PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2012-2013

Applicant	City of Chino	**Amount Requested**	$2,000,000
Proposal Title	City of Chino Arterial Flood and Stormwater Management Project	**Total Proposal Cost**	$4,022,384

PROJECT SUMMARY

This project manages stormwater runoff and reduces flood damages to Pine Avenue (a major east/west arterial), utilities below the roadway, and surrounding properties within the City of Chino. The existing shallow and wide earthen channel and floodplain that crosses Pine Avenue through 6 culverts result in flooding as a result of high frequency low volume storms, such as a 2-year storm. The project consists of construction of a culvert and two earthen channels, and raising Pine Avenue above the 100-year floodplain. The system is designed to handle the region's ultimate build-out condition in a 100-year storm event.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	**Score/ Max. Possible**	**Criteria**	**Score/ Max. Possible**
Work Plan	**12/15**	Technical Justification	**8/10**
Budget	**3/5**		
Schedule	**5/5**	Benefits and Cost Analysis	**12/30**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**2/5**	Program Preferences	**4/10**
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**46**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The work plan is well-organized and relatively complete. The introduction includes detailed goals and objectives of the project and are related to the IRWM Plan (on pages 3-3 to 3-9), although it does not have a tabulated overview or abstract for the project. The work plan does contain the current project status (on page 3-11). A project

location map is provided on page 3-28, and a map showing the relative location of the project is provided on sheet 1 of the preliminary construction plans. The tasks in the work plan contain adequate detail, appropriate deliverables, and reporting submittals to collectively implement the proposed project. The work plan contains a listing of permits in Task 7 and Task 10, provides the resolution approving the project's EIR, and includes a Hydrology and Water Quality section. The technical documentation and the submitted EIR support the feasibility of the project. Additionally, the preliminary construction plans and specifications are consistent with Task 5, included in the work plan. Monitoring is addressed in a limited manner in Task 10 (additional information on monitoring is provided in Attachment 6, Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures). The proposal did not contain a Data Management task, as described in the IRWM Plan Standards in the 2012 Guidelines. Data Management is not addressed in this proposal.

BUDGET

The budget has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the budget categories described in Exhibit B. Explanations are provided that describe how project costs are estimated, however, supporting documentation is limited. There are also some accounting issues. The total of the detailed costs presented for budget category A is listed as $145,000.00 when the cost shown actually equals $144,618.00 or $382.00 less than stated. The proposal match is technically less than the 50% requirement because the total cost of the project is $4,022,384.40 which would require a minimum cost share of $2,011,192.20. Instead, the proposal states a $2,000,000.00 cost share making it $11,192.20 short of meeting the requirement.

SCHEDULE

The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, is reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin implementation and construction by October 2014. Given the task descriptions in the work plan, the Schedule appears to be reasonable. Also, the Schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction in the first construction cycle after the assumed agreement execution date and one year before October 2015 (September 2014). The schedule is presented in a Gantt chart, which shows start and end dates as well as milestones for each task presented in the work plan.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Overall, the proposal lacked detail and careful consideration of monitoring, assessment, and performance measures. The proposal only identified two monitoring targets for four benefits claimed and one (flood protection up to and including a 100-year storm event) was identified for three of the four benefits. The two monitoring targets "flood protection up to and including a 100-year storm event" and "reduce frequency of erosive floodwaters" do not have quantifiable metrics so it is not clear how performance will be monitored.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

This criterion is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits, but not fully supported by thorough documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. The hydraulic study for the proposed project justifies the size of the project and the types of benefits claimed under 2, 25, and 100-year flood scenarios. However, there is no supporting information for the emergency preparedness, public safety, and water quality improvement elements to determine the feasibility of the project for these claimed benefits.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Total project cost is $3.925 million in present value (PV). The FDR benefits claimed included avoided travel delays, business losses, road repair, utility repair, and impairment of emergency access. Losses to businesses were estimated from proprietor interviews and tried to identify costs of "inaccessibility". An estimated $71,250 per 2-year flood event was derived in this way. Larger flood events were assumed to be twice as costly. Reviewer notes that the large majority of this is claimed by one business, a custom beef processor that claims $50,000 cost per event. This is an estimate provided by the business, so no further backup data or explanation is provided. Three other businesses provide damage estimates though they appear to be outside the inundation area and have alternative access routes. Most or all of the costs to them may already be captured in the travel cost estimates.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant demonstrates a high degree of certainty that the proposal will implement 4 of the program preferences claimed (2 program preferences and 2 statewide priorities) and documents the magnitude and breadth of each that the proposal will achieve. The proposal will achieve the following: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP; RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR; (3) Practice Integrated Flood Management, and; (4) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality.