PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Santa Barbara County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	**Amount Requested**	$ 2,022,890
Proposal Title	Lower Mission Creek Flood Control and Restoration Project Phase 1B and 2A	**Total Proposal Cost**	$ 13,877,029

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located on Mission Creek in the City of Santa Barbara. The project goal is to improve flood flow conveyance potential by widening and deepening the channel in two reaches of the overall 1.3-mile Lower Mission Creek project. Reach 1B: extends from the Mason Street to Yanonali Street and Reach 2A: extends from an existing box culvert at the railroad station downstream to the existing Mission Creek channel. . The project will also expand natural streambed features, which will enhance habitat for the endangered steelhead trout and other species.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**12/15**	Technical Justification	**6/10**
Budget	**4/5**		
Schedule	**5/5**	Benefits and Cost Analysis	**12/30**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**6/10**
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**48**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. While over 2,000 pages of supporting documentation is provided, including a Feasibility Study, EIR, Design Document Report, Design Plans (100% for Reach 1A, Phase 2; and 60% for Reach 1B), a brief discussion of the supporting documents and how they support the proposed project was not provided, nor were the relevant sections or page numbers of the documents referenced. The applicant does not adequately address how the proposed project, which is part of a larger multi-phased project effort on Lower Mission Creek, will deliver the claimed benefits and be fully functional without implementation of the subsequent projects.

BUDGET

A score of 4 is awarded as the budget for the proposed project includes detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the budget categories are not fully supported. For example, the budget category, Land Purchase/Easement ($3.8M), does not include any explanation of how this cost was estimated; and Task 4, Assessment and Evaluation ($42K); Task 7, Permitting ($42K); and Task 8, Construction Contracting ($42K), are not supported by documentation or an explanation. Otherwise, the costs shown are supported by documentation and adequately explained.

SCHEDULE

A score of 5 is awarded as the schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation no later than October 2014 (Mobilization date: 4/18/2014). The tasks are consistent with those described in the work plan and budget.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Applicant provides the required Project Performance Measures Table (Table 6-1), and indicates four project objectives; however, flood damage reductions is not given a quantitative target. Although the narrative mentions quantitative targets for increasing flow in Lower Mission Creek, it is not related to verifying flood damage reduction attributable to the project. In addition, the proposed monitoring for "Protect and Improve Surface Water Quality" goal is inadequate. No baseline of water quality data by which to compare pre-project and post-project is presented, nor are water quality parameters or reduction targets identified. The applicant provides a quantitative target for increased aquatic and streamside habitat.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

A score of 3 is awarded as the proposal appears technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. For example, while the flood damage reduction (FDR) benefits claimed are generally well described and are supported by the large amount of supplemental documentation provided, the supporting documentation pertains to a larger project (pg. 7-1), and therefore it is not clear that the flood control benefits claimed can be achieved by implementing only the proposed project (consisting of only 650 feet of creek restoration, compared to the overall project (pg. 7-1), which would improve 1.3 miles). Similarly, it is unclear whether the proposed project will achieve the environmental benefits claimed. The location of the habitat to be removed and created is not shown in the application (or referenced). Finally, the application states that the project will improve water quality by reducing erosion and enhancing filtration, pH, and water temperature. However, the application does not include any data on baseline water quality conditions or any data on the magnitude of water quality improvement directly attributable to the proposed project.

BENEFITS AND COSTS 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.

The net present value (NPV) of costs is $11.42 million. FDR estimates are developed using a 2004 USACE study and FRAM. FDR benefits are based on a larger project with 16.73 percent allocated to this project based on share of total

capital cost ($13.9 of $83.1 total, Page 8-5). On page 7-5, Tables 7-2 and 7-3 appear to be missing. Table 8-5, which is supposed to show expected annual damage (EAD) for "structures and contents for the without- and with-project conditions" (Page 8-7) appears to be missing. However, "avoided damages" in Table 8-16 are thorough and include residential and commercial structures and contents, roads, emergency response/cleanup, FEMA temporary rental assistance, and transportation disruption. Total monetized benefits in Table 8-16 include avoided creek bank stabilization costs, flood insurance overhead costs avoided, and riparian habitat. Claimed benefits of the Reach 1A-2 and 1B improvements funded by this project total $8,258,100. The analysis does not show how many structures in the floodplain would actually benefit from the Reach 1A Phase 2 and Reach 1B work. The project would construct 650 feet out of 6,864 feet, or 9.5 percent of the total project length. If this scaling factor were used instead of the 16.73 percent, the B/C would be less than 0.72.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that 4 program preferences and 4 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, the applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for 6 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) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; 4) Climate change response actions; 5) Expand Environmental Stewardship; and 6) Practice Integrated Flood Management.