

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Amount Requested	\$1,315,032
Proposal Title	Lower Mission Creek Flood Control and Restoration Project – Reach 1A Phase II	Total Proposal Cost	\$2,948,901

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

This Project is part of the overall 1.3-mile Lower Mission Creek Flood Control & Restoration Project. Reach 1A – Phase II provides the rehabilitation and reconstruction of a section of lower Mission Creek from Mason Street downstream approximately 230 feet. This Project will improve flood flow conveyance, reduce erosion, and improve water quality. It will also enhance the natural streambed features and provide a pocket park just downstream of the Mason Street Bridge. The primary goal of this project is to continue the reconstruction of Reach 1A between State Street and Mason Street to improve flood flow conveyance.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	6/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	3/12
Budget	2/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	3/12
Schedule	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			25

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is marginally addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The identified tasks are commensurate with delivering the Project; however, there is not enough detail on how the Project will be implemented and achieve project goals. For example, subtask 9.2 Project Construction only discusses the duration of construction and labor compliance and does not discuss construction activities. The Work Plan states that 100% Design is complete, but there is no indication that the plans submitted are from the 100% Design submittal, and there are no specifications included with the application. There are also no monitoring tasks identified in the Work Plan (although there are pre-construction endangered species monitoring tasks included in the Schedule). There is no demonstration

that the Project is a stand-alone project that can function without improvements to other reaches of Lower Mission Creek.

Budget

The Budget has some detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all the costs appear reasonable. Supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. There is no explanation or documentation for how the project costs were estimated. The Budget categories do not agree with the tasks identified in the Work Plan or Schedule (i.e., different task names/headings are used in each attachment). The Work Plan indicates that the City of Santa Barbara will be purchasing the 15 West Mason Street property and the County of Santa Barbara has obtained all other easements, but no costs are included in the Project Budget under Land Purchase/Easement. Costs associated with monitoring endangered species (e.g., tidewater goby and steelhead) would be expected before, during, and after construction, but these costs are not included in the Budget.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely reasonable and not consistent with the Workplan and Budget. The tasks shown on the Schedule do not match those in the Work Plan or Budget. For example, the Schedule included pre-construction tasks for endangered species monitoring, which were not included in the Work Plan or Budget. The level of detail provided in the Schedule is insufficient. For example, the Schedule should include a list of major Construction subtasks with their estimated timeline. Also, the Schedule should include a timeline for submission of quarterly and final reports. Lastly, the Work Plan states that the project design is complete and the Budget does not include any costs for design; however, the Schedule indicates the design will be completed January 30, 2012, which appears inconsistent. The Construction award date is April 13, 2012, i.e., 6 ½ months after the anticipated grant award date (October 1, 2011).

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The targets are feasible to obtain within the life of the project, but are not presented as quantitative metrics. The output indicators and outcome indicators are too general. There are no specifics regarding the tools, methods, and criteria that will be used to measure whether or not the three goals of the project (improvements to flood flow conveyance, habitat, and water quality) will be met. Baseline measurements are not included for the habitat improvement and water quality improvement with which to determine project success. For example, there is no baseline information regarding current habitat conditions for endangered species and the application does not include any methods for how this goal can or will be measured.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits

Low to average levels of Flood Damage Reduction Benefits can be realized through this Proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. However, an unreasonable process is used to determine project benefits. The Applicant assigns a percentage of the benefits available from the larger Lower Mission Creek project to this reach of the project without a clear rationale. The Applicant should calculate the expected annual damages that would occur from implementing the portion of the project grant money is being requested for. The damages for the with- and without-project conditions are not supported by any inundation maps, depths of flooding, or quantification of the inundated structures. The analysis includes several other errors. For example, the Applicant uses a 6% escalation rate to inflate project costs, this is not acceptable. The Applicant also uses the wrong updating factors to determine project cost and event damage. No Water Supply Benefits are claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Low to average levels of Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits can be realized through this Proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. There is only a brief qualitative discussion of Water Quality or Other Expected Benefits. No quantitative analysis is presented. Other Expected Benefits include environmental enhancement and aesthetic benefits.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements multiple Program Preferences including: Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality, Expand Environmental Stewardship, and Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently. 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.