

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

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

### *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011*

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Amount</b>	\$7,661,000
Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	<b>Requested</b>	
<b>Proposal Title</b> Phoenix Lake Integrated Regional Water Management Retrofit	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$15,322,000

#### PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Phoenix Lake IRWM Retrofit is a multi-purpose proposal composed of five component projects, all located at Phoenix Lake: Flood Damage Reduction; Water Supply; Water Quality; Ecosystem Restoration; and Recreation and Public Access. By seismically retrofitting the dam and constructing other improvements to the hydraulic and recreational infrastructures of the lake, thus can be operated to serve multiple purposes of flood control, drinking water supply, water quality, ecosystem restoration, and public recreation. Therefore, the Retrofit meets the 6 regional goals and 62 objectives of the Bay Area IRWM Plan.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	<b>15/15</b>	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	<b>9/12</b>
Budget	<b>5/5</b>	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	<b>6/12</b>
Schedule	<b>1/5</b>	Program Preferences	<b>8/10</b>
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	<b>5/5</b>		
<b>Total Score (max. possible = 64)</b>			<b>49</b>

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. The Work Plan includes a discussion of the supporting studies, data and resources for each sub project. The Work Plan contains an introduction, which includes goals and objectives for each sub project, a tabulated overview of sub-projects with abstract and project status and maps showing relative project locations. The sub project tasks are of adequate detail and collectively support the proposal. The Work Plan includes a listing of permits and their status including CEQA compliance. The proposed sub projects can be operational as standalone projects.

## **Budget**

The Budgets for all the sub projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information; the costs are reasonable, and all the Budget categories of Exhibit B are thoroughly supported. A detailed budget table is provided for each sub project of the Proposal. A roll-up budget summary is provided for the entire Proposal. The items shown in the Budget agree with the tasks shown in the Work Plan and Schedule.

## **Schedule**

The Schedule does not follow the sub-task format presented in the Work Plan and Budget, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation more than 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). Construction contracting starts March 2015, and construction implementation starts June 2015. The roll up Schedule does not indicate Administration tasks over the entire life of the Proposal.

## **Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures**

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational for each of the sub projects of the proposal. The Proposal describes the performance measures, monitoring systems and monitoring data that will be used to verify sub project performance with respect to the sub project objectives. The attachment includes a performance measure table for each sub project and includes desired outcomes, Output and Outcome Indicators, Measurement Tools and Methods, and Targets. Most of the Targets are quantitative. The Targets are reasonable and can be met within the life of the Proposal. The Output and Outcome Indicators effectively track output or a change.

## **Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits**

Average levels of flood reduction and water supply benefits can be realized through this Proposal, based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation included in the Proposal. Total Net Present Value (NPV) of costs is \$12.274 million of which \$9.633 million is for flood damage reduction. FDR claimed benefits are \$7.662 million; and with the seismic benefits suggested by Table 13, total FDR benefits are \$8.55 million. The economic benefit of water supply is about \$1 million NPV. Therefore, the flood and water supply benefits together (\$9.55 million) cover about 78% of the cost (\$12.274 million) of the project.

## **Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits**

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. In particular, important water quality benefits are not monetized including a substantial reduction in temperature of water releases (from 23 to 12 degrees centigrade), and reduced road- and trail-related erosion (830 cubic yards/yr). NPV of water quality, ecosystem restoration and recreation/public access project costs are estimated as \$0.363, \$0.303, and \$1.42 million, respectively.

## **Program Preferences**

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: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Effectively Resolve Significant Water-Related Conflicts within or Between Regions, Drought Preparedness, Expand Environmental Stewardship, Practice Integrated Flood Management and Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality.