

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
 Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
 Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011
CITY OF CHINO - PINE AVENUE STORM DRAIN PROJECT

COMMENTS RECEIVED		CLARIFICATION RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
WORK PLAN (6/15)			
1	The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient.	Please clarify the incomplete nature and lack of sufficiency in addressing the criterion and submitting documentation.	N/A
2	The applicant did not provide a summary description of the Project scope. The Work Plan conflicts with other parts of the application. For example, the Goals and Objectives specifically discuss how the Project will address stormwater management issues that affect Pine Avenue, and the Program Preferences state that "This grant project focuses solely on improvements to Pine Avenue within the Preserve project area." Yet, the Proposal implies that the Phase 1 Storm Drain System provides extensive utilities to areas of new development in the Preserve Project area.	This Application does not contain multiple projects under the proposal, just one project – the Pine Avenue Storm Drain Crossing. The proposal is a single storm drain crossing (no phasing) that requires the roadway currently subject to high frequency flooding to be raised with associated elements of construction included in the work plan, budget, schedule and other project delivery components. No additional Preserve related work is proposed.	N/A
3	The following plans were submitted, although not discussed: Culvert Improvement Plan, Water Improvement Plans for Tract Nos. 17571 and 17572, Street Improvement Plans for Tract Nos. 17571 and 17626, Off-site Street Improvement Plans for Tract No. 17572 & Portion of Tract No. 17057.	The plans were provided as supporting documentation for the Work Plan's discussion on the level of completion of design efforts. The Project Map indicated the area of work, the work plan (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 1, Task 5) indicates level of completion of design efforts. Storm Drains plans (primary element of project) were provided and Street Improvement plans with associated underground improvements such as water were provided with description of level of completeness.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 1, Task 5
4	Task 4 - Assessment and Evaluation states that all environmental studies have been completed, yet no description of what those studies were is provided.	The Council Resolution adopting the City of Chino Preserve Specific Plan EIR was provided, which describes that the EIR and all associated studies were completed and that the EIR provides for the full annexation by the City of the agricultural preserve area as well as all master plans and supporting environmental documents. Based on discussions with DWR staff, the full EIR was not required as an attachment, only provision of the adoption of the full EIR and associated technical studies. The Council Resolution was provided. The Work Plan Outline (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5, page 2, Task 4) indicates the title of assessment study "City of Chino Preserve Specific Plan EIR" and includes the adoption date of March 25, 2003. This reference is further noted in "Completed Work" (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 1, Task 6) and "Existing Data and Studies" (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 2, item #1).	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5, page 2, Task 4 Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 1, Task 6 Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 2, item #1
5	Task 6 - Environmental Documentation states "CEQA document completed and adopted" but no portion of the CEQA document was provided.	Please see above.	Please see above.
6	Resolution 2003-15 adopted a Programmatic EIR. No discussion or work tasks were provided to obtain Project specific CEQA clearance.	Please note that no additional CEQA review is required for the Proposal. The documentation completed is sufficient for the Master Planned Infrastructure work outlined in the Proposal.	N/A
7	Existing data and studies were included and two reports were provided; however, there was no description as to what data these reports contained.	The data and studies are described in the titles (Chino Preserve Natural Treatment Master Plan and Chino Preserve Master Plan of Drainage) and were included with the application as reference for supporting the Pine Avenue Storm Drain in both areas. The studies were incorporated into the text of the Work Plan as follows: The Natural Treatment Master Plan is referenced in "Goals and Objectives" (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_1of5) The Master Plan of Drainage is referenced in the "Work Plan Outline" (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5, Task 5) Both studies are cited in "Existing Data and Studies" (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 2).	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_1of5 Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5, Task 5 Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_3of5, page 2

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
 Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
 Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011
CITY OF CHINO - PINE AVENUE STORM DRAIN PROJECT

COMMENTS RECEIVED	CLARIFICATION RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
8 The scope of work was provided with tasks; however, not enough detail and supporting documentation was provided. For example, Task 5 - Final Design implies that all of the work will take place on Pine Avenue and contains very broad listing of tasks including full street right of way width grading, relocation or undergrounding of Southern CA Edison distribution facilities, and partial street improvements (2 lanes and raised median), but does not mention the water lines or off site street improvements.	Please clarify the additional details necessary to provide clarification to the scope of work. In the specific example provided, the project does not include any off site street improvements. The Project Workplan Outline (Task 5 - Final Design) indicates grading, street improvements, storm drainage and relocation of SCE distribution facilities. Additional detail on the components on the street improvements could have been included for elements such as the underground utilities; however, these elements are included in the street improvements and were intended to be implied.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5, Task 5
9 It is difficult to confirm if the "storm drainage structures and conveyance systems" is the portion of the overall regional water quality treatment train (sediment and associated gross solid removal) discussed in other parts of the proposal.	The proposal is for a storm drain project that includes storm drainage structures and conveyance systems. It is stated consistently throughout the Goals and Objectives and Purpose and Need that this project is part of the overall regional water quality treatment train. The Chino Preserve Natural Treatment Master Plan, 2004, provided with the Proposal provides the necessary information supporting that the Pine Avenue Storm Drain is a part of the overall regional water quality treatment train. Additional supporting information is included in the Chino Preserve Master Plan of Drainage, 2003, also included as an attachment to the Proposal.	Chino Preserve Natural Treatment Master Plan 2004 08 04.pdf Chino Preserve Drainage Master Plan 2003.pdf
10 Task 7 – Permitting gives a list of permits without a description of each and gives no status.	Please refer to Task 7, identifying the status of the permits as "Preparation of permitting pending completion of final design documents". In addition, the Project Schedule (Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2, lines 12-18) indicates the timeframes necessary for processing of these permits and the Budget Narrative (Att4_SWF_Budget_3of3) states that the environmental permits remain to be secured.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5, page 2 Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2, lines 12-18 Att4_SWF_Budget_3of3
11 IRWMP consistency is claimed, but with no explanation of how it is consistent.	The Goals and Objectives for this proposal are directly based on the IRWMP as stated in the first paragraph. The Goals and Objectives (Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_1of5) reference the consistency of the Proposal with the Santa Ana Watershed IRWM (OWOW Plan): (1) Improved Regional Flood Protection, (2) Sustainable Flood Water Management Systems, (3) Better Emergency Preparedness and Response, (4) Improving Water Quality within the Regional Santa Ana Watershed and Prado Basin, and (5) Reduce Erosion and Sediment Transport to Chino Creek, Prado Park Lake, and Prado Basin. Additionally, the Program Preferences (Att11_SWF_Preference_1of1 Pine) addressing Statewide Priorities are organized in the same categories as noted above to highlight the Proposal's consistency with those priorities.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_1of5 Att11_SWF_Preference_1of1 Pine
BUDGET (2/5)		
12 Not all costs appear reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the budget categories.	All costs were carefully estimated based on City project management experience and are considered reasonable based on comparable work completed in the region. The Budget Narrative (Att4_SWF_Budget_3of3) discusses the source of costs and the Budget Summary (Att4_SWF_Budget_1of3) provides details.	Att4_SWF_Budget_3of3 Att4_SWF_Budget_1of3
13 Category A – Direct Project Administration provides no explanation for the percent of a PY time equivalent of the staff level involvement; nor is it clear how they derived the \$120 blended rate.	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_SWF_Budget_3of3, page 1, Section A
14 Although the Budget narrative for Row (b) Land Purchase / Easement states that the property appraisal value for drainage easements in the 100-year flood plain is \$75,000 per acre, there is no appraisal or backup for the statement.	The estimated \$75,000 per acre is based on recent land sales as stated in the Budget Narrative: "Property appraisal value is based on estimated recent land sales for property within the Prado Basin currently under drainage easements for the 100 year flood plain. Local appraisals are anticipated to be around \$75,000 per acre". Actual appraisals are items of work outstanding as indicated in the Work Plan Outline, Budget, Budget Narrative and Schedule.	Att4_SWF_Budget_3of3, page 1, Section B Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5, page 2 Att4_SWF_Budget_1of3, Section B Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2, rows 45-51

PROPOSAL EVALUATION - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
 Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program
 Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011
CITY OF CHINO - PINE AVENUE STORM DRAIN PROJECT

COMMENTS RECEIVED	CLARIFICATION RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
15 Descriptions of disciplines and an explanation of the blended hourly wages for each discipline were not included for Category C, nor did it make sense that "Consultant to be Selected" was listed when the plans are 95% complete for the storm drain improvements and the street improvements are at 50% complete.	The blended rates are based on City project management experience and are considered accurate based on comparable projects managed by the City. In reference to the 50% and 95% plans, "Consultant to be Selected" was listed in error. Consultants have been selected for this scope.	N/A
16 There is no explanation of how the unit costs were derived or obtained in Categories D, E, F, G, or H.	Category D - Construction unit costs are based on the City's prior public works projects and engineer's construction cost estimates, which is standard practice for public works. Category E - Storm water compliance monitoring under the new general permit for construction activity 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_SWF_Budget_3of3, page 2
17 The Budget doesn't coincide with the Schedule or the Work Plan. For example, approximately 51% of the Budget is for Street Improvements and Domestic Water Improvements, without any mention of this work in the Work Plan.	Please clarify the inconsistency noted with the Budget, Schedule and Work Plan. For the example noted, the Work Plan Outline Task 9 outlines the construction scope of work and the sequence necessary to construct the storm drain crossing and bring it out of the 100 year flood plain. The Budget Category D lists the elements of this work and the associated cost. The Schedule, line items 76 through 88, indicates the time frames within which this work will be performed. The project eliminates an area of flooding on Pine Avenue as the road is subject to inundation at low storm frequency events. The roadway subject to the inundation will need to be raised to eliminate the flooding. The construction costs associated with raising the roadway outside of the 100 year flood plain are a necessary component of addressing this issue. Please note that the roadway costs include multiple elements under that category, primarily grading is a significant component. Not all elements under this category are street pavement and surface component related as indicated in the comment.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5 Att4_SWF_Budget_1of3 Att5_SWF_Schedule_1of2
SCHEDULE (1/5)		
18 The Schedule does not follow the items presented in the Work Plan and Budget, such as the finance development and waterline improvements tasks.	Please clarify the inconsistency noted with the Budget, Schedule and Work Plan. For the example noted, the Work Plan Outline Task 9 outlines the construction scope of work and the sequence necessary to construct the storm drain crossing and bring it out of the 100 year flood plain. The Budget Category D lists the elements of this work and the cost. The Schedule, line items 76 through 88, indicates the same time frames within which this work will be performed.	Att3_SWF_WorkPlan_5of5 Att4_SWF_Budget_1of3 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 CHINO - PINE AVENUE STORM DRAIN PROJECT

COMMENTS RECEIVED	CLARIFICATION RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
19 The Schedule does not demonstrate a readiness to begin construction or implementation within 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). The construction contract is scheduled to be awarded on November 30, 2012, fourteen months after the anticipated award date of October 1, 2011.	The construction bid package is scheduled for issuance on October 22, 2012 within one year of the anticipated grant agreement execution and is predicated on completion of the required easements of private property at the crossing. The schedule was developed with every attempt to be realistic, rather than optimistic. The City would prefer an earlier construction start and requests consideration for the attempt to prepare a realistic schedule within a few days of the grant application requirements for construction readiness.	N/A
MONITORING, ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES (3/5)		
20 The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. For example, some of the output and outcome indicators for improved regional flood protection and sustainable flood water management system were identical as were desired outcome and outcome indicators. The narrative lists several goals and how they will be met and how the outcomes will be measured.	The annual cost metrics for the "improved regional flood protection" were similar to the "long-term cost reductions" under the sustainable flood water management" by design as these are intertwined. Other criterion under improved regional flood protection were also described in "Att6_SWF_Measures_2of2" that may have been overlooked.	Att6_SWF_Measures_2of2
21 The focus of the "metrics" is reducing the costs of flood damage and economic losses, while increasing downstream water quality. The general metric is to compare costs before and after project construction. The output indicator for reduced erosion and sediment transport downstream that there will be reduced pollutant loads of trash sediment, suspended solids, and heavy metals; however, Attachment 3 [of the Work Plan] states that the trash and debris pollutant load is expected to remain the same. The measurement tool for determining if this goal is implemented is to monitor downstream berm damage and failures. The same outcome indicator and measurement tool are cited for the goal of improving water quality within the regional watershed.	Trash should not have been included as an output indicator. In the fully urbanized condition, bacteria, metals, nutrients, pesticides, and oxygen demanding substances are expected to be significantly reduced, however trash loading is expected to remain the same. Urban environments produce more trash; however additional controls for trash and debris will be implemented per requirements.	Att6_SWF_Measures_2of2
22 No monitoring, assessment and performance measures are proposed for the water improvements, street improvements or off site street improvements.	The project does not include any off site street improvements. Monitoring, assessment and performance measures are provided for the Proposal's expected water improvements through "4. Improve Water Quality Within the Regional Santa Ana Watershed and The Prado Basin" and "5. Reduce Erosion and Sediment Transport to Cucamonga Creek and County Line Channel". Monitoring, assessment and performance measures are provided for the Proposal's expected street improvements through "1. Improved Regional Flood Protection" and "3. Better Emergency Preparedness and Response".	Att6_SWF_Measures_1of2 Att6_SWF_Measures_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 CHINO - PINE AVENUE STORM DRAIN PROJECT

COMMENTS RECEIVED		CLARIFICATION RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS - FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION AND WATER SUPPLY BENEFITS (6/12)			
23	Average levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Some of the avoided costs claimed in Table 11 are not justified, and others are not well supported. For example, the business lost during a flood event, the utility costs avoided, and the burrowing owl habitat costs are not sufficiently justified or documented.	<p>Please note that assumptions used in the analysis are documented in detail in the footnotes of Table 11 (Att7_SWF_DReduc_1of2). For example: (1) assumptions related to utility losses were based on a 2010 FEMA application prepared by the City of Ontario (City of Chino data was not available, and data from the City of Ontario 2010 application was deemed the most accurate sample available to model the project impacts); and (2) habitat costs related to the burrowing owl were derived from a Conservation Study prepared for the County of Riverside. Exhibit B of the same attachment summarizes a case study of business owners within the project area, and supports the claims made on business losses in Table 11.</p> <p>Additionally, the project was requesting funding in the amount of \$2.4M. In discussions at the workshop in Alhambra, DWR representatives pointed out that overall "effort" on analysis should be commensurate with the amount of funding requested. While effort was put into documenting assumptions and supporting/justifying claims, the analysis was limited to data available at the time of preparation. When reasonable (based on the time and money required), additional studies to support claims were performed.</p> <p>If required, additional documentation, reference to documentation, and/or narrative can be provided.</p>	Att7_SWF_DReduc_1of2
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS - WATER QUALITY AND OTHER EXPECTED BENEFITS (6/12)			
24	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 is partially unsubstantiated.	The supporting documentation explains that water quality design storm event and the 2 and 5-year storm events for erosivity were estimated for pre and post project conditions. For both conditions, runoff from the developed, vacant, and agricultural lands were modeled using long-term continuous precipitation data for an idealized ten acre catchment, which was then scaled to the approximately 800 acre tributary area. The water quality benefit was conservatively considered to be only the sediment removal as a result of the project. The value of these benefits was estimated using three methods shown in the attachments and the lowest value used.	Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_1of2 Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_2of2
25	Water quality benefits are well described, but the economic value is estimated as equal to the construction cost of the water quality component of the project, not of maintenance costs.	The water quality benefits were calculated as stated except that the escalation factor of 2.5% for future water treatment costs was applied. Maintenance costs were not subtracted from the capital cost as the pre- and post-project conditions would have the same level of operations and maintenance expenses. This approach is a prudent consideration as costs will not remain unchanged over the life cycle of the project analysis because of the escalation factor.	Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_1of2 Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_2of2
26	These costs are escalated over time. This is not an appropriate way to estimate benefits.	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
27	Other benefits are 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 (OWOW) that this project, in combination with the other projects detailed in the OWOW, will improve conditions in an integrated fashion.	Att9_SWF_WQOtherBen_1of2 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 CHINO - PINE AVENUE STORM DRAIN PROJECT

COMMENTS RECEIVED	CLARIFICATION RESPONSE	REFERENCED ATTACHMENTS
<p>PROGRAM PREFERENCES (8/10)</p> <p>28 The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Regional Project or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within the Hydrologic Region and Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater, and Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently. However, Expanding Environmental Stewardship is not addressed.</p>	<p>Expanding Environmental Stewardship is not included in the proposal as this project does not address this category. No omission was intended as only the preferences the proposal achieves were included.</p>	<p>Att11_SWF_Preference_1 of 1 Pine</p>