

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant City of Upland	Amount Requested	\$2, 500,000
Proposal Title 14th Street Storm Water Collection/Integration Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,000,000

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The project that will provide flood protection by capturing and conveying storm flows to Upland Basin. The additional benefits such as water quality and ground water recharge through the construction of a detention/retention basin will allow recharge of storm flows into multiple aquifer basins and the decrease of pollutants and silt transportation into downstream sensitive habitat/species areas such as Santa Ana River and Prado Dam. In addition, the proposed project will be capable of mitigating flood damage and loss of life from a potential catastrophic San Antonio Dam failure.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	3/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	6/12
Budget	2/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	3/12
Schedule	1/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	1/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			22

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criteria is marginally addressed and not documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Proposal includes a map showing relative project location. A tabulated overview of the project including an abstract and project status is omitted. The Work Plan does not list the goals and objectives of the Proposal or discuss how the Proposal relates to the IRWM Plan. The Work Plan does not include Project tasks and adequate details describing those tasks. Therefore, it is clear that the proposal cannot be implemented. The submittal of quarterly and final reports is not discussed. A list of permits and their status including CEQA compliance are not included. No documentation is evident for the consistency with the design tasks because none of the project tasks are included. Supporting scientific and technical information is not

provided to support the feasibility of the project. The Proposal does not discuss if the project is operational as a standalone project.

Budget

The Budgets does not have detailed cost, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking for all of the Budget categories. Cost estimates are provided only as related to construction costs, but with no supporting documentation or explanation to support their validity. Cost estimates and supporting documentation are not provided for any of the other budget categories. The Budget does not provide hours and rates of involved personnel and does not describe how matching funds would be provided.

Schedule

The Schedule does not follow the work items presented in the Work Plan and Budget and is clearly not reasonable. Since neither the Schedule nor the Work Plan contain tasks, it is not possible to compare the two to determine if their tasks correspond.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures criteria is minimally addressed and not documented. Project Performance Measures Table described in Proposal Solicitation Package is not included in the Proposal. A few Outcome Indicators are listed as bullet points, but lack documentation to demonstrate they can be achieved. Additionally, the Proposal does not include a discussion of Measurement Tools and Methods or Targets.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of water supply and other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis was partially lacking and supporting documentation is absent. Tables required for Attachments 7 and 8 (or equivalent information) are not included. Applicant claimed to have used existing models, but no input data or assumptions are described. The water supply benefits calculations does not account for the cost of re-pumping the water that percolated to groundwater. Present value of benefits are claimed to be \$5.9 million in avoided disruption of services and \$6.8 million in avoided damage to structures. However, the reviewer had no way to assess these calculations or the data and assumptions used because the information is not provided in the application.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Low levels of water quality and other benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. Water quality benefits are briefly described as providing an opportunity for treatment of stormwater and improving groundwater quality. These benefits are not quantified, and no data is provided to assess the potential magnitude of the water quality benefits.

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, Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently 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.