PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

City of Ontario - NEW MODEL COLONY STORM DRAIN PROJECT

	COMMENTS RECEIVED	RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
	WORK PLAN (9/15)		
1	The criterion is less than fully addressed or rationales are incomplete or insufficient.	Clarify incomplete nature and lack of sufficiency in the criterion.	N/A
2	A table with an abstract and project status is not included in the Proposal.	Please note that a table is not required per the PSP. The Work Plan Outline indicates the status of each Task.	Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_5of5
3	The "Purpose and Need" section notes that "By implementing a part of this treatment train, from on-site BMPs to regional stormwater treatment BMPs, as well as storm drain facilities, this project aims to provide an integrated approach in meeting NPDES requirements..." yet, there is not discussion of these facilities in the Budget or Schedule.	As outlined in the Work Plan, this Project is a part of a larger treatment train that extends throughout the Cucamonga Creek Watershed and down to Orange County. Components of this particular Project are included in the Budget and Schedule; however, it is out of the scope of this grant application to include a discussion on Budget and Schedule for all facilities that make up the entire treatment train.	N/A
4	A regional and Project map were provided, and outlines of the Project limits are included; however, there are no details provided on where the storm drains are to be constructed or any other construction location details.	Signed improvement plans, ready for construction, were submitted. Please note the attachements to the left.	Archibald Avenue Storm Drain Final (D11904-D11929).pdf Edison Avenue Storm Drain 95% Submittal.pdf Haven Avenue Storm Drain 95% Submittal.pdf
5	In the Work Plan, page 1, the main point of concern for Edison Avenue would be a ½ mile east/west of Archibald Ave. Yet, on page 4 of the Work Plan, the table associates 16,132 feet of roadway with Edison Avenue, and the plans submitted for Edison Avenue are for the entire road length, making it unclear as to how much of Edison Avenue is actually included in the Project.	The limits of Edison Avenue are as noted on Page 1 and reflected on the Regional Map, Project Map and in the Budget. The table on page 4 is an excerpt from the Water Quality Management Plan Guidance - NMC East. As a master planned street, the design effort addresses the full limits within the NMC - East; however, the construction limits for this Proposal are as outlined throughout the application.	Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_1of5 Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_2of5 Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_3of5 Att4_SWP_Budget_1of3
6	Some main water bodies called out in the description of the Work Plan were Cucamonga Creek channel and Prado Basin, yet they are not shown on the maps.	A regional map showing the project limits for this Proposal was provided per the grant guidelines. Additional documentation can be provided to clarify the locations of the Cucamonga Creek and Prado Basin.	Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_2of5
7	Many of the tasks are missing deliverables.	Please clarify the missing deliverables noted in the comment. Deliverables are included for Tasks 1 - 8 and not included for Tasks 9 - 11, consistent with Table 5 on page 29 of the PSP.	Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_5of5
8	CEQA documents were provided; however, the document cited is the General Plan EIR adopted in January 2010. There is no discussion about any Project specific environmental documentation.	CEQA for this project was completed as part of the City's General Plan's EIR. No additional specific environmental documentation is required for Master Planned elements.	N/A
9	Task 7 status (Permitting) on page 1 of Completed Work states that the 401 and 404 permits determinations were included in the completed connection, but documentation was not provided.	A copy of the permits was not requested in the PSP but can be provided upon request.	N/A
10	There is significant level of detail in the detailed Budget that should be reflected in the Work Plan.	The Budget follows the Work Plan outline. Please clarify concerns not addressed in the Work Plan.	Att4_SWP_Budget_1of3 Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_5of5

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

City of Ontario - NEW MODEL COLONY STORM DRAIN PROJECT

	COMMENTS RECEIVED	RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
11	Specifications were stated as "ongoing" were not provided; however, design drawings were included.	Project specifications are covered by the City's standard specifications as noted and referenced on the plans. A construction bid-set will be generated with the bid documents noted under the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule.	Archibald Avenue Storm Drain Final (D11904-D11929).pdf Edison Avenue Storm Drain 95% Submittal.pdf Haven Avenue Storm Drain 95% Submittal.pdf
	BUDGET (2/5)		
12	The criterion for the Budget was marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. A detailed Project Budget and summary was provided; however, the summary descriptions did not provide clear explanations. For example, time equivalents for staff involvement were stated as 0.15 or 0.1 PY; however, there were no descriptions or examples of how those time equivalents were calculated.	The Project Administration costs, including the PY time equivalent of staff involvement and the blended rate are explained in the Budget Narrative as being "based on the City's construction experience" and are considered accurate based on comparable projects managed by the City.	Att4_SWP_Budget_3of3
13	Disciplines, hours, and hourly wages per discipline were not included; instead, a blended rate consisting of a variety of staff positions was given, without supporting documentation.	The Project Administration costs, including the PY time equivalent of staff involvement and the blended rate are explained in the Budget Narrative as being "based on the City's construction experience" and are considered accurate based on comparable projects managed by the City.	Att4_SWP_Budget_3of3
14	The design task Budget does not explain why it will take $220,000 to bring the design plans from 90% and 95% to construction bid documents, or why they will need to select a consultant for this work.	The Budget Narrative Section C explains that the $220,000 refers to "final construction documents". The final design efforts are in reference to the creation of a "final construction documents" to address the storm drain installation for the existing conditions.	Att4_SWP_Budget_3of3
15	The Budget Narrative notes in Row (d) Construction/ Implementation, that "the Project's Engineer Cost Estimate for Construction of the Project is estimated at $5,429,215"; however, this is the cost for Phase 1 only.	The Budget Narrative should have listed the overall construction cost of $11,436,735.	N/A
16	The construction category contained more information than was given in the Work Plan with relation to construction items for Phase I, II, and III; however, there is no supporting documentation to justify the construction unit cost estimates, and there was no mention of the NSBB or CDS Units cited in the Work Plan.	The Work Plan addresses under Task 9 the elements of work detailed in the budget. Unit costs are based on the City's experience with prior public works projects as well as local projects in the county, which is standard practice for public works and considered to be accurate. NSBB and CDS units should have been listed for installation on Haven and Archibald Avenues and were inadvertantly ommited.	Att3_SWP_WorkPlan_5of5 Att4_SWP_Budget_3of3

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011
City of Ontario - NEW MODEL COLONY STORM DRAIN PROJECT

	COMMENTS RECEIVED	RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
17	In addition, there was no supporting documentation for Categories E, F, G, or H.	Please note that Categories E, F, G, H are detailed under both the notes of the Budget Summary and the Budget Narrative. Category E – Storm water compliance monitoring under the new permit is estimated at this point as the new permit implementation has not been in practice at the time of the application. Category F – Construction Administration costs are explained as being 5% of the construction costs in the Budget Narrative, which is standard practice and consistent with the City's experience. Category G – Construction documents are in process of being finalized and final permit and inspection costs are estimates as explained in the Budget Narrative. Category H – Construction Contingencies are explained in the Budget Narrative as being 10% of the construction hard costs, and are considered prudent practice within public works.	Att4_SWP_Budget_1of3 Att4_SWP_Budget_3of3
	SCHEDULE (3/5)		
18	The criterion is not entirely consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction between six and 12 months after the award date.	The Project consists of three phases with separate construction start dates. Please see Lines 83 through 104 for the bid awards. Construction, with Phase I is scheduled to begin on 6/18/12, consistent with time frames indicated under the PSP. Please clarify the lack of consistency noted in comments.	Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2
19	The Schedule for the Archibald Avenue design is not reasonable.	The Schedule and Work Plan (Task 5) state that 100% design for Archibald is complete; therefore, additional design time is not required. The time listed in the schedule is for "Construction Document Preparation" as stated on the Project Schedule, line item 67. Please clarify the concern regarding the schedule not being reasonable.	Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2 Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5
20	The Schedule is more detailed than the Work Plan and Budget, but is difficult to evaluate. For example, Task 9.2 in the Work Plan – Construction, cannot be compared to the Schedule because the tasks are not listed or numbered.	The Work Plan Task 9.2 states that each phase "requires similar construction approaches" and, as such, the general construction components were listed only once. The components contained within Task 9 "Construction" in the Work Plan are clearly labeled "Construction" in the schedule. The construction schedule outlines the same tasks at a detailed phase specific level. Please note additionally that the schedule is designed to provide a chronolgical sequence of events necessary for the project to be completed and cannot be completely a match to either a Work Plan or Budget, that are designed to be functional in nature.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5 Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011
City of Ontario - NEW MODEL COLONY STORM DRAIN PROJECT

	COMMENTS RECEIVED	RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
21	The Schedule provides a breakdown of three construction phases for Archibald, Haven, and Edison Avenue; however, the Work Plan does not break down construction by phases.	Please see above.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5 Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2
	MONITORING, ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES (2/5)		
22	The criterion is marginally addressed, and documentation and rationales are incomplete and insufficient.	The criterion described in narrative and tabular forms were prepared specifically to be used to develop the project Monitoring Plan if the grant application were successful (as specified in the proposal solicitation package). Please clarify where criterion is addressed marginally or insufficiently.	N/A
23	When claiming water quality benefits, it would be appropriate to include water quality sampling to verify this benefit is achieved.	Please note that both the Performance Measures Narrative and Performance Measures table describe that water quality benefits will be measured through "monitor(ing) and report(ing) gross solid pollutant load removals" which would indicate the fulfillment of "the Statewide Priority of reducing pollutant loads of suspended solids and sediments, thereby producing improved regional water resources".	Att6_SWF_Measures_1of2 Att6_SWF_Measures_2of2
24	A baseline should be established when comparing pre-project vs. post-project benefits.	Some baseline data is available and other would be modeled through development of the Monitoring Plan.	N/A
25	Outcome indicators and targets for improved regional flood protection and sustainable flood water management are not clearly explained.	The Performance Measures Narrative states "Costs associated with flooding and flood risk, including roadway maintenance and repairs, will be quantified and tracked pre- and post-project, resulting in a measurement of the project's success in meeting this project performance goal" thus providing a measurable outcome indicator for the target of reducing costs related to roadway flooding and closures associated with flooding. Please clarify areas that lack the clarity requested.	Att6_SWF_Measures_1of2 Att6_SWF_Measures_2of2
26	The proposed targets are not measurable. For example, in the targets column it is stated that the applicant will compare post-project maintenance costs to "other similar improved roadway areas". It would be more appropriate to compare pre-project maintenance costs to that of post-project maintenance costs of the same project.	Please note that both the Performance Measures Narrative and table specifically state that pre- and post-project costs associated with maintenance will be quantified, with the "Target" (or goal) being to bring these sections of roadway more in line with similar improved roadways in the region.	Att6_SWF_Measures_1of2 Att6_SWF_Measures_2of2
27	Overall, the monitoring and performance measures were too general where they should have been specific to the individual Project and objective.	Please see first comment above, this section.	N/A

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011
City of Ontario - NEW MODEL COLONY STORM DRAIN PROJECT

	COMMENTS RECEIVED	RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS - FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION AND WATER SUPPLY BENEFITS (3/12)		
28	Only low 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. Output from an FDR analysis was displayed in Table 12, and demonstrates that the present value of FDR benefits would be just over $2 million (as compared to a project cost of ($11.6 million). These FDR benefit estimates appear to be consistent with the other data and assumptions provided in the footnotes to Table 11 and in the text.		
29	Modeling or other analysis to justify the physical damages avoided with-project was not described.	Please note that "Description of methods used with- and without-project" section describes the methodology used to determine both with- and without-project costs. Furthermore, all assumptions related to the with- and without-project scenarios are documented in Table 11 and in Exhibits A through C.	Att7_SWF_DReduc_1of2
	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS - WATER QUALITY AND OTHER EXPECTED BENEFITS (6/12)		
30	Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis was partially lacking and/or supporting documentation was partially unsubstantiated.	Extensive research was conducted in preparation of the adopted Water Quality Management Plan guidance document for the NMC-East development (May 2008), which informed modeling and additional calculations cited in the application submittal (see "Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_2of2"). Please clarify where the analysis provided is partially lacking or where additional supporting information is unsubstantiated.	Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_2of2
31	Water quality benefits were described as avoided sediment load and other surface pollutants carried by stormwater. They were estimated as equal to the cost of the water quality components of the project, net of maintenance costs, and then escalated over time at 2.5%. This is not an appropriate way to estimate benefits.	The water quality benefits were calculated as stated except that the escalation factor of 2.5% for future water treatment costs was applied prior to subtracting the operations and maintenance costs (which also had an applied escalation factor for the increasing cost of labor). The escalation factor is used as a conservative estimate of increases in water treatment costs over the life of the project, to bring future costs to the present value for comparison.	Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_1of2 Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_2of2
32	Other benefits were briefly mentioned but not quantified.	Extensive studies detailing the actual benefits to the Prado Basin ecosystem were not conducted as part of the drainage plan; however, it is understood and clearly described in this application as well as the referenced IRWMP ("One Water One Watershed") that this project, in combination with the other projects detailed in the IRWMP, will improve conditions in an integrated fashion.	Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_2of2

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

City of Ontario - NEW MODEL COLONY STORM DRAIN PROJECT

	COMMENTS RECEIVED	RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
	PROGRAM PREFERENCES (6/10)		
33	The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within hydrologic region and Practice Integrated Flood Management. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lack thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.	Achievement of the Program Preferences noted is explained throughout the application as well as in the Program Preferences as being "one of the initial steps in the region's water quality treatment train". These claims are also clearly supported through the project's inclusion in the region's IRWMP ("One Water One Watershed"). Please clarify basis of assessment that the Proposal demonstrates a "limited degree of certainty" that the Program Preferences can be achieved as well as the additional lack of documentation. The application describes in great detail the manner in the which the Proposal will achieve the Program Preferences noted.	Att11_SWF_Preference_1of1 Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_1of5