PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	Santa Margarita Water District	**Amount Requested**	$5,000,000
Proposal Title	Santa Margarita Water District Prop 1E Gobernadora Multipurpose Basin Project Grant Proposal	**Total Proposal Cost**	$14,009,085

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project includes the development of the following: (1) Urban runoff water quality basin to improve water qualify for downstream riparian and wetlands areas; (2) Stormwater detention basin to protect downstream wetlands and riparian habitat from further erosion and deposition damage; (3) Collection system to capture and harvest drainage flows for recycled water use in the existing Portola Reservoir; and (4) Regional trail link for overall trail connection from Thomas F. Riley Park to Caspers Wilderness Regional Park.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**15/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**6/12**
Budget	**3/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**6/12**
Schedule	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**10/10**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**5/5**		
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**48**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well presented documentation and logical rationale. The Applicant has presented a detailed and specific Work Plan that adequately documents the Proposal. For example, the Work Plan is supported by maps, detailed tasks, plans and specifications consistent with the identified tasks, and other technical information that illustrate the feasibility and implementability of the proposed Project.

Budget

The criterion is less that fully addressed and supporting documentation is lacking. The Budget in the Proposal has some detailed cost information, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking. A summary Budget (Table 6), a detailed construction Budget, and Budget narrative are provided for the Project. The tasks shown in the Budget generally agree with the tasks shown in the Work Plan and Schedule. The Budget narrative contains explanations of how the project costs were estimated; however, there are some discrepancies. For example, for category (d) Construction the value shown in the narrative ($9,800,000) does not match the Budget summary (Table 6), which shows $6,912,790. The narrative also includes lump sum costs for some items (e.g., Land Purchase/Easement and Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement) and does not provide information or documentation on how those costs were developed. Lastly, Table 6 did not include column (e) % Funding Match, as requested in the PSP.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction between six and 12 months after the anticipated grant award date (October 1, 2011). The Schedule generally corresponds to the tasks described in the Work Plan; however, the names of the tasks in the Schedule do not exactly match the names of the tasks in the Work Plan. For example, the Schedule for Task 12 Construction does not include all three subtasks identified in the Work Plan. The Work Plan states Task 9 Environmental Documentation will be complete in May 2011; whereas, the Schedule indicates the task is scheduled to be complete at the end of June 2011.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Targets appear realistic and output and outcome indicators should effectively track project output and performance. It is feasible for the Targets to be met within the life of the Proposal.

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

Average levels of FDR and Water Supply Benefits can be realized through this Proposal; however, the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation is insufficient. Flood damage reduction estimates are based on history, primarily the 2010 floods, with extrapolation based on peak rainfall at the Santiago station and cost of repairs. Inundation maps are provided. Information provided for the Flood Damage Reduction Analysis is adequate. Water supply benefits claimed under the Water Supply Benefits Economic Analysis are based on 750 acre-feet per year of water that will be used for water recycling and harvesting. Documentation for how the 750 acre-feet per year are determined is not provided.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits can be realized through this Proposal; however, the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation is insufficient. Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits are $0.53 million, based on the amount of contribution by Orange County Parks times a discount factor. This is not an acceptable measure of Project benefit. Water quality and ecosystem benefits are briefly discussed qualitatively.

Program Preferences

The Proposal addresses the following Program Preferences: Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality, Expand Environmental Stewardship, and Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; and demonstrates a significant degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.