The project would restore native riparian vegetation within the regarded channel in order to increase nutrient uptake and reduce sediment flowing downstream into Lake San Marcos.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	9/12
Budget	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Schedule	1/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			36

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Much of the Work Plan and associated documentation are devoted to discussion of the larger San Marcos Creek's "Specific Plan and Floodway Improvement Project." It is well into the Proposal that the project components for which grant funding is being requested is discussed. Designs and specifications for the specific Project components are not provided. For example, the floodwall and storm drain alignments are not clear; areas and dimensions of channel grading are not indicated, and areas for environmental restoration are not provided. Because the requested Project appears to be a portion of the Specific Plan and Floodway Improvement Project it is unclear if the requested Project can provide intended benefits and attain the project goals and objectives as a standalone project. Further, the economic analysis provided in

Attachment 7 indicates “the proposed Project will require additional capital and maintenance costs to fully achieve the Project benefits.” These capital costs will include levees along the north bank of San Marcos Creek within the Project Area and a levee concrete pad. Therefore, the proposed Project does not appear to be operational as a standalone project.

Budget

The Budget has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking, particularly related to construction, for a majority of the items shown in the Budget. The Budget and Work Plan cannot be fully compared, because of details lacking in the Work Plan. For example, the Budget indicates large expenditures for sheet pile floodwall and concrete pipes; however, due to lack of documentation, these lengths and placements cannot be confirmed on plans or detailed discussion in the Work Plan. Although the Budget has detailed cost information and the costs appear to be reasonable, the Budget does not have supporting documentation to substantiate its cost basis. Specifically, no references are given to substantiate the “average of standard industry published rates” that are used as a basis for certain costs.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely consistent with the Work Plan. For example, the Schedule does not contain construction subtasks indicated in the Work Plan. Additionally, the Schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction more than 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). The Schedule depicts construction beginning December 4, 2012.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Insufficient information is provided about the Project funding is being requested for; therefore, it is difficult to determine if the performance measures can be achieved. Several of the performance measures, particularly related to water quality, seem to rely on other phases of the project and other programs being implemented. Additionally, two benefit types appear to be contradictory—“Increase Local Water Supply” by increasing total stormwater flow into Lake San Marcos appears to directly contradict the benefit type “Reduction in Stormwater Flows.” The Project is consistent with Basin Plan.

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

Average levels of FDR and water supply benefits can be realized through this Proposal based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. Total net present value (NPV) of costs is \$12.744 million. FDR claimed benefits are \$11.005 million. FDR benefits estimation could be improved by considering how damage per structure is related to depth. Water supply claimed benefits are \$1.96 million. The water supply benefit appears to be somewhat speculative.

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 is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation was partially unsubstantiated. Water quality and other claimed benefits are \$1.78 million. \$0.83 million are cost savings from reduced sediment dredging and oxygenation. This cost saving is based on similar work at Canyon Lake scaled down by the ratio of surface areas. \$0.95 million are reduced maintenance costs for the existing facilities based on 5 days a year for response crew, contractors and equipment/materials. Other benefits include habitat/creek restoration, and increased recreation opportunities.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management with Land Use Planning, and Practice Integrated 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.