PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Stockton East Water District	**Amount Requested**	$9,743,800
Proposal Title	Calaveras River Integrated Stormwater Management Project	**Total Proposal Cost**	$20,975,000

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located in San Joaquin County within incorporated and unincorporated areas in the City of Stockton. The project will construct the following improvements: up-size an existing stormwater pump station to increase pumping capacity from 10,000 to 30,000 gallons per minute, expand an existing groundwater recharge basin from 65 to 280 acres, and install 7 new and rehabilitate 4 existing water supply production wells in the recharge area. The project will divert peak stormwater flows on the Calaveras River, and discharge the flows to the expanded groundwater recharge basin.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**6/15**	Technical Justification	**4/10**
Budget	**2/5**		
Schedule	**4/5**	Benefits and Cost Analysis	**12/30**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**8/10**
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**39**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is marginally and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. Tasks were provided for each project in tabulated format; however, descriptions for many of the task items were lacking adequate detail to be able to determine what and how the tasks were going to be performed, such as, construction, and environmental compliance and mitigation. To be more specific, construction details were descriptive for the Wisconsin Pump Station but were lacking for the SEWD Flood Detention Basin Project. A narrative description was given for the overall work plan; however, this description did not correlate to the tabulated task list. The work plan does not include data management and monitoring deliverables nor was there mention of annual and final reports.

BUDGET

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. A summary budget and individual project budgets were provided for the proposal. However, the tasks noted in the individual budgets did not correspond to those provided in the work plan. Detailed cost estimates are provided for each project; however, no backup documentation, explanation, or references to where those costs came from were provided, and no hourly rates are provided for staff time. For example, Table 8 – Opinion of Probable Costs, Wisconsin Pump Station – (d) Construction Implementation is provided as one line, Construction with one total. There is no description and breakdown of what those costs include. The SEWD Flood Detention and Groundwater Recharge Facility cost estimates had a better breakdown of costs per project element; however, Table 10 (pg. 76) was illegible.

SCHEDULE

The schedule is consistent with the work plan but no milestones were identified. The schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation no later than October 2014. The Wisconsin Ave Pumping Station project schedule includes the sequence and timing of the project; including a construction start and end date of 4/1/2017 and 10/15/2017, respectively. The SEWD Flood Detention and Groundwater Recharge Facility project schedule also includes the sequence and timing of the project; including a construction start and end date of 6/28/2014 and 5/30/2015, respectively.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Appropriate quantitative targets and measurement tools are not identified for all benefits claimed. For example, three of the four objectives of the proposal were assessed in some format, except for creating seasonal waterfowl habitat. A narrative description was provided but did not correlate to the table provided, meaning some of the issues, such as, water quality were discussed but not supported in the table. Many of the performance indicators and measurement tools and methods were provided without appropriate associated targets. Measurement tools and methods by which the objective or goal can be met are only marginally provided for the Wisconsin Pump Station.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

Proposal's technical justification cannot be determined due to a lack of documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project and physical benefits are not well described. In Attachment 7 the applicant did not clearly describe the physical benefits. For example, the applicant presented the "without project" scenarios but did not present the "with project" physical benefits leaving the actual benefits that could be achieved by this project unknown. Appendix E provided a technical economic analysis which provided "with project" monetized benefits. However, reviewers were more concerned with seeing physical benefits for flood damage reduction as that was the project's main goal. Appendix E provided monetized benefits for flood damage reduction but did not provide actual measurable physical benefits for flood damage reduction. Also, applicant failed to use Table 7 which would have been helpful in comparing with and without project benefits, had they been presented in full.

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 reported as $27.33 million in net present value (NPV). Costs shown in Table 5 of Attachment 4 do not quite match the corresponding numbers in

Table 16 of Attachment 8. SEWD owns some of the land needed for the detention basin but $5.1 million in additional costs are shown to purchase more land or easements (unclear if the opportunity cost of already owned land is included in that). Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) benefits are assessed using local estimates and United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) information, primarily from its American River Watershed Common Features Project, including depth damage functions. The vehicle damages shown in Tables 26 and 27 are much larger than what is supported by the USACE memorandum "Generic Depth-Damage Relationships for Vehicles" (2009) as claimed (see Table 3 in the USACE memorandum). Other depth-damage percents for structures and contents do not exactly match the values in the referenced USACE study, though they are similar. Technical justification of the flood depths and inundation areas by flood event are not provided. Documentation of flood depths, frequencies, and inundation areas is needed to justify benefits.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

The Applicant claims that 5 program preferences and 5 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. Applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for eight of the preferences claimed. The proposal will achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region 3) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; 4) Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions; 5) Drought Preparedness; 6) Climate Change Response Actions; 7) Practice Integrated Flood Management; and 8) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality.