

DRAFT FINAL

**PROPOSITION 84
STORM WATER GRANT PROGRAM
DRAFT FINAL GUIDELINES**



JANUARY 30, 2009

DRAFT FINAL

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK,
TO ALLOW FOR DOUBLE-SIDED PRINTING***

DRAFT FINAL
TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOPIC	Page #
I. PURPOSE	1
II. PROGRAM CONTEXT	1
III. BACKGROUND	1
IV. VISION	2
V. GUIDELINES OVERVIEW	4
VI. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS, PROGRAM PREFERENCES, & PRC § 75072 PLANNING AND MONITORING PROJECTS	6
A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS	6
B. PROJECT TIMELINE, MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNTS, & MATCH REQUIREMENTS	6
<i>i. Timeline</i>	6
<i>ii. Minimum Grant Amounts & Maximum Grant Amounts</i>	7
<i>iii. Funding Match Requirements</i>	7
<i>iv. Funding Match Reduction</i>	7
C. ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES	8
D. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH	9
E. PROGRAM PREFERENCES	9
F. PRC § 75072 PLANNING AND MONITORING PROJECTS	10
VII. PROPOSAL SOLICITATION, REVIEW, & SELECTION PROCESS	11
A. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF CONCEPT PROPOSALS	11
B. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF FULL PROPOSALS	11
C. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF PRC § 75072 PLANNING & MONITORING PROJECT PROPOSALS	12
D. APPLICANT ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS	12
E. COMPLETENESS REVIEW	12
F. ELIGIBILITY REVIEW	13
G. REVIEW AND SCORING PROCESS	13
<i>i. Concept Proposal</i>	13
<i>ii. Full Proposal</i>	13
H. APPLICANT NOTIFICATION	15
I. FUNDING AWARDS	15
J. GRANT AGREEMENT	15
K. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS	15
VIII. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	16
A. CONFLICT OF INTEREST	16
B. CONFIDENTIALITY	16
C. LABOR CODE COMPLIANCE	16
D. CEQA COMPLIANCE	16
E. WAIVER OF LITIGATION RIGHTS	16
F. PROJECT ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION PLANS	17
G. MONITORING & REPORTING	17
H. DATA MANAGEMENT	17
I. URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	17

DRAFT FINAL

J. GRANT MANAGER NOTIFICATION18
K. DIVISION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.....18
APPENDIX A: PROPOSITION 84 STORM WATER GRANT PROGRAM SUMMARY TABLE19
APPENDIX B: USEFUL WEB LINKS20
APPENDIX C: REQUESTS FOR REDUCTION OF FUNDING MATCH FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.....23
I. PURPOSE.....23
II. ALLOWANCES23
III. STEPS TO REQUEST A REDUCTION OF THE FUNDING MATCH24
IV. REDUCED FUNDING MATCH REQUIREMENTS24
EXHIBIT C-1: CERTIFICATION OF UNDERSTANDING26
APPENDIX D: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION & EVALUATION CRITERIA.....27
APPENDIX D-1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION.....29
APPENDIX D-2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA35
APPENDIX E: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION & EVALUATION CRITERIA38
APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION.....39
APPENDIX E-2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....46
APPENDIX F: PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 75072 PLANNING AND MONITORING PROJECTS.....51
APPENDIX F-1: PRC § 75072 PROJECT TYPES52
APPENDIX F-2: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL APPLICATION56
APPENDIX F-3: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA61
APPENDIX G: ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS64
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) CHECKLIST FOR THE GRANTEE66
APPENDIX H: PREPARING PROJECT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PLANS67
I. PURPOSE.....67
II. BACKGROUND67
III. PROJECT PERFORMANCE MEASURES TABLES.....67
APPENDIX I: BUDGET TABLE69
APPENDIX J: DEFINITIONS71

DRAFT FINAL

ACRONYMS USED IN THESE GUIDELINES AND APPENDICES

AB	Assembly Bill
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan
BMP	Best Management Practice
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CLC	California Labor Code
CP	Concept Proposal
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWC	California Water Code
Division	Division of Financial Assistance
DWR	Department of Water Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FAAST	Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool
FP	Full Proposal
FY	Fiscal Year
HMP	Hydro-modification Management Plan
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
JPA	Joint Powers Authority
LID	Low Impact Development
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
MB	Megabyte
MHI	Median Household Income
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems
NOD	Notice of Determination
NOE	Notice of Exemption
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	Nonpoint Source
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
PAEP	Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PRC	California Public Resources Code
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
Regional Water Board	Regional Water Quality Control Board
RPU	Regional Programs Unit
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
SUSMP	Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan
SWAMP	Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program
SWATF	Storm Water Advisory Task Force
SWGP	Storm Water Grant Program
The Act	The Urban Water Management Planning Act
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USCB	United States Census Bureau
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
Water Boards	State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards

PROPOSITION 84 STORM WATER GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of these Guidelines is to establish the process and criteria that the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) will use to solicit applications, evaluate and select proposals, and award grants for the Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program (SWGP) as established in California Public Resources Code (PRC) § 75050(m). These Guidelines describe the information and documentation applicants will be required to submit to apply for the grant funds.

II. PROGRAM CONTEXT

Storm water runoff is the most common cause of water pollution in the United States. Unlike pollution from industry or sewage treatment facilities, which is caused by discrete sources, storm water pollution is caused by the daily activities of people everywhere. Under existing law, the State Water Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge of storm water in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program established by the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Storm water runoff is related to California's hydrologic cycle in three general ways:

Storm water quality: Impaired waterbody listings (also known as 303[d] listings) and total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) identify the State's most significant water quality problems. In many parts of the State, flows over urban landscapes, as well as dry-weather flows from urban areas, are the most significant source of pollutants that contribute to water quality degradation. These flows carry potential pollutants downstream, which often end up on the beaches and in rivers, lakes, streams, bays, estuaries, and coastal waters.

Water supply: California is plumbed to capture, store, and deliver water based on the precipitation patterns of the late 19th and the 20th centuries. These historical patterns are changing and are expected to result in significantly different runoff conditions in the current century. An increasing amount of California's water is predicted to fall on the State, not as snow in the mountains but as rain in the valleys and on the coast, where development tends to occur. This phenomenon will likely have a profound and transforming effect on California's hydrologic cycle and much of that water will no longer be captured by California's reservoirs, many of which are located to capture snow melt. As the effects of global climate change continue during the 21st century, both halves of California's plumbing infrastructure – for supply and drainage – are expected to become increasingly outdated.

Water drainage: Climate change is predicted to exacerbate the challenge of managing flooding and hydro-modification by increasing the amount of water flowing to and through storm drain / flood control systems. Over the last 160 years, much of the water drainage from developments has been based on the traditional flood control principle of capturing and conveying water away from people and property. However, if used properly, this drainage can be used to benefit people, other species, and the environment.

III. BACKGROUND

Proposition 84, the *Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006*, was approved by California voters in the general election on November 7, 2006. Proposition 84 provides the State Water Board \$90 million for matching grants to local public agencies for the reduction and prevention of storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams (PRC § 75050[m]). After bond and program administration costs, approximately \$82 million is available for grants.

DRAFT FINAL

In addition, Proposition 84 allows up to 10 percent of funds allocated to the SWGP to be used to finance planning and monitoring necessary for the successful design, selection, and implementation of the SWGP projects (PRC § 75072). Therefore, up to \$9 million is available from the SWGP for this purpose, as outlined in [Section VI.F](#).

Assembly Bill (AB) 739 (Statutes 2007, Chapter 610) further defines the storm water provisions of Proposition 84. AB 739 requires the State Water Board to appoint a Storm Water Advisory Task Force (SWATF), which will provide advice to the State Water Board on its storm water management program. This may include, but is not limited to, program priorities, funding criteria, project selection, and interagency coordination of State Programs that address storm water management. In February 2008, the State Water Board appointed 15 SWATF members with expertise in water quality and storm water management from public agencies, representatives of the regulated community, nonprofit organizations, and industry. AB 739 requires the development of project selection and evaluation Guidelines. SWATF members and Regional Water Boards staff provided advice to State Water Board staff on the development of these Guidelines.

State Water Board staff engaged stakeholders in the development of these Guidelines through several venues. Staff conducted three scoping meetings in February and March of 2008 (in Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, and Los Angeles), to obtain stakeholder input on the proposed requirements, including setting minimum and maximum grant amounts, required match, project preferences, and the grant solicitation process. Draft Guidelines were available online for review and comment from November 17, 2008 through December 18, 2008. Three public workshops were held in December 2008 (in San Luis Obispo, Sacramento, and Los Angeles) to answer questions and solicit comments on the draft Guidelines.

In addition, staff received input through the State Water Board website, which is updated frequently to include draft program information and to provide staff-level documents for public review and feedback.

IV. VISION

As outlined in Proposition 84, the purpose of the SWGP is to provide funds for projects that reduce and prevent storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams. The Water Boards' (State Water Board and nine Regional Water Boards') mission is to preserve, enhance, and restore the quality of California's water resources for the benefit of present and future generations. The Water Boards' *Strategic Plan Update 2008-2012*, adopted September 2, 2008, recognizes the critical importance of addressing the State's most significant environmental priorities and states:

"The Water Boards' environmental priorities focus on strategies for achieving environmental outcomes associated with protecting the State's surface waters and groundwaters, and promoting sustainable water supplies...

Priority 1. Protect and Restore Surface Water Quality – Goal, Objectives, and Actions

Goal 1. Implement strategies to fully support the beneficial uses for all 2006-listed water bodies by 2030.

Objective 1.1. Implement a statewide strategy to efficiently prepare, adopt, and implement TMDLs, which result in water bodies meeting water quality standards, and adopt and begin implementation of TMDLs for all 2006-listed water bodies by 2019.

Action 1.1.2. Identify and document by March 2009 the pollutant groupings or TMDL groupings, such as litter or trash, that can be developed and implemented on a watershed, regional, or statewide basis.

DRAFT FINAL

Action 1.1.5. By January 2009, identify, document, and begin implementation of strategies with broad application that can be applied through policies and permits to restore water quality, and that may eliminate the need to develop a TMDL.

Objective 1.2. Manage urban runoff volume to reduce pollutant loadings, reduce wet weather beach postings by 75 percent by 2020, eliminate dry weather beach closures and postings by 2012 and, where applicable, explore opportunities for using management techniques to promote sustainable water supplies.

Action 1.2.1. Develop and adopt incentives and standard requirements, beginning with the general construction permit by December 2008, and water quality certifications by December 2009, that encourage or require local jurisdictions to implement Low Impact Development (LID)/Green Infrastructure techniques that promote the infiltration, capture, and treatment of storm water for reuse.

Action 1.2.3. Collaborate with the State Water Board's Storm Water Advisory Task Force, the California Stormwater Quality Association, and other interested stakeholders to identify, prioritize for action, and begin to address by December 2010 impediments associated with the implementation of LID and storm water reuse techniques...

Objective 1.3. Take appropriate enforcement actions and innovative approaches as needed to protect and restore all surface waters."

On May 6, 2008, the State Water Board adopted Resolution No. 2008-0030, *Requiring Sustainable Water Resources Management*, identifying Low Impact Development as an "innovative approach [that] helps meet water quality and water supply objectives and maintain healthy, sustainable watersheds." Further, the Resolution states that:

"The Water Boards recognize the importance of continuing to apply climate change strategies and LID principles in regulatory and financial assistance programs to benefit water supply and contribute to water quality protection."

And,

"Directs State Water Board staff to assign a higher grant priority to climate-related and LID projects, particularly those that are supported by local policies or ordinances."

SWATF members recommend use of storm water management systems that address storm water pollutants and minimize storm water impacts. LID is a storm water management strategy aimed at maintaining or restoring natural hydrologic functions to achieve natural resource protection objectives and fulfill environmental regulatory requirements. LID employs a variety of natural and built features that simultaneously help address the challenges faced in storm water runoff including:

- ❖ Storm water quality (filtering pollutants out of runoff);
- ❖ Water supply (facilitating the infiltration of water into the ground); and
- ❖ Water drainage (reducing the rate of runoff).

Because of these multiple benefits, LID is considered a superior best management practice (BMP) strategy. Accordingly, the Guidelines promote the use of LID as a storm water management strategy. The majority of grant funds are targeted at projects that implement LID practices. See [Section VI.C](#) for more project type information.

DRAFT FINAL

The benefits of LID may be used in conjunction with other conservation and planning approaches, such as Smart Growth. Smart Growth is encouraged because it is a sustainable practice that serves the economy, the community, and the environment by concentrating growth in urban areas, to limit urban sprawl. Smart Growth also helps preserve open space, sustainability, and watershed health. Coordinating and integrating LID with Smart Growth and other innovative land use approaches may limit conversions in land cover, preserve natural watershed areas, and maximize the management of storm water runoff.

V. GUIDELINES OVERVIEW

The SWGP provides funding for projects that reduce and prevent storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams. Projects must either implement LID strategies or assist in compliance of established storm water TMDLs. State Water Board staff plans to distribute SWGP funding through at least two rounds of funding, with up to \$45 million available in Round 1, and the remaining funding available in Round 2.

An overview of the SWGP process and timeline is presented in the flowchart in Figure 1. The SWGP solicitation will be a two-step process. All proposals will be submitted through the State Water Board's on-line Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). In the first step, applicants submit brief Concept Proposals (CPs). In the second step, applicants with the highest-ranking CPs will be invited to submit Full Proposals (FPs). Additionally, a separate solicitation will be held prior to or during Round 1 for the PRC § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Projects, which are discussed further in [Section VI.F](#). Recommended funding lists will be developed and presented at State Water Board meetings for public comment and State Water Board adoption.

Figure 1
Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program (SWGPs) Schedule



VI. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS, PROGRAM PREFERENCES, & PRC § 75072 PLANNING AND MONITORING PROJECTS

Applications will be evaluated for compliance with the eligibility requirements during the CP phase. Eligibility is based on minimum and maximum grant amounts, project timeline, match requirements, applicant type, and project type. Proposals that do not meet the eligibility requirements will not be reviewed or considered for funding. Projects shall not include overhead. Only direct costs associated with implementing the project are eligible.

A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Proposition 84 states that eligible applicants are restricted to “local public agencies.” A local public agency means any city, county, city and county, or district. A joint powers authority (JPA) comprised entirely of local public agencies is an eligible applicant. Eligible applicants are different for Planning and Monitoring Projects funded under PRC § 75072, as discussed in [Section VI.F.](#)

B. PROJECT TIMELINE, MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNTS, & MATCH REQUIREMENTS

Project timing must take into account planning, permitting, construction, and effectiveness monitoring, as outlined below in [Section VI.B.i.](#) The timeline for project completion does not relieve any discharger of its obligations for compliance with any permits, enforcement orders, or other regulatory deadlines. The maximum and minimum grant amounts, and the match requirements for implementation projects are presented in Table 1 and are discussed in more detail below.

Table 1 – Minimum and Maximum Grant Amounts, and Match Requirements

Minimum Grant Amount	Maximum Grant Amount	Match Requirement ¹
\$250,000 per Project	\$3,000,000 per Project	<p>Group A: Small & Severely Disadvantaged Community 5% if population is less than 20,000 persons AND MHI is less than 60% Statewide MHI ²</p> <p>Group B: Small & Disadvantaged Community 10% if population is less than 20,000 persons AND MHI is between 60-80% Statewide MHI ³</p> <p>Group C: Disadvantaged Community 15% if population is greater than 20,000 persons AND MHI is less than 80% Statewide MHI ³</p> <p>Group D: All Others 20% if population is greater than 20,000 persons AND/OR MHI is more than 80% of Statewide MHI</p>

¹ Match is calculated based on the total project cost, not on the grant amount. (Total project cost x % match = required match)

² Less than 60% of the average statewide median household income (MHI) is considered severely disadvantaged, PRC § 75005(g).

³ Less than 80% of the average statewide MHI is considered disadvantaged, PRC § 75005(g).

i. TIMELINE

It is anticipated that funds will be appropriated over a three-year period (starting fiscal year [FY] 2007-2008), and disbursed over an additional two years, for a 5-year funding cycle. Division of Financial Assistance (Division) staff will notify applicants and post information on the website regarding any updates to the SWGP schedule. The general implementation project timeline for each Round of funding is outlined in Table 2.

DRAFT FINAL

A project is not considered complete until post construction monitoring is conducted and the final report has been reviewed and accepted by the Water Boards Grant Manager. Projects must include a minimum of one dry and/or wet weather season of post construction monitoring, as appropriate, to determine project effectiveness. Post construction monitoring may not be applicable to Planning and Monitoring Projects implemented under PRC § 75072 ([Section VI.F](#)).

Table 2 – Project Timeline ¹

Round	Fiscal Year (FY) Appropriation	Encumber by Date ²	Construction Complete ³	Final Report	Work Completion Date	Final Invoice Date
1	FY 2007/08 & FY 2008/09	June 2011	March/ September 2012	January 2013	March 2013	May 2013
2	FY 2008/09 & FY 2009/10	June 2012	March/ September 2013	January 2014	March 2014	May 2014

¹ Project timeline is subject to legislative appropriation of funds. Funds appropriated in future years will be disbursed in accordance with the appropriation(s) schedule(s). These dates represent deadline dates; therefore, Grantees should plan to complete the tasks well in advance of the listed dates.

² The “Encumber by Date” is the date by which grant agreements between the State Water Board and the grantee must be executed.

³ Construction must be completed early enough to perform a minimum of one dry and/or wet weather season of post-construction monitoring, as appropriate, to determine project effectiveness.

ii. MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNTS & MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNTS

The minimum and maximum grant amounts, presented in Table 1, are based on input from stakeholders, Water Boards staff, and SWATF members. Minimum and maximum grant amounts are different for Planning and Monitoring Projects funded under PRC § 75072, which are outlined in [Section VI.F](#).

iii. FUNDING MATCH REQUIREMENTS

The applicant is required to provide a funding match as outlined in Table 1. “Funding match” means funds made available by the applicant. Eligible reimbursable expenses incurred after adoption of the Guidelines and prior to the project completion date can be applied to the funding match.

The funding match may include, but is not limited to, Federal funding, local and private funding, State funding, education/outreach, or donated and volunteer (“in-kind”) services. Proposition 84 does not limit the sources that are eligible for match. Therefore, unlike previous Proposition 50 funding programs, financing received through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program or any other State or Federal sponsored loan program may be used for match. **Regardless of the source, grant funds cannot be used for the required match.** The State Water Board reserves the discretion to review and approve funding match expenditures.

The funding match is calculated based on the total project cost for which funding is requested, not the grant amount (see [Appendix C](#) for an example). The match requirement may be reduced as discussed below in the Funding Match Reduction Section.

iv. FUNDING MATCH REDUCTION

Disadvantaged communities may request a reduction of the funding match, as outlined in Table 1. Applicants requesting a disadvantaged community funding match reduction must document that representatives of the disadvantaged community have been or will be involved in the planning and implementation process and that project implementation will provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged

DRAFT FINAL

community. State Water Board staff will review and make the final determination on funding match reduction eligibility.

C. ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

Up to 5% (five percent) of the SWGP funds (i.e., \$4.5 million) will be reserved to fund projects that provide a direct benefit to disadvantaged communities, with preference given to small severely disadvantaged communities first. To be eligible for this five percent, the applicant must be a disadvantaged community or a disadvantaged community based organization and the project must directly benefit the disadvantaged community. [Appendix C](#) provides more detail on disadvantaged community eligibility requirements and documentation.

Eligible projects for the SWGP are projects designed to reduce and prevent storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams. Eligible project types include:

- ❖ Implementing LID and other onsite and regional practices, on public and private lands, that seek to maintain predevelopment hydrology for existing and new development and redevelopment projects. Projects shall be designed to infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, or retain runoff in close proximity to the source of water; and
- ❖ Complying with TMDL requirements established pursuant to section 303(d) of the CWA (33 U.S.C. Sec. 1313[d]) and Division 43 of the PRC where pollutant loads have been allocated to storm water, including, but not limited to, metals, pathogens, and trash pollutants. Up to \$10 million, total from Round 1 and Round 2, may be used for storm water related TMDL projects. Preference will be given to TMDLs that cannot be addressed through a LID approach. For the purposes of California law, an established TMDL is one that has been adopted by both the applicable Regional Water Board and the State Water Board, has been approved by the Office of Administrative Law and paid the appropriate fees to the Department of Fish and Game.

All SWGP projects must meet the following requirements:

- ❖ All projects must be consistent with the applicable water quality control plan (Basin Plan) adopted by the State Water Board and/or Regional Water Board. Refer to [Appendix B](#) for web links to the Basin Plans;
- ❖ All projects must demonstrate capability of contributing to sustained, long-term water quality benefits for a period of 20 years, and address the causes of degradation rather than the symptoms;
- ❖ Applicants receiving SWGP funds must submit a monitoring and reporting plan to the State Water Board that does all of the following: (1) identifies the nonpoint source(s) (NPS) of pollution to be prevented or reduced by the project; (2) describes the baseline water quality of the environment to be addressed; (3) describes the manner in which the project will be effective in preventing or reducing pollution and in demonstrating the desired environmental results; and (4) describes the monitoring program including, but not limited to, the methodology, the frequency, and duration of monitoring;
- ❖ Water quality monitoring shall be integrated into the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) administered by the State Water Board;
- ❖ All projects must include an education/outreach component, which is designed to increase the public's understanding of the project's environmental benefits and the enjoyment of California's water resources directly related to the project. See [Section VI.D](#) for more information;
- ❖ Upon completion of the project, grantees must submit a report to the State Water Board that summarizes the completed activities and indicates whether the goals of the project have been met. The report must include information collected by the grantee in accordance with the project

DRAFT FINAL

monitoring and reporting plan, including an assessment of project effectiveness. This may include monitoring receiving water quality, determining pollutant load reductions, and assessing improvements in storm water discharge water quality resulting from project implementation. The State Water Board will make the report available to the public;

- ❖ Grantees must upload into FFAST a 1-2 page project summary that highlights the project's water quality and environmental benefits. The summary will be made available to the public and may include photographs, maps, and/or illustrations of the project;
- ❖ An applicant requesting funds from the SWGP must inform the State Water Board of any necessary public agency approvals, entitlements, and permits that may be necessary to implement the project; and
- ❖ All projects carried out on lands not owned by the grantee (public or private) will be required to obtain adequate rights of way for the useful life of the project (i.e., at least 20 years).

D. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

The Water Boards' *Strategic Plan Update 2008-2012* promotes "knowledge and awareness of the value of water resources, the importance of water rights and water quality protection, public engagement in the protection of water resources and an understanding of the mission of the Water Boards." The Water Boards believe that education and outreach is important because "public awareness of water management issues and their complexities can encourage changes in people's behaviors to improve and protect water quality." Therefore, one of the Water Boards desires in the Strategic Plan is for Government agencies and the public to "understand and contribute to each other's water resource protection efforts through collaboration, education, and outreach."

By itself, education and outreach is not an eligible project type. However, under the general provisions of Chapter 5 of Proposition 84, certain education and outreach activities are eligible as a piece of an eligible project type identified in [Section VI.C](#). According to Chapter 5 of Proposition 84, funds shall be available for the "protection and restoration of rivers, lakes, and streams." (PRC § 75050) Protection means "those actions necessary to allow the continued use and enjoyment of property or natural resources and includes acquisition, development, restoration, preservation and interpretation." Interpretation includes, but is not limited to, "a visitor serving amenity that educates and communicates the significance and value of natural, historical, and cultural resources in a way that increases the understanding and enjoyment of these resources." (PRC § 75005) Therefore, projects that include education/outreach designed to increase the public's understanding of the project's environmental benefits and the enjoyment of California's water resources directly related to the project may be eligible for funding. This may include, but is not limited to, project pros and cons, effects on water quality, and techniques implemented.

All projects must include education/outreach, as outlined in [Section VI.C](#). Up to 10% (ten percent) of the grant amount may be used to fund education and outreach activities that are directly related to implementation of the eligible project. Additional education and outreach expenditures may be used to meet the funding match requirement.

E. PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Program preferences for the SWGP are identified in AB 739. Preference will be given to projects that do one or more of the following: (1) support sustained, long term water quality improvement; or (2) are coordinated or consistent with any applicable Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. These preferences are reflected in the Concept Proposal Evaluation Criteria ([Appendix D](#)) and Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria ([Appendix E](#)) and will be considered by the Selection Panel when determining the recommended project funding lists.

DRAFT FINAL

F. PRC § 75072 PLANNING AND MONITORING PROJECTS

While the SWGP funds are targeted at storm water implementation projects that directly improve water quality, PRC § 75072 allows up to ten percent (10%) of grant funds (i.e., up to \$9 million) to be used to finance Planning and Monitoring Projects that are beneficial to the SWGP. All projects funded under PRC § 75072 must be of regional and/or statewide significance, and be necessary planning and monitoring activities for the successful design, selection, and implementation of SWGP projects. These funds may be awarded through a competitive process or by directed action. All projects awarded under this provision will be awarded funding by the State Water Board.

PRC § 75072 does not restrict planning, monitoring, or design costs that are part of the eligible implementation project types outlined in [Section VI.C](#).

Project timing, maximum and minimum grant amounts, and match requirements are listed in Table 3. Eligible applicants for PRC § 75072 funding include public agencies, nonprofit organizations, public colleges, regional agencies, and State agencies.

**Table 3 – PRC § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Projects:
Timing, Minimum and Maximum Grant Amounts, and Match Requirements**

Project Timing	Minimum Grant Amount	Maximum Grant Amount	Match Requirement
Round 1 Only ¹	\$100,000 per Project	\$1,000,000 per Project	10% ²

¹ Although Planning and Monitoring applicants may only apply prior to or during Round 1, any remaining grant funds that are not awarded to implementation projects during Round 2 may be used for PRC § 75072 activities (up to the 10% limit).
² The match requirement may be waived for State agencies.

Up to 10% of SWGP funds (but no less than 3% [\$2.7 million]) may be set-aside for high priority planning and/or monitoring projects. Applications will not be accepted during Round 2 for PRC § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Projects. The State Water Board may also award these funds through a directed action(s). Any remaining grant funds not awarded to implementation projects during Round 2 may be used for PRC § 75072 activities up to the 10% limit. The types of planning and monitoring projects that may be considered for funding include, **but are not limited to the topics listed below, which are further discussed in [Appendix F](#):**

- ❖ Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Performance Evaluation;
- ❖ Sediment-Bound Pollutants;
- ❖ Industrial & Construction Discharges;
- ❖ LID Barriers (Regulatory/Standards) and Solutions;
- ❖ Plan/Implement LID at a Watershed Scale;
- ❖ Storm Water Capture and Reuse;
- ❖ Storm Water Capture for Groundwater Recharge;
- ❖ Storm Water Quality Monitoring;
- ❖ Engineered Soil Analysis and Nutrient Reduction;
- ❖ Development of a Hydro-modification Model Based on Field Verification;
- ❖ Technical Assistance Team(s) to Help Local Jurisdictions Develop Projects;

DRAFT FINAL

- ❖ Storm Water Program Effectiveness Assessment Tools; and
- ❖ Identify, Investigate, and Plan Abatement of On-land Locations with Elevated Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) and Mercury Concentrations.

VII. PROPOSAL SOLICITATION, REVIEW, & SELECTION PROCESS

The SWGP will be managed through a two-step solicitation process: 1) Step 1 - CPs; and 2) Step 2 - FPs. The solicitation process, review process, and selection process are described below. Application requirements and evaluation criteria are included in Appendix D (CP) and Appendix E (FP). There will be two rounds of funding with up to \$45 million allocated for Round 1 and the remaining funds targeted for distribution in Round 2. PRC § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Projects will be managed through a one-step application process and applications will not be accepted after Round 1.

A. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF CONCEPT PROPOSALS

State Water Board staff will release a CP Solicitation Notice upon adoption of the Guidelines. The CP Solicitation Notice will include the application period, due date, and the detailed instructions on the procedures for submitting the CP.

The CP Solicitation Notice will be posted on the State Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml

A CP Solicitation Notice will also be e-mailed to all interested parties on the State Water Board's "Storm Water Grant Program (Proposition 84)" electronic mailing list. Interested parties may sign up for the electronic mailing list at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email_subscriptions/swrcb_subscribe.shtml

The CP application will consist of an on-line application submitted using the State Water Board's FAAST system. The CP application and evaluation criteria are presented in [Appendix D](#). The on-line FAAST application for the CP application will be available following issuance of the CP Solicitation Notice, at the following secure link:

<https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/>

B. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF FULL PROPOSALS

Applicants with the highest ranking CPs will be invited to submit FPs. Any CP receiving a score of less than 65 points will automatically be excluded from the FP phase. The FP review process will also be competitive since the number of CPs invited back will likely exceed the total available funding.

The FP Solicitation Notice will include information on the application period, due date, and detailed instructions on the procedures of submitting the FP. During the FP stage, the applicant is expected to expand upon the CP submitted previously, respond to any comments received on the CP, and provide the detail needed for the State Water Board to make a funding decision.

Applications may include attachments with supplemental materials such as design plans and specifications, detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot projects, additional maps, diagrams, letters of support, copies of agreements, or other applicable items. All supporting documentation will be requested in an electronic format through FAAST, unless specified otherwise. Details on what information will be required and FP evaluation criteria are presented in [Appendix E](#).

It is HIGHLY advisable that applicants review the Grant Agreement Template prior to submission of their FP. If applicants are not able to abide by the terms and conditions contained therein, applicants should not submit a FP. Only under extreme and unusual circumstances will modifications to the Grant Agreement Template's terms and conditions be made. A copy of a Grant Agreement Template will be available on the State Water Board website at:

DRAFT FINAL

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml

Applicants who do not receive funding during Round 1 may be eligible to reapply for Round 2. If additional funding becomes available, the next eligible applicant on the funding list may be awarded funding.

C. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF PRC § 75072 PLANNING & MONITORING PROJECT PROPOSALS

The State Water Board will release a PRC § 75072 Proposal Solicitation Notice for planning and monitoring projects prior to or during Round 1 (see Figure 1). The PRC § 75072 Proposal Solicitation Notice will include the application period, due date, and detailed instructions on the procedures for submitting the PRC § 75072 Proposals.

The PRC § 75072 Proposal Solicitation Notice will be posted on the State Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml

A PRC § 75072 Proposal Solicitation Notice will be e-mailed to all interested parties on the State Water Board's "Storm Water Grant Program (Proposition 84)" electronic mailing list. Interested parties may sign up for the electronic mailing list at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email_subscriptions/swrcb_subscribe.shtml

The PRC § 75072 Proposal application for planning and monitoring projects will consist of an on-line application submitted using the State Water Board's FFAST system. The PRC § 75072 Proposal application and evaluation criteria are presented in [Appendix F](#). The on-line FFAST application for the PRC § 75072 Proposal will be available following issuance of the PRC § 75072 Proposal Solicitation Notice, at the following secure link:

<https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/>

Applications may include attachments with supplemental materials such as detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot studies or collected data, additional maps, diagrams, pictures, letters of support, copies of agreements, or other applicable items. All supporting documentation will be requested in an electronic format through FFAST, unless specified otherwise. Details on what information will be required and PRC § 75072 Proposal evaluation criteria are presented in [Appendix F](#).

D. APPLICANT ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS

State Water Board staff will conduct technical assistance workshops throughout California to address questions and to provide general assistance to applicants in preparing CPs. The CP technical assistance workshops will include a presentation of general program information. Water Boards staff will also conduct workshops on proposal development for applicants invited to submit FPs. The dates and locations of the CP and FP workshops will be available on the State Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml

Applicants interested in obtaining the limited PRC§ 75072 Planning and Monitoring funds are encouraged to work directly with Water Boards staff on proposal development.

E. COMPLETENESS REVIEW

Applications must contain all required items listed in the Solicitation Notice. All applications, including attachments and supporting documentation, must be provided by the submittal deadline. Any material submitted after the deadline will not be reviewed or considered. State Water Board staff will initially evaluate and screen each application for completeness. Applications not containing all required information will not be reviewed or considered for funding, and applicants will be notified.

F. ELIGIBILITY REVIEW

State Water Board staff will evaluate and verify complete applications for compliance with eligibility criteria during the CP phase. All proposals must meet the Eligible Applicants requirements in [Section VI.A](#), and Eligible Project Types in [Section VI.C](#). Applications that are determined to be ineligible will not be reviewed or considered for funding, and applicants will be notified.

G. REVIEW AND SCORING PROCESS

i. CONCEPT PROPOSAL

CPs will be evaluated and screened mainly on the basis of their ability to address the SWGP's purpose (i.e., reduce and prevent storm water contamination), with other criteria (e.g., applicant's capabilities and experience, probability of success, incorporation of appropriate partners, technical expertise, etc.) also considered. Screening of CPs allows the FP review and selection to focus on technical and scientific merit.

All CPs must be submitted in FFAST by the deadline. As the CPs arrive in FFAST, State Water Board staff will conduct completeness and eligibility reviews. Water Boards staff will then proceed with technical review of all complete eligible CPs. CPs will also be made available to the SWATF members for review and comment.

The criteria outlined in the *Concept Proposal Evaluation: Scoring Criteria Form* ([Appendix D-2](#)) will be used to score CPs. Reviewer scores will be averaged in FFAST. State Water Board staff will review the scores for consistency among review results, and as needed may contact reviewers to resolve inconsistencies or disregard an outlier score in determining the average score for a CP. Once the scores are averaged, State Water Board staff will generate a list, sorting the CPs from high to low based on the final average scores.

State Water Board staff will group the CPs into three categories:

- ❖ Applicant Invited to Submit FP;
- ❖ Applicant Not Invited to Submit FP; and
- ❖ Ineligible CPs.

CP scores will be the basis for selection of the most competitive projects and determination of whether an applicant should be invited to submit a FP. The list will be distributed to the Regional Water Boards and SWATF members for review. SWATF members will have the opportunity to review, comment, and make recommendations prior to applicant notification. The lists will be posted on the State Water Board's Division website ([Appendix B](#)) and notification emails will be sent to all applicants. Applicants who submit the most competitive eligible CPs will be invited to submit FPs (if possible, invited applicants' funding requests will total at least 125 percent of the available grant funds for that Round).

ii. FULL PROPOSAL

The following information is required for a FP application to be deemed complete:

- ❖ Detailed project description;
- ❖ Documentation that the applicant is an eligible type, as listed in [Section VI.A](#);
- ❖ Names and addresses of contacts that should be notified of SWGP funding;
- ❖ Documentation of the environmental review (California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA]) status ([Appendix G](#));
- ❖ Draft Scope of Work for the project;

DRAFT FINAL

- ❖ Schedule for project activities;
- ❖ Line Item Budget for the project ([Appendix I](#));
- ❖ Project Performance Measures Table(s) ([Appendix H](#));
- ❖ Evidence that the applicant will be able to fund the operation and maintenance of the project for a period of 20 years;
- ❖ Status of any real property or right-of-way acquisitions necessary for the project to proceed;
- ❖ Letters of support from collaborating partners, if applicable.

Each FP will be evaluated and scored based on the information the applicant provides in the FP without regard to the CP score. FPs will be evaluated for consistency with the CP and major changes to the scope of work may disqualify the proposal. Previous knowledge, conversations, or outside information that is not provided in the FP will not be used to evaluate and score FPs. However, an applicant's past performance and track record may be taken into consideration.

FPs will be evaluated by the following two groups: (1) technical review teams (TRTs); and (2) selection panel. The role, makeup, and purpose of each group are outlined below. FPs will also be made available to the SWATF members for review and comment.

TRTs will evaluate and score all complete and eligible FPs. TRT members will individually score FPs in accordance with the evaluation criteria presented in [Appendix E](#). Each TRT will be comprised of at least three reviewers who will evaluate and score each eligible FP. TRTs will be formed, and appropriate reviewers selected, based on the "Project Type" categories identified during the CP phase. Reviewers within each team will review all FPs in a "Project Type" group. For example, all FPs with a "Trash TMDL" focus will be reviewed by the "Trash TMDL" review team. Additional TRTs may be identified as needed based on the number of proposals received and project types identified.

Following completion of the individual reviews, TRT members will discuss the FPs to arrive at a final evaluation and score for each proposal. Based on the final scores, State Water Board staff will compile FPs into a preliminary ranked list and send the list to Regional Water Boards staff, TRT members, and SWATF members for review and comment. The scope of the review and comments on the list should be limited to errors and/or inconsistencies in compiling the ranked list.

The State Water Board will convene a Selection Panel to review the preliminary ranking list, technical scores, and reviewer comments. If a TRT has not reached a final score on any proposal, the Selection Panel will determine a final score based on individual reviewer comments. If there is a disparity in the scores or concerns from the TRT reviewers or SWATF members, the Selection Panel will consider them and may revise the scores as appropriate. The Selection Panel may also adjust final scores for the proposals to ensure that evaluation criteria have been consistently applied.

The Selection Panel will make initial funding recommendations, considering the following items:

- ❖ Final review and score;
- ❖ Program Preferences ([Section VI.E](#)); and
- ❖ Amount of funds available for the grant program.

The Selection Panel will determine the recommended funding list, for presentation to the State Water Board for adoption. The Selection Panel may recommend reducing individual grant amounts from the requested amount. However, such reductions will be considered only if technical reviewers have indicated in their review comments that the budget is too high or some tasks are not necessary. A

DRAFT FINAL

reduction would also be weighed against whether the reduced funding would impede project implementation.

H. APPLICANT NOTIFICATION

State Water Board staff will post the list of proposals recommended for funding on the State Water Board website (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml) and notify applicants of the availability of the recommended funding list.

I. FUNDING AWARDS

The State Water Board will consider adoption of the funding recommendations developed by the Selection Panel at a State Water Board meeting. Following approval by the State Water Board, applicants will be notified of the funding award decision.

J. GRANT AGREEMENT

Although the grant solicitation and selection process is implemented by the State Water Board, the grant agreement oversight will be coordinated between the State Water Board and the Regional Water Boards. Following funding awards, the State Water Board will execute a grant agreement with the grantee. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by authorized representatives of the grantee and the State Water Board.

The State Water Board encourages collaboration in the development and implementation of projects. Parties that wish to collaborate on a proposal may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship, a joint venture, a joint powers authority, or other appropriate mechanism. Grant agreements will be executed with one eligible grantee per project. This grantee can subcontract with partners that are responsible for implementation of the project tasks. The grant funding and the implementation responsibilities will be the province of the grantee; subcontracting to another entity does not relieve the grantee of its responsibilities. The State Water Board will not have a relationship with collaborators or subcontractors.

Non-responsiveness has been an issue with a handful of past grantees. Such non-responsiveness slows down the funding process. In several cases, non-responsiveness has resulted in grant funds being left unused for a substantial and unwarranted amount of time and has caused the termination of grant agreements. For this reason, lack of responsiveness prior to finalizing and executing a grant agreement may result in withdrawal of the grant award. These funds may be made available to other competitive proposals listed below the funding line on the State Water Board adopted award list.

K. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS

Reimbursable costs are defined in [Appendix J](#). Only direct costs related to the project are allowed. Only work performed within the terms of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Reasonable feasibility and preliminary design costs for eligible project types are eligible for SWGP funding, provided these costs are tied to an implementation project, and the entire project can be completed within the funding timeframe. **Advance funds will not be provided.** Funding match requirements are discussed in [Section VI.B.iii](#).

Eligible expenses incurred upon execution of the grant agreement and prior to the project completion date may be directly reimbursed. Eligible expenses incurred after adoption of the Guidelines and prior to the work completion date may be claimed as match. Up to 10% (ten percent) of the grant amount may be used to fund education and outreach activities that are a part of an eligible project (see [Section VI.D](#)). Review and approval of funding expenditures will be performed by the Water Boards' Grant Manager.

VIII. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

A. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

All participants are subject to State and Federal conflict of interest laws. Failure to comply with these laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the application being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal action may also be taken. Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding conflict of interest requirements. Applicable statutes include, but are not limited to, California Government Code section 1090 and California Public Contract Code sections 10410 and 10411.

B. CONFIDENTIALITY

Once the proposal has been submitted to State Water Board, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived.

The location of all projects awarded funding, including the locations of management measures or practices implemented, must be reported to the Water Boards and will be available to the public. The Water Boards report project locations to the public through internet-accessible databases. The locations of all monitoring points and all monitoring data generated for ambient monitoring must be provided to the Water Boards and will not be kept confidential. The State Water Board uses Global Positioning System coordinates for project/sampling locations. See Monitoring and Reporting ([Section VIII.G](#)) for additional information on monitoring and reporting requirements.

C. LABOR CODE COMPLIANCE

Proposition 84 requires the body awarding a contract for a public works project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 84 to adopt and enforce, or contract with a third party to enforce, a labor compliance program pursuant to California Labor Code (CLC) § 1771.5(b). Compliance with applicable laws, including CLC provisions, will become an obligation of the grantee under the terms of the grant agreement between the grantee and the State Water Board. Proposition 84 provides, where applicable, that the grantee's Labor Compliance Program must be in place at the time of awarding of a contract for a public works project by the grantee.

Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding CLC compliance. See [Appendix B](#) for web links to the California Department of Industrial Relations.

D. CEQA COMPLIANCE

All projects funded under the SWGP must comply with the CEQA. See [Appendix B](#) for links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook.

Grantees are responsible for complying with all applicable laws and regulations for their projects, including CEQA. PRC § 75102 requires that, prior to the adoption of negative declaration or environmental impact report (EIR) for any project to be financed with Proposition 84 funds, the lead agency shall notify the proposed action to a California Native American tribe, which is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission, if that tribe has traditional lands located within the area of the proposed project. State Water Board selection of a project for a grant does not indicate that the consideration of alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate adverse environmental effects of that project are adequate. No work may proceed until the State Water Board completes its own CEQA findings. Details about the State Water Board's environmental compliance process can be found in [Appendix G](#).

E. WAIVER OF LITIGATION RIGHTS

Under no circumstances may a grantee use funds from any disbursement under a grant agreement to pay costs associated with any litigation the grantee pursues against the Water Boards. Regardless of the outcome of any such litigation, and notwithstanding any conflicting language in the grant agreement, the

DRAFT FINAL

grantee agrees to complete the project funded by the grant agreement or to repay all grant funds plus interest.

F. PROJECT ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION PLANS

All FPs must include the Project Performance Measure Tables, which form the basis of the Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP), to summarize how project performance will be assessed, evaluated, and reported. The goals of the PAEP are to:

- ❖ Provide a framework for assessment and evaluation of project performance;
- ❖ Identify measures that can be used to monitor progress towards achieving project goals and desired outcomes;
- ❖ Provide a tool for grantees and grant managers to monitor and measure project progress and guide final project performance reporting that will fulfill the grant agreement requirements;
- ❖ Provide information to help improve current and future projects; and
- ❖ Quantify the value of public expenditures to achieve environmental results.

The grantee must submit a PAEP after the grant agreement is executed and make annual updates thereafter for the term of the grant agreement. The PAEP must include a summary of project goals, the desired project outcomes, the appropriate performance measures to track the project progress, and measurable targets that the applicant thinks are feasible to meet during the project period. The PAEP is not intended to be a monitoring plan. PAEP guidance is presented in [Appendix H](#).

G. MONITORING & REPORTING

As outlined in PRC § 75050.2, grantees are required to assess and report on project effectiveness, which may include, but is not limited to, monitoring receiving water quality, determining pollutant load reductions, and assessing improvements in storm water discharge quality resulting from project implementation.

Monitoring data must be integrated into the SWAMP. Under SWAMP, all projects must complete and implement a monitoring plan and a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). For surface water monitoring, the QAPP must be prepared in accordance with the SWAMP QAPP template, which is available on-line at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/

Reports that will be required include regular progress reports as well as draft and final project reports.

H. DATA MANAGEMENT

Projects must include appropriate data management activities so that project data can be incorporated into appropriate statewide data systems. Project-generated data will be available to the stakeholders, agencies, and the public. Web links to additional information on the State Water Board's statewide data management efforts are provided in [Appendix B](#).

I. URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Urban Water Management Planning Act (the Act) (California Water Code [CWC] § 10610 et seq.) provides that management of urban water demands and efficient use of urban water supplies shall be a guiding criterion in public decisions. Urban Water Suppliers, publicly or privately owned suppliers that provide water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers or supply more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually, shall be required to develop water management plans to actively pursue the efficient use of available supplies. An urban water supplier shall submit to the Department of Water Resources (DWR), the California State Library, and any city or county within which the supplier provides water

DRAFT FINAL

supplies a copy of its plan no later than 30 days after adoption. Copies of amendments or changes to the plans shall be submitted to the department, the California State Library, and any city or county within which the supplier provides water supplies within 30 days after adoption (CWC § 10644).

AB 1420 (Statutes 2007, Chapter 628) requires an Urban Water Supplier to prepare and adopt an urban water management plan that includes a description of water demand management measures being implemented or scheduled for implementation in their service area. Beginning January 1, 2009, Urban Water Suppliers applying for water management grants or loans are required to demonstrate implementation of water demand management measures (CWC §10631). Compliance with this provision will be required before a grant agreement can be executed with an Urban Water Supplier if the project is considered a water management project. DWR is the responsible agency for verifying compliance with the AB 1420 provision.

J. GRANT MANAGER NOTIFICATION

Grantees will be required to notify the Water Boards' Grant Manager prior to conducting construction, monitoring, demonstration, or other implementation activities so that the Water Boards' Grant Manager may observe to verify activities are conducted in accordance with the grant agreement. The Water Boards' Grant Manager may document the inspection with photographs or notes, which may be included in the Water Boards' project file.

K. DIVISION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY

Funds may become available from projects which are withdrawn or completed under budget. The Deputy Director of the Division shall have the authority to utilize these funds for funding additional projects below the funding line on an adopted SWGP funding list or for augmenting the scope and budget of projects previously awarded. Additional activities funded under existing grants will be subject to these Guidelines and must complement or further the goals of existing projects.

DRAFT FINAL

APPENDIX A: PROPOSITION 84 STORM WATER GRANT PROGRAM SUMMARY TABLE

Grant Program	Project Eligibility	Eligible Applicants/ Funding Available
<p>Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program</p> <p><i>Purpose: Provide matching grants to local public agencies for the reduction and prevention of storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposition 84, Chapter 5 [Pub. Resource Code, § 75050(m).] Assembly Bill No. 739 (Stats. 2007, Ch. 610.) Assembly Bill No. 1420 (Stats. 2007, Ch. 628.) Senate Bill No. 732 (Stats. 2008, Ch. 729.) 	<p>Grants may be awarded for projects to achieve any of the following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assistance in implementing low-impact development and other onsite and regional practices, on public and private lands, that seek to maintain predevelopment hydrology for existing and new development and redevelopment projects. Projects will be designed to infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, or retain runoff in close proximity to the source of water. Complying with total maximum daily load (TMDL) requirements established pursuant to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)) and Division 43 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC) where pollutant loads have been allocated to storm water, including, but not limited to, metals, pathogens, and trash pollutants. Up to \$10 million dollars, total from Round 1 and Round 2, may be used for storm water related TMDL projects. <p><u>Project Preferences</u> Preference will be given to projects that do one or more of the following:</p> <p>(A) Projects that support sustained, long-term water quality improvements.</p> <p>(B) Projects which are coordinated or consistent with any applicable integrated regional water management plan.</p> <p><u>Additional Requirements</u></p> <p>(A) Beginning January 1, 2009, the terms of, and eligibility for, a water management grant or loanⁱ made to an urban water supplierⁱⁱ and awarded or administered by the Department of Water Resources, State Water Resources Control Board, or California Bay-Delta Authority or its successor agency shall be conditioned on the implementation of the water demand management measures described in section 10631 of the California Water Code (CWC).</p> <p>(B) The allocation of funds shall be consistent with water quality control plans (Basin Plans) and section 75072 of the PRCⁱⁱⁱ, which states that up to 10 percent of funds allocated, may be used to finance planning and monitoring necessary for the successful design, selection, and implementation of the projects authorized.</p> <p>(C) Grantees will be required to assess and report on project effectiveness, which may include monitoring receiving water quality, determining pollutant load reductions, or assessing improvements in storm water discharge water quality resulting from project implementation.</p> <p>(D) Prior to the adoption of negative declaration or environmental impact report for any project to be financed with Proposition 84 funds, the lead agency shall notify the proposed action to a California Native American tribe, which is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission, if that tribe has traditional lands located within the area of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Local Public Agencies</p> <p>Approximately \$82 million</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not to exceed three million dollars (\$3,000,000) per project <p>See Table 2 in Section VI.B.i of the Guidelines for project timing.</p>

ⁱ Water management grants and loans include funding for programs and projects for surface water or groundwater storage, recycling, desalination, water conservation, water supply reliability, and water supply augmentation.

ⁱⁱ Per CWC, section 10617, an "urban water supplier" means a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually. An urban water supplier includes a supplier or contractor for water, regardless of the basis of right, which distributes or sells for ultimate resale to customers. This definition of an urban water supplier applies only to water supplied from public water systems subject to Chapter 4 (commencing with section 116275) of Part 12 of Division 104 of the Health and Safety Code.

ⁱⁱⁱ Information on eligibility for PRC § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Projects can be found in Section VI.F of these Guidelines.

DRAFT FINAL APPENDIX B: Useful Web Links

Performance Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP) Websites

Project Planning, Research, Monitoring, and Assessment (many of these resources also apply to BMP implementation or habitat restoration effectiveness monitoring)

cwam.ucdavis.edu
www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/volunteer.html
www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp
www.epa.gov/watertrain
www.dfg.ca.gov/cabw/csbp_2003.pdf
www.cramwetlands.org
www.calfish.org/DesktopDefault.aspx?tabId=112
www.cnr.berkeley.edu/forestry/comp_proj/DFG/Monitoring%20the%20Implementation%20and%20Effectiveness%20of%20Fisheries.pdf

Education and Outreach

www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,%207-135-3313_3682_3714-75944--,00.html
learningstore.uwex.edu/pdf/G3658-10.PDF

Pollutant Load Reduction Activities

it.tetrattech-ffx.com/stepl
www.sfei.org/watersheds/reports/GuadalupeYear1final.pdf

Habitat Restoration

www.dfg.ca.gov/nafwb/manual.html
www.dfg.ca.gov/nafwb/pubs.html
www.dfg.ca.gov/hcpb/species/stds_gdl/survmonitr.shtml
www.epa.gov/watertrain
water.usgs.gov/nawqa/protocols/OFR-93-408/habit1.html

PAEP Tools and Project Performance Measures Tables

www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/paep/index.shtml

Regional Water Boards Watershed Management Initiative Chapters

Region 1: www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/watershed_management_initiative.shtml
Region 2: www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/watershedmanagement.shtml
Region 3: www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/water_issues/programs/wmi/index.shtml
Region 4: www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/regional_program/index.shtml#Watershed
Region 5: www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/watershed_management/r5_wmi_chapter.shtml
Region 6: www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/watershed_management/index.shtml
Region 7: www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/water_issues/programs/wmi/wmi_chapter.shtml
Region 8: www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/wmi/index.shtml
Region 9: www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/wmc/index.shtml

Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans)

Region 1: www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/basin_plan
Region 2: www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/basin_planning.shtml
Region 3: www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/publications_forms/publications/basin_plan/index.shtml
Region 4: www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/basin_plan
Region 5: www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans
Region 6: www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/index.shtml
Region 7: www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/water_issues/programs/basin_planning
Region 8: www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/index.shtml
Region 9: www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/index.shtml

State Water Board Program Information

303d List: www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/docs/303dlists2006
Division of Financial Assistance: www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans
Groundwater Monitoring: www.waterboards.ca.gov/gama
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Program
NPS Program: www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/protecting.html
Storm Water Grant Program: www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml
Storm Water Regulatory Program: www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater
Strategic Plan: www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/hot_topics/strategic_plan/2007update.shtml
TMDL List: www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/docs/tmdlolist.doc

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX B: Useful Web Links

State Water Board Statewide Data Management Programs

California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS)

www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/index.shtml

Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP):

www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp

SWAMP Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) Template:

www.waterboards.ca.gov/swamp/docs/swampqapp_template032404.doc

US Census 2000

www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html

USEPA's NPS Program

www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-WATER/2003/October/Day-23/w26755.htm

USEPA's Storm Water Program

www.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX C: REQUESTS FOR REDUCTION OF FUNDING MATCH FOR
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES
(Applicable to Full Proposals)

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Appendix is to provide a method for requesting a reduction of the funding match for the SWGP. An applicant must either demonstrate that the required funding match will be provided, or request a reduction of the funding match and submit a signed Certificate of Understanding ([Exhibit C-1](#)). State Water Board staff will review the information submitted by the applicant and decide, based on the information provided, whether to grant, amend, or deny, the request for the reduction.

At a minimum, the following information must be included in the application:

- ❖ Provide a map with sufficient geographic detail to define the boundaries of the disadvantaged community;
- ❖ Describe the methodology used in determining the total population of the project area and the total population of the disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area. The applicant must include what census geographies (i.e., census designated place, census tract, census block) were used, and how they were applied. Also, the applicant must explain how the disadvantaged communities were identified;
- ❖ Provide annual median household income (MHI) data for the disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area;
- ❖ Provide sample calculations showing how the proposed reduced funding match was derived;
- ❖ Provide information on amount and type of direct benefit(s) the project(s) provides to the disadvantaged community(ies);
- ❖ Include descriptions or information on the disadvantaged community's(ies)' involvement, such as past, current, and future efforts to include disadvantaged community representatives in the planning and/or implementation process; and
- ❖ Letters of support from representatives of the disadvantaged community(ies) indicating their support for the project or portion of the proposal designed to provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged community(ies) and acknowledging their inclusion in the planning and/or implementation process.

The following data requirements must be met:

- ❖ MHI and population data sets must be from either the 2000 or later Census, or a population survey if no Census data is available; and
- ❖ MHI and population data used in analysis must be from the same time period and geography.

II. ALLOWANCES

For assistance with accessing census data see the Census website ([Appendix B](#)).

In determining the MHI and population for a disadvantaged community(ies) and the project area, applicants may use a single type of census geography or combinations of 2000 or later Census geographies that best represent the project area. However, the census geography used must be consistent for both MHI and population for a particular community. Official census geographies, such as census tract, place, and block group, are acceptable. The intent of including this flexibility is to allow applicants a choice so that population and income data in the project area can be accurately represented.

III. STEPS TO REQUEST A REDUCTION OF THE FUNDING MATCH

STEP A. SCREENING BASED ON MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT

Grants awarded under the SWGP have specific maximum grant amounts (presented in [Section VI.B](#)) regardless of disadvantaged community status.

STEP B. DOCUMENTATION OF THE PRESENCE OF DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

Disadvantaged communities must be located in the project area. **If there are no disadvantaged communities in the project area, do not apply for a reduced funding match.** The disadvantaged community(ies) should be identified in the description of the project area in the Full Proposal. Applicants should ensure the description of the disadvantaged community(ies) is adequate to determine whether the community(ies) meets the definitions of this Appendix. The disadvantaged community(ies) should also be shown on maps of the project area. In describing the disadvantaged community(ies), include the relationship to the project objectives. Include information that supports the determination of disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area.

STEP C. DOCUMENTATION OF DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION & PARTICIPATION

The mere presence of a disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area is not sufficient cause to grant a reduction of the funding match. The disadvantaged community(ies) must be involved in the implementation process. Supporting information that demonstrates how the disadvantaged community(ies) is, or will be, involved in the implementation process of the project must be included. Information must demonstrate how the disadvantaged community(ies) or their representative(s) is participating in the implementation process. As indicated above, include letters from the disadvantaged community(ies) representatives that verify support of and inclusion and participation in the process. **If disadvantaged community representation or participation in the implementation process cannot be demonstrated, do not apply for a reduced funding match.**

STEP D. BENEFITS AND IMPACTS TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

Applicants must explain anticipated benefits and impacts to the disadvantaged community(ies) in their project area for the specific work item(s) in their proposal. The explanation should include the nature of the anticipated benefit(s), the certainty that benefit(s) will accrue if the project is implemented, and which disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area will benefit and/or be impacted.

STEP E. DETERMINING A REDUCED FUNDING MATCH

The required funding matches for the SWGP are presented in [Section VI.B](#) of the Guidelines. Where the project directly benefits a disadvantaged community, a reduction in the required funding match may be allowed.

IV. REDUCED FUNDING MATCH REQUIREMENTS

The funding match is calculated based on the total project cost.

- ❖ **Option A: Small & Severely Disadvantaged Community** – 5% match if the population is less than 20,000 persons **and** the MHI is less than 60% of the Statewide MHI.
- ❖ **Option B: Small & Disadvantaged Community** – 10% match if the population is less than 20,000 persons **and** the MHI is less than 80% of the Statewide MHI.
- ❖ **Option C: Disadvantaged Community** – 15% match if the population is greater than 20,000 persons and the MHI is less than 80% of the Statewide MHI.

DRAFT FINAL

Example of Reduced Funding Match Calculation					
Total Project Cost: \$2,000,000 (\$2 M)					
Calculation of 5% funding match		Calculation of 10% funding match		Calculation of 15% funding match	
Required Funding Match to be Provided by Applicant	Maximum Grant Funds Requested	Required Funding Match to be Provided by Applicant	Maximum Grant Funds Requested	Required Funding Match to be Provided by Applicant	Maximum Grant Funds Requested
$0.05 \times \$2 \text{ M} =$ \$100,000	$\$2 \text{ M} - \$0.1 \text{ M} =$ \$1,900,000	$0.1 \times \$2 \text{ M} =$ \$200,000	$\$2 \text{ M} - \$0.2 \text{ M} =$ \$1,800,000	$0.15 \times \$2 \text{ M} =$ \$300,000	$\$2 \text{ M} - \$0.3 \text{ M} =$ \$1,700,000

Use of zero values for populations and MHI for disadvantaged communities are not appropriate in data sets. Text, data, and other information that supports selection of areas as a disadvantaged community(ies) must be provided. For assistance with accessing census data, see the 2000 Census data website ([Appendix B](#)). Include the method used for population determination, the population of the project area, the population of disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area, MHI data for disadvantaged community(ies), and the calculation of the reduced funding match.

DRAFT FINAL

EXHIBIT C-1: CERTIFICATION OF UNDERSTANDING

The undersigned certifies that:

The application submitted by <Insert Name of Applicant> for <Insert Proposal Title> for a Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program contains a request for a reduction of the funding match based on <"small & severely disadvantaged," "small disadvantaged," or "disadvantaged"> community status.

The above named applicant understands:

- The reduction of the funding match presented in the application is a request that will not be automatically granted.
- State Water Resources Control Board staff will review the disadvantaged community information submitted in the application prior to making a decision to accept, modify, or deny such a reduction.
- Should the proposal be chosen for funding, but the requested reduction in funding match be rejected or modified, the grantee is responsible for costs exceeding the grant funding amount to complete the project and any additional required match.
- The granting agency will rescind the grant award if the grantee cannot cover either:
 - 1) Increased costs and/or match due to rejection or modification of the request for reduction in the funding match; or
 - 2) Adequately restructure the grant proposal within the available budget, while still meeting the intent of the original proposal.

Authorized Signature: _____
 Printed Name: _____
 Title: _____
 Agency: _____
 Date: _____

DRAFT FINAL

**APPENDIX D: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION &
EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Appendix D-1 Concept Proposal Application

Appendix D-2 Concept Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Please note that the application and/or review questions outlined in [Appendix D](#) may be slightly reworded, combined, or separated as the information is transferred to the online Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The technical content and requirements will not change.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D-1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION

This section provides instructions for preparing and submitting an application via the Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). These directions refer to the Concept Proposal (CP), Full Proposal (FP), and Public Resources Code (PRC) § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Project Proposal application process. It is important that the applicants follow the instructions to ensure that their application will address all of the required elements. Applicants must submit a complete application online using the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) FAAST at the following secure link:

<https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov>

The due date for applications will be outlined in the Solicitation Notice, to be posted on the State Water Board's webpage at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml

To complete a successful FAAST application, we recommend that applicants:

- ❖ Review the FAAST User Manual and Frequently Asked Questions, available at the FAAST webpage, before creating a user account and completing the online application;
- ❖ Make note of the unique Proposal Identification Number (PIN) FAAST assigns when an application/proposal is created. This pin should always be referenced when an applicant needs assistance with FAAST;
- ❖ Print out a blank copy of the entire application if the applicant would like to work from a hard copy. To print an application, complete the following steps:
 - Initiate a new application and fill out the following three fields on the first page: "Project Title," "Project Description," and "Responsible Regional Water Board." Applicants can come back to edit these fields later;
 - Click on the "Save and Continue" button to initiate the application process; and
 - Click on the "Preview/Submit Application" button and select the "Print" option from the browser "File" menu.
- ❖ Use pull-down menus, text boxes, or multiple-choice selections to answer questions. FAAST will allow applicants to type text or cut and paste information from other documents directly into a FAAST submittal screen. When using the cut and paste feature, remove any formatting (e.g., bold, underline, indent) before pasting into FAAST;
- ❖ Upload attachments using a name similar to the attachment title to simplify personal file management, and keep the following rules in mind:
 - Special characters such as dashes, asterisks, symbols, spaces, percentage signs are not allowed, but underscores may be used. FAAST tracks attachments by an attachment title, not by file name;
 - The file name section in FAAST requires a computer path to the file location on the applicant's computer;
 - Acceptable file formats are: MS Word, MS Excel, or PDF; and
 - File size for each attachment submitted via FAAST is limited to 10 Megabytes (MB).
- ❖ Review the complete application prior to submitting it in FAAST. Once an application has been submitted no further modifications, additions, or deletions will be allowed;
- ❖ Save the application often and submit the application only when all requested information is entered and uploaded;

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

- ❖ Avoid last minute submittals and allow time for FFAST staff assistance, should any submittal problems occur; and
- ❖ Note that once the application has been submitted to the State Water Board, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived.

After the application is submitted, the FFAST system will send an automated confirmation email to the applicant confirming the date and time of submission.

The following information is provided as a guide for applicants to ensure that they have submitted the required information.

A. Program Selection & General FFAST Information	
1.	PROJECT SELECTION
	Select the “Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program.” Select either “Implementing LID” or “Complying with TMDL requirements.”
2.	GENERAL INFORMATION
	<u>Project Title</u> – Provide the title of the Proposal. If this item is not completed, FFAST will not accept the application.
	<u>Project Description</u> – Provide a brief description of the project. The length of the Project Description is limited to 1,000 characters (including spaces). If this item is not completed, FFAST will not accept the application.
	<u>Applicant Details</u> – Provide the name and address of the applicant organization.
	<u>Project Director</u> – The Project Director is the person responsible for filing an application, executing a grant agreement, and any subsequent amendments to the grant agreement. Persons that are subcontractors to be paid by the grant cannot be listed as the Project Director.
	<u>Project Manager</u> – The Project Manager is the day-to-day contact on the project from the applicant Organization.
	<u>Grant Funds Requested</u> – Provide amount of grant funds requested – for the project in dollars.
	<u>Total Budget</u> – Grant fund requested, funding match, and total project cost.
	<u>Latitude/Longitude</u> – Enter latitude/longitude coordinates of the approximate midpoint of the project location in degrees using decimal format.
	<u>Watershed</u> – Provide name(s) of the watershed(s) where the project is located. If the project covers multiple watersheds, list the primary watershed first.
	<u>County</u> – Provide the county in which the project is located. If the project covers multiple counties, select “Multiple Counties” from the drop down list.
	<u>Responsible Regional Water Board</u> – Provide the name of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) in which the project is located. If the project extends beyond one Regional Water Board boundary, select “Statewide” from the drop down list. If this item is not completed, FFAST will not accept the application.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.	<p>LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION</p> <p>Enter the State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. Congressional Districts in which the project is located. For projects that include more than one district, please enter each district. Lookup tables are provided in FFAST to assist with determining the appropriate districts.</p>
4.	<p>COOPERATING ENTITIES</p> <p>Include entities that have/will assist the applicant in project development or implementation. Provide name(s) of cooperating entity(ies), role/contribution to project, first and last name of entity contact, phone number, and email address.</p>
5.	<p>AGENCY CONTACTS</p> <p>If the applicant has been collaborating with State and Federal agencies (Department of Water Resources [DWR], Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), etc.) in Proposal/project development, please provide agency name, agency contact first and last name, phone, and email address. This information is used to identify individuals who may have an understanding of a project and in no way indicates an advantage or disadvantage in the ranking process.</p>
6.	<p>APPLICATION QUESTIONNAIRE</p> <p>The answers to these questions will be used in processing the application and determining the eligibility and completeness of the application.</p>
7.	<p>PROJECT CLASSIFICATION</p> <p>These questions allow State Water Board staff to categorize the type(s) of activity(ies) the project is proposing to implement.</p>

B. Concept Proposal Questions	
1.	<p>APPLICANT TYPE</p> <p><u>Q1.</u> Select the applicant's organization type from the drop-down menu. In order to be considered eligible, the applicant must meet the definition of "local public agency" and be a city, county, city and county, or district. A joint powers authority comprised entirely of local public agencies is an eligible applicant.</p> <p><u>Q2.</u> Is the applicant an Urban Water Supplier (i.e., a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, that provides water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplies more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually)? If yes, has the Urban Water Supplier prepared, adopted, and submitted to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) an urban water management plan? Provide the status of the plan.</p> <p><u>Q3.</u> Is the applicant an Urban Water Supplier and is the project is a water management project, as defined in Appendix J? If yes, has the applicant submitted documentation to DWR requesting compliance verification with Assembly Bill (AB) 1420 (Statutes 2007, Chapter 628)? Explain and provide the status.</p>
2.	<p>PROJECT TYPE (PT)</p> <p><u>Q4.</u> Describe how the project meets the eligible project types outlined in Section VI.C of the Storm Water Grant Program (SWGP) Guidelines:</p> <p>PT1. Assistance in implementing Low Impact Development (LID) and other onsite and regional practices, on public and private lands, that seek to maintain predevelopment hydrology for existing and new development and redevelopment projects. Projects shall be designed to infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, or retain runoff in close proximity to the source of water.</p> <p>PT2. Complying with Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirements established pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. Sec. 1313(d)) and Division 43 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC) where pollutant loads have been allocated to storm water, including, but not limited to, metals, pathogens, and trash pollutants.</p>

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND TIMLINE
	<u>Q5.</u> Briefly describe the project.
	<u>Q6.</u> Describe the project location. Attach a map or diagram depicting the project and watershed, and provide photographs of the proposed site. (Attachment 1)
	<u>Q7.</u> Provide a list and brief description of all major project work items and the associated schedule for completion of all major project work items.
	<u>Q8.</u> Enter the estimated “Start Date” and “End Date” for the proposed project in mm/yyyy format. For the “End Date” provide the estimated submittal date(s) of the final report and final invoice. (The draft report and final report are typically due two (2) months and one (1) month prior to the work completion date, respectively.) Refer to Section VI.B for a timeline associated with Round 1 and Round 2 projects.
	<u>Q9.</u> If the project extends beyond more than one Regional Water Board boundary, list the Regional Water Boards the project spans.
4.	PROBLEM AND SOURCE IDENTIFICATION
	<u>Q10.</u> What are possible or known sources of storm water contamination applicable to this project? Describe any studies or data collection efforts that have been done to confirm these conclusions.
	<u>Q11.</u> Identify the water quality and other problem(s) the project is proposing to solve.
	<u>Q12.</u> Describe the impaired waters, their beneficial uses, and the water quality problem(s) that interfere with the beneficial uses of those waters. Beneficial uses associated with a water body can be found in each Regional Water Board’s Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) located on their website (Appendix B).
	<u>Q13.</u> What is the quantity and origin of the storm water flow to be treated?
5.	PROPOSED SOLUTION AND POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS
	<u>Q14.</u> How does the project solve the identified water quality and other problem(s) identified in Question 11?
	<u>Q15.</u> Is this a phased project or part of a larger project effort? Please explain the objectives, framework, and scheduling for the larger project. Note whether there is a commitment to complete the entire project, referencing any related agreements, stability of funding for other phases, etc.
	<u>Q16.</u> Indicate the expected project benefits to water quality and beneficial uses.
	<u>Q17.</u> Describe the approach the project is proposing to use to solve the problem(s), and the technical basis for the selected approach.
	<u>Q18.</u> Identify any risks to water quality associated with the proposed approach described in Question 16.
6.	PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS
	<u>Q19.</u> How do you propose to measure and document your project’s benefits to water quality and beneficial uses (e.g., before and after concentrations of a constituent, percent load reduction, etc.)?
7.	PROGRAM PREFERENCES
	<u>Q20.</u> Does the project address one or more of the following Program Preferences? Please explain how the project addresses the specific Program Preference(s). (a) Supports sustained, long term water quality improvement; or (b) Is coordinated or consistent with any applicable Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

8.	MULTIPLE BENEFITS
	<p><u>Q21.</u> For PT1 Projects: Does the project address one or more TMDL(s)? Indicate the TMDL(s) that your project will address and its status (e.g., Trash TMDL for the Los Angeles River Watershed, approved by the USEPA in August 2002). Explain how the project will contribute expeditiously and measurably to long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards by implementing the applicable TMDL(s).</p> <p>For PT2 Projects: Does the project implement Low Impact Development (LID) or support Smart Growth. If yes, identify the LID technique(s) or Smart Growth strategies that the project will implement.</p>
	<p><u>Q22.</u> Does the project implement the Ahwahnee Principles for Resource Efficient Land Use. If yes, identify the Ahwahnee Principle(s), and describe how the project implements the principles.</p>
	<p><u>Q23.</u> Will the project be funded, in part or in whole, from <u>local</u> resources, <u>local</u> bond measure(s), or other <u>local</u> revenue sources? If yes, identify the source(s) and amount(s).</p>
	<p><u>Q24.</u> Does the proposed project use urban greening or green infrastructure principles? If yes, describe how.</p>
	<p><u>Q25.</u> Will the project reduce green house gas emissions and/or addresses climate change? If yes, describe how, quantify the reduction, and provide the basis for the quantification.</p>
9.	READINESS TO PROCEED
	<p><u>Q26.</u> Provide the status of all environmental documents required for the project. All projects require California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance and will be allowed to use grant funds for match and/or reimbursement of CEQA costs, provided the costs were incurred after the adoption of the Guidelines, or are incurred within the term of the grant agreement.</p>
	<p><u>Q27.</u> Will your project be adopting a negative declaration or environmental impact report? If yes, provide an update on the status of the document or the proposed timeline for development. Projects with a negative declaration or environmental impact report will be subject to additional requirements, as outlined in Appendix H of the Guidelines.</p>
	<p><u>Q28.</u> List any permits, approvals, or design standards that must be obtained/met before the project can be implemented.</p>
	<p><u>Q29.</u> Describe the anticipated source(s) and amount(s) of proposed funding match for the project. Please indicate if the funding match is secured or pending. If the applicant will be requesting a match reduction as part of the Full Proposal application, please indicate the amount of match reduction to be requested, and the basis for the request (i.e., project serves a small severely disadvantaged community).</p>
	<p><u>Q30.</u> Has the project described in this Concept Proposal been funded, in part or in full, previously by other grants? If so, explain.</p>
	<p><u>Q31.</u> Is the project planning and design complete? If not, what are the anticipated deliverables and associated estimated completion date(s)?</p>
	<p><u>Q32.</u> Will the proposed project require property acquisition and/or land owner agreements? If so, will agreements and/or acquisition be complete prior to grant award or grant agreement execution? If the proposed property will be owned by another entity, provide background on the applicant's authority to perform the project on the land. Indicate if adequate rights of way have been obtained for the useful life of the project (i.e., at least 20 years).</p>
10.	APPLICANT INFORMATION
	<p><u>Q33.</u> Has the applicant or any cooperating entities applied for other funds from another program for this specific project? (This includes programs not administered by the State Water Board.) If yes, identify the agency, program, and amount requested/received.</p>

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

	<u>Q34.</u> Has the applicant or any cooperating entities entered into a contract or grant agreement: (1) that was terminated; (2) in which funds were withheld by the State Water Board; (3) in which the grantee was notified of a Breach of Agreement; or (4) that has been the subject of an audit in which there were findings regarding the management of the project or funds by the applicant or cooperating entity? If so, explain including actions taken to address the problem(s).
	<u>Q35.</u> Is the applicant or was the applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the project? If so, explain (include the name and case number in your explanation).
11.	BONUS POINTS
	<u>Q36.</u> Describe how the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community or address environmental justice issues. Applicants must provide strong justification to receive bonus points.
12.	DISCLAIMER
	<u>Q37.</u> _____(initials): The <u>Project Director</u> has read and understands the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement. If the Project Director does not agree with the terms and conditions, a grant award may be denied. (All applicants will be required to check the box and initial next to the statement.)

APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Provide the attachments listed below by attaching files, no larger than 10 megabytes, to the FFAST application. For instructions on attaching files, please refer to the FFAST User Manual and the solicitation notice. When attaching files, applicants must use the naming convention noted in FFAST.

Attachment #	Attachment Title	Description
Attachment 1	Project Location - Map and Photos	Map, diagram, and/or photographs of the proposed project area.
Attachment 2 (Optional)	Project Information	Provide any additional information not contained in the on-line FFAST questionnaire.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D-2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

PROPOSITION 84 STORM WATER GRANT PROGRAM CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION: ELIGIBILITY REVIEW		
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	YES / NO	KEY
General Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) Information 1. Does the Concept Proposal contain all the required information requested in the FAAST? (e.g., General Details, Project Budget, Project Location, Funding Source, Legislative Information, Contact Agency Information, Cooperating Entity Information, etc.)		Applicant must receive “Yes” for ALL questions to be eligible for invite back.
Eligibility 2. Is the applicant eligible for funding? (Question 1)		
3. Is the project an eligible project type? (Question 4)		
Readiness to Proceed 4. Does the project’s estimated “Start Date” and “End Date” fall within the SWGP appropriations? (Question 8)		
Applicant Information 5. Has the applicant checked the box and initialed that the Project Director has read and understands the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement? (Question 37)		
Overall Evaluation 6. Indicate if the Concept Proposal should be scored, based on answers to Questions 1 through 5 above?		Yes = Concept Proposal should be scored. No = Concept Proposal should not be scored.

PROPOSITION 84 STORM WATER GRANT PROGRAM CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORING CRITERIA		
Note: The question references are provided below to assist the reviewer. However, the information provided throughout the Concept Proposal should be used to determine the score.		
SCORED CRITERIA	SCORE	POINTS POSSIBLE
1. How well does the proposed project address the problem(s) and pollutant(s)? (Questions 10-13)		0 - 10
2. How well does the proposed project appear to reduce and prevent storm water contamination of surface waters? (Entire CP)		0 - 20
3. Does the approach appear to be technically feasible? Does the description of how benefits will be achieved appear reasonable? Are the appropriate methods being proposed? (Questions 14-18)		0 - 20

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SCORED CRITERIA	SCORE	POINTS POSSIBLE
4. How well does the project address Program Preferences? (Question 20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports sustained, long term water quality improvement. (Four points possible) • Is coordinated or consistent with any applicable Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. (Two points if consistent/coordinate, and four points if project identified in IRWM Plan.) 		0 - 8
5. How well does the project provide multiple benefits? Does the Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For PT1 Projects: Contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards by implementing a TMDL? (Question 21) <li style="text-align: center;">or • For PT2 Projects: Implement Low Impact Development (LID) that contributes to storm water quality improvements, and/or supports Smart Growth? (Question 21) • Implement the Ahwahnee Principles for Resource Efficient Land Use or similar land use or planning principles? (Question 22) • Leverage local resources from <u>local</u> bond measures or other <u>local</u> revenue sources to implement the project? (Question 23) • Use urban greening and/or green infrastructure principles? (Question 24) • Contribute to the reduction of green house gas emissions and/or reduce climate change? (Question 25) • Does the project restore beneficial uses (e.g., human consumption, water supply of a city or town, recreational, etc.)? (Question 16) 		0 - 12 (2 pts per criteria)
6. How well does the applicant address the project's readiness to proceed? (Questions 26-32) (Minus 2 points if property is not yet acquired.)		10
7. How well does the project address project effectiveness? (Question 19)		10
8. Does the applicant have a good track record? If no, are the proposed actions to be taken to address the problem(s) sufficient? (Questions 34-35) (- 5 Points if Negative, 0 points if Neutral or Good)		0
Overall Evaluation 9. What is the total score of this Concept Proposal?		88 (does not include bonus points)
Bonus Points 10. Does the project directly benefit a disadvantaged community or address environmental justice issues? (Question 36)		5
11. Should the applicant be invited back to submit a Full Proposal? Note: Concept Proposals with a score of less than 65 points will automatically not be invited back.		Yes or No
12. Discuss any concerns with respect to the submitted Concept Proposal/Project.		
13. If this applicant is invited to submit a Full Proposal, discuss suggestions on how to improve the proposal/project. (Note to Reviewers: This text will be provided to the applicant. Be clear and concise.)		

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX D – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

CONCEPT PROPOSAL SCORING TABLE	
Note: The following table will be used to score Concept Proposals unless otherwise noted.	
Score	Scoring Rationale
Full Points	Criteria are fully addressed and supported by thorough and well presented documentation and logical rationale.
↑	Criteria are addressed with sufficient documentation and rationale.
Half Points	Criteria are addressed but documentation and/or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.
↓	Criteria are partially addressed and little to no documentation and/or rationale is presented.
No Points	Applicant is not responsive (i.e., criteria are not addressed and no documentation or rationale is presented).

APPENDIX E: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION & EVALUATION CRITERIA

Appendix E-1 Full Proposal Application

Appendix E-2 Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Please note that the application and/or review questions outlined in [Appendix E](#) may be slightly reworded, combined, or separated as the information is transferred to the online Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The technical content and requirements will not change.

DRAFT FINAL

APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

Applicants will be asked to organize their Full Proposal in a format consistent with the evaluation criteria. This approach should assist applicants in providing complete documentation and will streamline the review process. Applicants should use consistent terminology throughout their Full Proposal application. Full Proposals will be submitted online using the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) FFAST. See the beginning of [Appendix D](#) for Application Instructions.

The minimum information that must be provided in the Full Proposal for each of the sections is discussed in the corresponding sections below.

Full Proposal Questions	
1.	Eligibility Requirements
	<u>Q1.</u> Is the applicant a local public agency as defined in Appendix J of this document? Explain whether the Applicant has legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board.
	<u>Q2.</u> Describe how the project meets the eligible project types outlined in Section VI.C .
	<u>Q3.</u> Describe how the match requirement will be met.
	<u>Q4.</u> Describe how the project increases the public's understanding of the environmental benefits and enjoyment of water resources directly related to the project through education and outreach.
	<u>Q5.</u> Describe how the project will contribute to sustained, long-term water quality benefits for a period of 20 years, and address the causes of degradation rather than the symptoms?
	<u>Q6.</u> Describe any changes made since the submittal of the Concept Proposal and how the changes have impacted the scope of work. If applicable, outline the Concept Proposal reviewer comments that have been incorporated. If reviewer comments have not been incorporated, explain why.
	<u>Q7.</u> Enter the expected start and end date for this project. The projects funded by this funding source need to meet the timeline milestones outlined in Table 2 of the Guidelines.
	<u>Q8.</u> Describe how the applicant will coordinate and cooperate with the relevant local, state, and federal agencies during implementation of the proposed project.
	<u>Q9.</u> Submit the application completeness Checklist as Attachment 13 (provided in Full Proposal Solicitation).
2.	Full Proposal Questions
A.	Project Information
	<u>Q10.</u> Provide a detailed description of the proposed project for which funding is requested. Describe the approach the project is proposing to use to solve the problem(s) and the technical basis for the selected approach. Discuss if there are any associated risks to water quality. (Attachment 1)
	<u>Q11.</u> Where is the proposed project location(s)? Attach a map(s) and/or diagram(s) depicting the project including the area and watershed encompassed by the project and disadvantaged communities within the project area (if applicable). Photographs of the proposed site(s) may also be included. (Attachment 2)
	<u>Q12.</u> Describe if the project is an integral part of a larger project, or how it provides multiple benefits.
	<u>Q13.</u> Identify and describe any innovative practices or approaches that will serve as demonstrations for future implementations.
	<u>Q14.</u> Describe how the applicant demonstrates the experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the project. The applicant may provide examples of past successes in completing previous grant funded projects, or other relevant supporting information.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

	<u>Q15.</u> Provide a detailed, concise, and specific scope of work as Attachment 3 . This scope of work will be used for preparing the grant agreement should the project be selected for funding.
B.	Project Significance
	<u>Q16.</u> Is the project located in a high priority watershed? What is the size of the area to be treated through the proposed project and how does the area to be treated relate to the overall problem area in the watershed?
	<u>Q17.</u> Do the pollution problems and the loads from the drainage area treated by the proposed project address targeted constituents within the watershed (e.g., 303(d) listed water bodies)?
C1.	Meeting LID Goals (PT1)
	<u>Q18a.</u> Describe how the project implements LID best management practices (BMPs) or principles?
	<u>Q19a.</u> Describe how the project achieves the pre-development / post-development hydrograph requirements for the site?
	<u>Q20a.</u> Is the project part of an urban greening or other smart growth plan for the area? AND/OR Does the project address storm water pollution associated with a transportation land use? If yes, explain.
	<u>Q21a.</u> Describe how the proposed project reduces the rate of runoff, filters pollutants out of runoff, or facilitates the infiltration of water into the ground and/or on-site storage of water for reuse? Any applicable supporting documentation can be provided in Attachment 8 (Technical Reports) .
C2.	Implementing a TMDL (PT2)
	<u>Q18b.</u> Indicate the TMDL(s) that your project will address, its priority, and its status (e.g., Trash TMDL for the Los Angeles River Watershed, approved by the USEPA in August 2002). Explain how the project will contribute expeditiously and measurably to long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards by implementing the applicable TMDL(s).
	<u>Q19b.</u> What is the project's expected TMDL(s) percent load reduction? Provide current values, expected future values, and the anticipated percent(s) of load reduction. Any applicable supporting documentation can be provided in Attachment 8 (Technical Reports) .
	<u>Q20b.</u> Can your project be implemented through Low Impact Development (LID) techniques? If yes, explain why the project is better executed without LID. If no, describe why LID is not feasible.
	<u>Q21b.</u> Does the proposed project take into account TMDLs, including non-storm water related TMDLs in the same waterbody segment, which are likely to be approved in the next 5-10 years? How are you proactively addressing future needs, and what are some future benefits of the project?
D.	Pollution Reduction – Magnitude and Assessment
	<u>Q22.</u> Does the project result in the reduction of loads/concentrations of more than one pollutant? Identify the type(s) of pollutants that will be reduced (e.g., bacteria, toxic sediment, pesticides, trash, metals, etc.). What are the influent concentrations and projected effluent concentrations for the targeted pollutants? Quantify.
	<u>Q23.</u> Specify the methods that will be used to determine the pollutant load reductions and why the methods were chosen. Quantify the predicted load reductions, and how the load reductions were determined.
	<u>Q24.</u> Does the project cause positive or negative impacts to other pollution problems? If yes, describe impacts including any proposed mitigation for negative impacts. If no, explain.
	<u>Q25.</u> Describe how the effectiveness of the project will be monitored and assessed (i.e., submittal of the project Performance Measures Table in Appendix H). (Attachment 7)

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

E.	Pollution Reduction – Best Management Practices
	<u>Q26.</u> Is the BMP a proven BMP for pollutant removal of this type based upon available American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), or site-specific BMP scientific data? Provide information on the BMP’s track record in addressing the targeted pollutant in similar projects. If no track record, provide information supporting the use of the selected BMP(s) for the proposed project.
	<u>Q27.</u> Do the BMP design effluent concentrations meet at least median performance (e.g., the median effluent concentration of total suspended solids for a detention basin is 25 mg/L) on the International Storm Water BMP Database (http://www.bmpdatabase.org)?
F.	Water Quality Goals and Monitoring
	<u>Q28.</u> Does the project help achieve (or address) water quality standard compliance for impaired waters? If so, how? Also, describe the beneficial uses of the water body(ies) affected by the project referenced in the applicable water quality control plan (Basin Plan).
	<u>Q29.</u> During which seasons (wet and/or dry) would measurable compliance progress be achieved? (Year-round improvement is the preferred goal.)
	<p><u>Q30.</u> Describe the monitoring plan for the project, including how it is consistent with the project’s goals and objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss how the monitoring activities will help to document project effectiveness; • Identify the appropriate parameters and frequency for monitoring; • Discuss whether the proposed monitoring activities are covered under an existing Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) or if a QAPP will have to be developed. Indicate if the QAPP has been approved by the Water Boards’ Quality Assurance Officer / Project Manager; • Discuss the integration of data into the State Water Board’s Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP); • Describe the post construction/initial implementation performance monitoring; and • If applicable, describe how the proposal leverages existing monitoring efforts.
G.	Multiple Objectives
	<u>Q31.</u> Does the project augment local water supply? If yes, quantify and describe (e.g., enhancing aquifer and/or surface water resources by 500 acre-feet/year, water conservation, etc.).
	<u>Q32.</u> Does the project significantly reduce runoff, flood risk, or sanitary sewer overflows (e.g., retaining, detaining, or slowing flows)? Describe and quantify.
	<u>Q33.</u> Does the project restore or enhance stream habitat, provide natural resource protection, or use natural systems? If yes, describe how that project will achieve these benefits.
	<u>Q34.</u> Does the project reduce carbon dioxide emissions or address climate change? If yes, quantify and describe.
H.	Project Cost Effectiveness
	<u>Q35.</u> What are the anticipated project capital and operations and maintenance (O&M) costs? How do the anticipated costs compare to industry standards? How long will the project remain in operation before it needs to be replaced? Describe the life cycle costs of the proposed project.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

	<p><u>Q36.</u> Discuss the mechanisms for ongoing support and financing to continue operation and maintenance of the implemented project beyond the grant period. Indicating the availability of matching funds that later become unavailable will be considered a deviation from the proposed project and may result in the grant being withdrawn.</p>
	<p><u>Q37.</u> Explain how the project is economically feasible and a good use of State funds? (Provide the cost per unit of pollutant reduction, if available, or describe how the project data will be used to demonstrate the economic benefit of the implemented approach)?</p>
	<p><u>Q38.</u> If applicable, describe how the project can be cost effectively adapted to changing conditions (regulatory, pollution, land-use, etc)?</p>
	<p><u>Q39.</u> Does the project leverage any existing or potential funds from the State, local, and other sources? How much and from what source(s)? How secure is each funding source(s)?</p>
	<p><u>Q40.</u> Explain how project costs were estimated, and provide a reasonable estimate of cost for each work item (i.e., line item) contained in the Proposal, including planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match. Provide a detailed budget in Attachment 4.</p>
	<p><u>Q41.</u> If requesting a match reduction, the applicant must complete Attachment 9 (Request for Reduction of Funding Match). Include a discussion of how much direct benefit the project provides to disadvantaged communities.</p>
I.	Planning
	<p><u>Q42.</u> Has the applicant adopted policies that support implementation of sustainable and/or LID principles? (e.g., resolutions, general plans, local plans, or ordinances that specify implementation of concepts such as sustainability, LID, the Ahwahnee Principles, plastic bag ban, polystyrene ban, or provide financial incentives, such as storm water fee rebate, litter tax, etc.). If yes, provide copies of applicable resolutions(s) and/or section(s) of the plan(s). (Attachment 12)</p>
	<p><u>Q43.</u> Is the project coordinated or consistent with any applicable Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan?</p>
	<p><u>Q44.</u> Is the applicant an Urban Water Supplier (i.e., a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, that provides water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplies more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually)? If yes, has the Urban Water Supplier prepared, adopted, and submitted to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) an urban water management plan? Provide the status of the plan.</p>
	<p><u>Q45.</u> Is the applicant an Urban Water Supplier and is the project is a water management project, as defined in Appendix J? If yes, has the applicant submitted documentation to DWR requesting compliance verification with Assembly Bill (AB) 1420 (Statutes 2007, Chapter 628)? Explain and provide the status.</p>
J.	Project Readiness
	<p><u>Q46.</u> Provide a detailed project timeline/schedule, including the sequence and timing for project implementation. How complete are the project plans and specifications (e.g., 50%, 100%, etc.)? What is the project's construction period? (Attachment 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss how the timeline is consistent with the scope of work; • Identify possible obstacles to project implementation (e.g., permits, land acquisition, weather, etc.); and • Discuss the related elements of the project, their current status, and how the applicant plans to ensure the timely completion of these related elements.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

	<p><u>Q47.</u> Provide a description of the type(s) and the status of all environmental documents required for the project. If a negative declaration or environmental impact report is required, the applicant must comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 732, as outlined in Appendix G. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance costs may be reimbursable, provided the costs were incurred after the grant agreement is executed. Provide status and State Clearing House number if available. If draft or final CEQA documents are available, please submit documents as part of Attachment 6.</p>
	<p><u>Q48.</u> Is the proposed project site(s) obtainable? Or, does a clear process exist for attainment of the project site(s)? For projects that may be performed on not yet identified sites, include information on the desired characteristics for identifying a candidate parcel (e.g., the parcel size, proximity to an impaired water body, soil condition, permeability, etc. are some characteristics considered when identifying a candidate parcel).</p>
K.	Bonus Points
	<p><u>Q49.</u> Describe how the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community or address environmental justice issues. Applicants must provide strong justification to receive bonus points. (Attachment 10)</p>
3.	Additional Application Information / General Program Questions
	<p><u>Q50.</u> Are you aware that, once the Proposal has been submitted in FAAST, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections offered by law with respect to the application package and project location are waived?</p>
	<p><u>Q51.</u> Is the applicant or was the applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the project.</p>
	<p><u>Q52.</u> Has the scope of work been modified from what was proposed at the Concept Proposal phase, other than those necessary to address reviewer comments? If yes, briefly discuss the reason(s) for the modification(s) or reference the section(s) where documentation is provided.</p>
	<p><u>Q53.</u> Does this project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any Water Boards regulation, permit, or order?</p>
	<p><u>Q54.</u> Does the proposed plan/project have any implications with respect to conflict between water users, water rights disputes, and/or water rights issues? Please discuss briefly and if applicable reference sections of the Proposal where additional detail is provided.</p>
	<p><u>Q55.</u> Are the applicant and/or cooperating entities in violation of any water right permit requirements including, payment of fees? If yes, please elaborate and discuss the status or progress towards resolving the violation.</p>

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Provide the attachments listed below by attaching files, no larger than 10 megabytes, to the FAAST application. For instructions on attaching files, please refer to the FAAST User Manual and the application instructions. When attaching files, applicants must use the naming convention noted in the Solicitation Notice.

Attachment #	Attachment Title	Description
Attachment 1	Project Information	Provide any additional information not contained in the on-line FAAST questionnaire.
Attachment 2	Project Location - Map and Photos	Map(s), diagram(s), and/or photograph(s) of the proposed project area.
Attachment 3	Scope of Work	Provide a detailed, concise, and specific scope of work. This scope of work will be used for preparing the grant agreement should the project be selected for funding.
Attachment 4	Budget	See Appendix I for detailed guidance on preparation of this attachment.
Attachment 5	Schedule	Provide a schedule for implementation of the project showing the sequence and timing of the proposed work items. The schedule should show the start and end dates and milestones. Work items may overlap. Applicants should show any dependence on predecessors by showing links between work items. At a minimum, the following work items should be included on the schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of financing; • Development of environmental documentation and CEQA compliance; • Development of monitoring plan and QAPP; • Project design and bid solicitation process; • Identification and acquisition of all necessary permits; • Construction start and end dates with significant milestones included; • Implementation of any environmental mitigation or enhancement efforts; • Development and submittal of Draft and Final Project Reports; and • Post construction project performance monitoring periods.
Attachment 6	Environmental Clearance Checklist & CEQA Documentation	Provide the status of all environmental documents required for the project. See Appendix G for more information. Attach any draft or final CEQA documents that are available.
Attachment 7	Performance Measures	Applicants are required to submit a Project Performance Measures Table(s) specific to their proposed project. The Project Performance Measures Table(s) should include: project goals, desired outcomes, output indicators (measures to effectively track output), outcome indicators (measures to evaluate change that is a direct result of the work), measurement tools and methods, and targets (measurable targets that are feasible to meet during the life of the project [grant period]). See Appendix H for more information.
Attachment 8	Technical Report(s)	Technical Reports are used to verify that appropriate background data gathering and studies have been performed in the development of the proposed project, selection of the best management practices, and to assess the proposed project's ability to produce the benefits claimed. Furthermore, applicants must provide detailed technical information enabling a reviewer to understand and verify water quality benefits that are claimed.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

Attachment 9 (If Applicable)	Request for Reduction of Funding Match	Applicants requesting a funding match reduction for disadvantaged communities must demonstrate that the project is designed to provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities. See Appendix C for more information. For assistance regarding requesting a match reduction, please contact State Water Board staff, Ms. Bridget Chase, at (916) 445-0827.
Attachment 10 (If Applicable)	Bonus Points	<p>Applicant's response to the following questions will be used to determine whether the proposal should receive any points for benefiting disadvantaged communities and/or addressing environmental justice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the demographics of disadvantaged and/or environmental justice communities in the project area. Explain the methodology used in determining the total population in the project area. The applicant must include what census geographies (i.e., census designated place, census tract, census block) were used, and how they were applied; • Discuss how land-use in the project area impacts the disadvantaged and/or environmental justice communities; • Discuss efforts made to identify and address disadvantaged and/or environmental justice communities needs and issues within the project area; • Explain how the project will address the disadvantaged and/or environmental issues that disproportionately impact these communities; • Explain the proposed project's direct benefits to the disadvantaged and/or environmental justice communities; and • Discuss any negative impact the proposed project may have on the disadvantaged and/or environmental justice communities.
Attachment 11 (If Applicable)	Letters of Support or Opposition	Submit electronic copies of any letters of support for or opposition to the proposed projects. General letters of support or opposition will not be considered. Letters of support or opposition must clearly state how implementation of the project will benefit or adversely impact the individual or entity providing the letter. All letters should be attached to your proposal in FFAST, and may be addressed to the Project Director.
Attachment 12	Adopted Policies	Submit electronic copies of applicable letters or resolutions.
Attachment 13	Application Completeness Checklist	Submit the Application Completeness Checklist, indicating which attachments are provided as part of the Full Proposal application.

DRAFT FINAL

APPENDIX E-2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

This Section includes the Full Proposal eligibility and evaluation criteria that will be used by reviewers. The maximum possible score is 105 points, with up to 5 additional bonus points. This Section is broken into the following tables, which contain the criteria that will be used by reviewers to determine eligibility and score Full Proposals.

FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION TABLES		
Table	Title	
Table I	Eligibility Review Criteria	Eligible/Ineligible
Table II	Project Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Score = 105 points (plus up to 5 bonus points)
Table III	Additional Information/General Program Questions (To be completed by reviewers and consensus reviewers.)	Not Scored (For Selection Panel Review and Consideration)

Eligibility to be Scored

Per Proposition 84, projects must reduce and prevent storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams. This funding is targeted at projects that improve water quality. Whenever possible, projects should provide multiple benefits, which may include demonstrably reducing pollutant loads, increasing flood control, and/or augmenting water supply. In addition, projects are encouraged to incorporate the principles of sustainability and address climate change. Funds can be used for project planning, design, construction, and monitoring that improve storm water quality and add to the overall body of knowledge of implementing effective approaches to storm water management. The project shall avoid or mitigate negative impacts including: flood control, loss of habitat, hardening of creeks or rivers, and shall not exacerbate any existing environmental problems in the vicinity or downstream of the project.

TABLE I: ELIGIBILITY REVIEW CRITERIA

The Eligibility Criteria listed below will be used to screen Full Proposals for all of the funding programs. State Water Board staff will complete the eligibility review. A “No” response to any of the following may deem the Proposal ineligible for funding. The Full Proposal should not be scored until the Review Liaison makes a determination.

Criteria	Response
1. Is the <u>applicant</u> a <i>Local Public Agency (City, County, City and County, District, or eligible Joint Powers Agency)</i> ? (Question 1)	Yes/No
2. Is the <u>project</u> eligible for funding under the SWGP? (Question 2)	Yes/No
3. Is the <u>applicant</u> requesting a reduction of the match requirement as a disadvantaged community? (Question 3 & 41 and Attachment 9)	Yes/No
4. Does the <u>Proposal</u> meet the match requirement? (Question 3)	Yes/No
5. Does the <u>Proposal</u> meet the education and outreach requirements? (Question 4)	Yes/No
6. Does the <u>Proposal</u> demonstrate the project’s capability of contributing to sustained, long-term water quality benefits, and address the causes of degradation rather than the symptoms? (Question 5)	Yes/No
7. Is the <u>application</u> complete? (Entire FP, Question 9, and Attachment 13)	Yes/No
8. Is the <u>project</u> listed in the Full Proposal consistent with the Concept Proposal and does it address the reviewers’ comments? (Question 6) Explain:	Yes/No

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE II: PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be scored based on how well the proposal and project address the criteria as a whole (See Full Proposal Scoring Table below for scoring rationale). There is no direct correlation between the questions and points (unless expressly noted in the points possible column). Reviewers will consider the questions listed under each criterion as a whole when determining a score. Any project that does not obtain a minimum of 70 points will not be considered for funding.

Note: The question references are provided below to assist the reviewer. However, the information provided throughout the Full Proposal should be used to determine the score.

Criteria	Score	Points Possible
<p>Project Significance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project located in a high priority watershed? What is the size of the area to be treated through the proposed project? (Preference will be given to projects that address larger areas.) (Questions 11 & 16 and Attachment 2) Do the pollution problems and the loads from the drainage area treated by the proposed project address targeted constituents within the watershed (e.g., 303(d) listed water bodies)? (Question 17) 		<p>10</p>
<p>Meeting LID Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well does the project implement LID best management practices (BMPs) or principles? (Question 18a) How well does the project achieve the pre-development / post-development hydrograph requirements for the site? (Question 19a) Is the project part of an urban greening or other smart growth plan for the area? AND/OR Does the project address storm water pollution associated with a transportation land use? (Question 20a) How well does the proposed project significantly reduce the rate of runoff, filter pollutants out of runoff, or facilitate the infiltration of water into the ground (without negative impact) and/or the on-site storage of water for reuse? (Question 21a) 		<p>20</p> <p>(5 points maximum per question)</p> <p>Note: Project will be scored either on Meeting LID Goals or on Implementing a TMDL, but not both.</p>
<p>Implementing a TMDL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project contribute expeditiously and measurably to long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards by implementing the applicable TMDL(s)? (Question 18b) Is the expected TMDL pollution reduction significant? (Question 19b) Is the project better executed through the techniques proposed than through LID techniques? (Question 20b) Will the proposed project provide future water quality benefits by preventing and/or proactively addressing the expected TMDLs? (Question 21b) 		

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Score	Points Possible
<p>Pollution Reduction – Magnitude and Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project result in reduction of loads/concentrations of more than one pollutant? Is the reduction significant? (Question 22) What are the number and types of pollutants that will be reduced? (Bacteria, toxic sediment, pesticides, trash, and metals have highest priority/point value.) (Questions 22 & 23) Does the project cause positive or negative impacts to other pollution problems? (Question 24) (Add up to 4 points for positive and subtract up to 4 points for negative.) 		10
<p>Pollution Reduction – Best Management Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the selected BMP a proven BMP for pollutant removal of this type based upon available ASCE, USEPA, or site-specific BMP scientific data? (Question 26 and Attachment 8) Do the BMP design effluent concentrations meet at least median performance on the International Storm Water BMP Database? (Question 27) 		10
<p>Compliance with Water Quality Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project help significantly in achieving (or addressing) water quality standard compliance for the impaired waters? (Question 28 and Attachment 7) During which seasons (wet and/or dry) would measurable compliance progress be achieved? (Year-round improvement is the preferred goal.) (Question 29) Are the Monitoring Plan and Quality Assurance Project Plans adequate? (Question 30) 		10 (Up to 6 points for monitoring plan)
<p>Multiple Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project significantly augment local water supply? (Question 31) Does the project significantly reduce runoff, flood risk, or sanitary sewer overflows (e.g., retaining, detaining, or slowing flows)? (Question 32) How well does the project restore or enhance stream habitat, provide natural resource protection, or use natural systems? (Question 33) How well does the project reduce carbon dioxide emissions or address climate change? (Question 34) 		20 (5 points maximum for each criteria)
<p>Project Cost Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the project capital and operations and maintenance (O&M) costs meet industry wide standards? How long will the project remain in operation before its replacement? (Projects must have an expected useful life of 20 years.) (Question 35) Is the project economically feasible and a good use of State funds? (Question 37 and Attachment 4) How well can the project be cost effectively adapted to changing conditions (regulatory, pollution, land-use, etc.)? (Question 38) Does the project leverage any existing or potential funds from State, local, and/or other sources? How much and from where (local funding is preferred)? Are the funds from a reliable and secure source? (Question 39) Are the estimated project costs reasonable? (Question 40 and Attachment 4) 		10

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Score	Points Possible
<p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the applicant adopted policies that support implementation of sustainable and/or LID principles? (e.g., resolutions, general plans, local plans, or ordinances that specify implementation of concepts such as the Ahwahnee Principles, sustainability, LID, plastic bags ban, polystyrene containers ban, or provide financial incentives such as storm water fee rebate, litter tax, etc.). (Question 42 and Attachment 12) (Scoring: 2 points if the provisions are in the General Plan; 4 points if in Specific Plan; 6 points if in local policy or a resolution; and 8 points if in an ordinance.) Is the project coordinated or consistent with an applicable Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan? (Question 43) (2 points if project is identified in an IRWM Plan, 1 point if coordinated or consistent with IRWM Plan.) 		<p>10 (General scoring criteria not applicable.)</p>
<p>Project Readiness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How ready is the project for implementation? How complete are the project plans and specifications? Will the project be completed within the funding timeline? What is the project's construction duration? (Questions 7 & 46 and Attachment 5) What is the status of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other permitting requirements? Is it CEQA ready? (Question 47 and Attachment 6) Is there a site available for the project? Or, does a clear process exist for attainment (the parcel size, proximity to an impaired water body, soil condition, permeability, etc. are some characteristics considered when identifying a candidate parcel)? (Question 48) (Subtract 2 points if land is not yet acquired.) 		<p>5</p>
<p>Total Points: 105 Note: Up to 5 bonus points may be given for projects that directly benefit a disadvantaged community or address environmental justice within the project's community. (Question 49 and Attachment 10)</p>		

FULL PROPOSAL SCORING TABLE	
<p>Note: The following table will be used to score projects unless otherwise noted. Where applicable, project objectives / goals / outcomes must be reflected in the Project Performance Measures Tables, which should include feasible targets, tracked with effective indicators, and measured with effective tools/methods that can be accomplished by the project within its timeframe.</p>	
Score	Scoring Rationale
Full Points	Criteria are fully addressed and supported by thorough and well presented documentation and logical rationale.
↑	Criteria are addressed with sufficient documentation and rationale.
Half Points	Criteria are addressed but documentation and/or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.
↓	Criteria are partially addressed and little to no documentation and/or rationale is presented.
No Points	Applicant is not responsive (i.e., criteria are not addressed and no documentation or rationale is presented).

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX E-2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE III: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/GENERAL PROGRAM QUESTIONS

The Selection Panel will review the responses to the following questions as part of review of the consensus scores.

1. Has the applicant been responsive to the Concept Proposal reviewers' comments?
2. Does the Proposal address compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements? Does the reviewer have any concerns regarding environmental compliance requirements for the proposed project?
3. Does this project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation, permit, or order? (Response taken from Application.)
4. Is the proposed completion time reasonable?
5. Does the reviewer believe the proposed project is technically and financially feasible?
6. Is the total project cost reasonable?
7. Do you have any concerns about the applicant's ability to secure all of the required funding for accomplishing the expected outcomes of this proposal or long term operation and maintenance costs?
8. Is the applicant or was the applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the project. (Response taken from Application.)
9. Does the proposed plan/project have any implications with respect to conflict between water users, water rights disputes, and/or interregional water rights issues? (Response taken from Application.)
10. Is the applicant and/or a cooperating entity in violation of any water rights permit requirements, including payment of fees? (Response taken from Application.)
11. Would you recommend the proposed project for funding? Answer Yes or No. Explain your answer.
12. Does the reviewer have any concerns about funding this project? If you answer yes, please explain.
13. Does the applicant demonstrate experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to implement the proposed project?

DRAFT FINAL

**APPENDIX F: PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 75072
PLANNING AND MONITORING PROJECTS**

Appendix F-1: PRC § 75072 Project Types

Appendix F-2: PRC § 75072 Proposal Application

Appendix F-3: PRC § 75072 Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Please note that the application and/or review questions outlined in [Appendix F](#) may be slightly reworded, combined, or separated as the information is transferred to the online Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The technical content and requirements will not change.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-1: PRC § 75072 PROJECT TYPES

The SWGP will set-aside up to 10% (\$9 million), but no less than 3% (\$2.7 million), for high priority planning and/or monitoring projects. All projects funded under PRC § 75072 must be of regional and/or statewide significance, and be necessary planning and monitoring activities for the successful design, selection, and implementation of SWGP projects. Applicants can only request this funding prior to or during Round 1 or as part of a directed action approved by the State Water Board. Any remaining grant funds not awarded to implementation projects during Round 2 may be used for PRC § 75072 Planning and Monitoring activities, up to the 10% limit of \$9 million. PRC § 75072 provides the opportunity to fund studies or projects that include, but are not limited to, those listed below.

A. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Performance Evaluation

A comprehensive technical review of water-quality performance resulting from implementation of new development performance standards (e.g., Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans [SUSMPs] and Hydro-modification Management Plans [HMPs]) adopted as requirements in California MS4 permits since 2000. The primary focus of this effort would be to support a more effective, consistent statewide approach to achieving the desired water quality outcomes with storm water permits. This study would build on the existing MS4 “audits” and expand to MS4s with SUSMP-like requirements in place long enough to have new development projects subject to those SUSMP requirements. Levels of review would be:

- ❖ Tier 1: the MS4 complies with the new development requirement;
- ❖ Tier 2: the new development performance standard (e.g., SUSMP) is successful in mitigating the intended impacts (e.g., hydro-modification, pollutant transport, etc.). The review should be done as geographically close to the development site as possible; and
- ❖ Tier 3: a comparison of the various methods used to specify new development (post-construction) performance standards.

B. Sediment-Bound Pollutants

Conduct a literature review and prepare a report regarding pollutants adsorbed to sediment in storm water runoff. Possible discussions may include: (1) control of the discharge of sediments and other storm water pollutants; and (2) “sediment free” runoff and effects to receiving waters.

C. Industrial & Construction Discharge

Produce a comprehensive report (including high quality datasets) that accurately characterizes storm water runoff from a cross-section of industrial facilities and/or construction activity sites for the purposes of: (1) characterizing discharges by estimating hourly and total pollutant loading values for various sized storm events; (2) identifying pollutant patterns and variations among the differing industries and various geographic zones; and (3) establishing and comparing background concentrations and loadings to those of industrial facilities. This information is vital to the development of numeric discharge limits.

D. Low Impact Development (LID) Barriers (Regulatory/Standards) and Solutions

Eliminate the barriers from municipal ordinances, regulations, site design guidelines, and standards that are preventing or hindering implementation of LID practices. Develop and adopt incentives and standard requirements that encourage or require local jurisdictions to implement LID/green infrastructure techniques that promote the infiltration, capture, and treatment of storm water for reuse or groundwater basin recharge. To encourage engineers and developers to use LID principles it is important that regulations and standards both allow and encourage their use. Problems to address may include parking lot and driveway requirements, setback requirements, required conventional curbs, and required road and sidewalk widths.

DRAFT FINAL

For possible LID policy/regulation enhancement options, reference *State and Local Policies Encouraging or Requiring Low Impact Development in California, Appendix A*:

http://www.resources.ca.gov/copc/02-29-08_meeting/06_LID/0802COPC_06_EX1%20Tetra%20Tech%20LID%20Final%20Report.pdf

E. Plan/implement LID at a Watershed Scale

Investigate and demonstrate potential benefits of a comprehensive LID strategy implemented on a watershed or municipal scale. The project should incorporate planning and implementation of most or all of the following elements within one watershed, municipality, or other identifiable region:

- ❖ Public outreach and identification linking the LID strategy as part of a comprehensive solution to a significant regional-scale problem, such as beach closures, stream erosion, habitat degradation, or recurrent flooding;
- ❖ Review and possible revision of General Plan, Area Plans, Master Drainage Plans, Standard Details and Specifications, and/or other local development policies to promote and facilitate the use of LID;
- ❖ A LID emphasis for compliance with municipal storm water NPDES requirements for new development, including the use of LID for storm water treatment and control or beneficial use of runoff peak flows and durations;
- ❖ An emphasis on using discretionary review and/or voluntary compliance to incorporate LID into smaller development projects, which do not exceed the municipal storm water NPDES permit thresholds;
- ❖ Outreach and training on LID for land development professionals and for municipal staff involved in development review and in capital projects;
- ❖ Construction or retrofit of public buildings, facilities, streets, parks, and/or parking lots with LID; and
- ❖ Encouragement of LID retrofits such as disconnected downspouts, cisterns, and “rain gardens” (bioretention areas) by private and public property owners using outreach plus social incentives (e.g., public recognition or other social marketing strategies) and/or economic incentives (e.g., rebates, awards, reduction of utility fees).

The project should place the LID strategy in the context of an ongoing effort to protect one or more watershed or groundwater resources. Examples include protection and enhancement of stream, wetland, or ocean habitat and other beneficial uses, water conservation, groundwater recharge, floodplain management, and improvement of the urban environment.

F. Storm Water Capture and Reuse

Conduct a study that reviews and compares different methods of capturing and reusing storm water. This study should look at direct storm water capture and reuse, such as irrigation water. The study should also investigate how capture and reuse of storm water is or could be affected by water rights.

G. Storm Water Capture for Groundwater Recharge

Conduct studies to evaluate methods to increase storm water capture and infiltration in areas that provide maximum benefits to sustain regional groundwater resources and increase water supply reliability.

H. Storm Water Quality Monitoring

Conduct studies and develop monitoring plans, programs, and reports to ensure groundwater quality is not degraded and continues to meet appropriate groundwater basin management plan objectives.

I. Engineered Soil Analysis and Nutrient Reduction

Conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness of engineered soils used in bioretention or other soil based storm water treatment systems. The study should demonstrate the balance, trade-offs, and limitations of these systems in terms of infiltration and pollutant removal especially in regard to ammonium, nitrate,

DRAFT FINAL

Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN), phosphate, and total phosphorus. The study should also consider: total organic carbon (TOC); dissolved organic carbon (DOC); chemical oxygen demand (COD); total dissolved solids (TDS); total suspended solids (TSS); turbidity; metals (Al, Ag, As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Mn, Ni, Pb, and Zn) and adsorbed Hg; polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB); pesticides (including organophosphates, pyrethroids, phenylpyrazoles); and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH). The study should also present alternative approaches for removal of any of these pollutants that may prove problematic using on-site treatment systems.

J. Development of a Hydro-Modification Model Based on Field Verification

The model may include: (1) an evaluation of the outcomes of all existing post-construction (hydrologic-based) requirements (i.e., SUSMPs, hydro-modification, and LID standards); and (2) a study of the feasibility of a single model or suite of models.

K. Technical Assistance Team to Help Local Jurisdictions Develop Projects

Provide LID outreach, education, and training to help with all stages of the development of projects. The technical assistance team will provide assistance during all stages of project development. It should support the consistent statewide implementation of LID by providing relevant information, training and technical assistance to the appropriate audiences engaged in the development process including: builders, developers, engineers, architects, planning and public works staff, maintenance workers, public officials, and others. At least a portion of the assistance should be targeted at disadvantaged communities. It is recommended that at least 25% of the project costs be directed to assisting disadvantaged communities. The training workshops should be focused on getting needed changes made in the planning, design, implementation, and construction process.

L. Storm Water Program Effectiveness Assessment Tools

Conduct a project to further the development of storm water program effectiveness assessment methods and approaches across any of a variety of program areas (e.g., construction, development, municipal, residential, commercial, or industrial). Projects emphasizing non-structural controls will be given preference. Examples of specific project activities which may be funded include, but are not limited to: (1) conducting comprehensive reviews of assessment methods and approaches currently in use; (2) developing and/or validating assessment methods and approaches; (3) characterizing data and information requirements for methods and approaches being evaluated or proposed, including potential limitations on data availability and collection; (4) identifying or conducting potential studies needed to address identified data deficits; and (5) developing guidance for implementing recommended methods and approaches using real-world examples.

M. Identify, Investigate, and Plan Abatement of On-land Locations with Elevated Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) and Mercury Concentrations

Identify drainage areas that contain high levels of PCBs and conduct pilot projects to investigate and plan abatement of these high PCB concentrations. Include investigation of mercury in any of the pilot drainages that contain elevated mercury levels. Interview municipal staff and review municipal databases, other agency files, and other available information to identify potential PCB/mercury source areas and areas where PCB/mercury contaminated sediment accumulates, including private property, public rights-of-way, and within storm water conveyances. Qualitatively rank and map potential PCB/mercury source areas within each drainage. Conduct reconnaissance surveys of the identified drainages and gather information concerning past or current use of PCBs/mercury to further identify potential source areas and determine whether runoff from such locations is likely to convey soils/sediments with PCBs/mercury to municipal storm water conveyances. Validate existence of elevated PCB/mercury concentrations through surface soil/sediment sampling and analysis where visual inspections and/or other information suggest potential source areas within each drainage. Where data confirm significantly elevated PCB/mercury concentrations in surface soils/sediments, provide available information on the current site conditions, owner/operators, and other potentially responsible parties to the Regional Water Board and other appropriate regulatory agencies to facilitate their issuance of orders for further investigation and remediation of the subject sites. Assist the Regional Water Board and other appropriate agencies to identify funding to perform abatement and/or responsible parties, and evaluate

DRAFT FINAL

abatement options. In addition, perform a desktop evaluation of the feasibility of implementing other measures for controlling PCBs/mercury contamination and preventing its transport through the storm drain (e.g., on-site treatment, and sediment management practices to control migration of the PCBs away from the source of contamination). Report lessons learned through these pilot efforts that will inform the direction of future efforts targeting contaminated zones.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-2: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL APPLICATION

Applicants will be asked to organize PRC § 75072 Proposals for Planning and Monitoring Projects in a format consistent with the evaluation criteria. This approach should assist applicants in providing complete documentation and will streamline the review process. Applicants should use consistent terminology throughout their PRC § 75072 Proposal application. PRC § 75072 Proposals will be submitted online using the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board) Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). See the beginning of [Appendix D](#) for Application Instructions.

More detail on the information that must be provided in the PRC § 75072 Proposal is discussed in the tables below.

A. Program Selection & General FAAST Information	
1.	PROJECT SELECTION
	Select the "Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 75072" Solicitation.
2.	GENERAL INFORMATION
	<u>Project Title</u> – Provide title of the project. If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.
	<u>Project Description</u> – Provide a brief description of the project. The length of the Project Description is limited to 1,000 characters (including spaces). If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.
	<u>Applicant Details</u> – Provide the name and address of the applicant organization.
	<u>Project Director</u> – The Project Director is the person responsible for filing an application, executing a grant agreement, and any subsequent amendments to the grant agreement. Persons that are subcontractors to be paid by the grant cannot be listed as the Project Director.
	<u>Project Manager</u> – The Project Manager is the day-to-day contact on the project from the Applicant Organization.
	<u>Grant Funds Requested</u> – Provide amount of grant funds requested for the project in dollars.
	<u>Total Budget</u> – Grant fund requested, funding match, and total project cost.
	<u>Latitude/Longitude</u> – Enter latitude/longitude coordinates of the approximate midpoint of the project location in degrees using decimal format.
	<u>Watershed</u> – Provide name(s) of the watershed(s) where the project is located. If the project covers multiple watersheds, list the primary watershed first.
	<u>County</u> – Provide the county in which the project is located. If the project covers multiple counties, select "Multiple Counties" from the drop down list.
	<u>Responsible Regional Water Board</u> – Provide the name of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) in which the project is located. If the project extends beyond one Regional Water Board boundary, select "Statewide" from the drop down list. If this item is not completed, FAAST will not accept the application.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-2: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL APPLICATION

3.	<p>LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION</p> <p>Enter the State Assembly, State Senate, and U.S. Congressional Districts in which the project is located. For projects that include more than one district, please enter each district. Look up tables are provided in FFAST to assist with determining the appropriate districts.</p>
4.	<p>COOPERATING ENTITIES</p> <p>Include entities that have/will assist the applicant in Proposal development or implementation. Provide name(s) of cooperating entity(ies), role/contribution to project, first and last name of entity contact, phone number, and email address.</p>
5.	<p>AGENCY CONTACTS</p> <p>If the applicant has been collaborating with State and Federal agencies (Department of Water Resources [DWR], Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), etc.) in project development, please provide agency name, agency contact first and last name, phone, and email address. This information is used to identify individuals who may have an understanding of a project and in no way indicates an advantage or disadvantage in the ranking process.</p>
6.	<p>APPLICATION QUESTIONNAIRE</p> <p>The answers to these questions will be used in processing the application and determining the eligibility and completeness of the application.</p>
7.	<p>PROJECT CLASSIFICATION</p> <p>These questions allow State Water Board staff to categorize the type(s) of activity(ies) the project is proposing to implement.</p>

B. PRC § 75072 Proposal Questions	
1.	<p>APPLICANT TYPE</p> <p><u>Q1.</u> Select the applicant's organization type from the drop-down menu. In order to be considered eligible, the applicant must be a public agency, nonprofit organization, public college, regional agency, or State agency as defined in Appendix J.</p>
2.	<p>PROJECT TYPE</p> <p><u>Q2.</u> Describe how the proposed project meets the Planning and Monitoring project types outlined in Section VI.F and Appendix F-1?</p> <p><u>Q3.</u> Describe how the proposed project is necessary for the successful design, selection, and implementation of SWGP projects.</p>
3.	<p>PROBLEM DEFINITION / BACKGROUND</p> <p><u>Q4.</u> Describe the proposed research or project, why it is needed, and how it is of Regional or Statewide significance.</p> <p><u>Q5.</u> What is the specific topic(s)/question(s) the proposed research or project intends to address?</p> <p><u>Q6.</u> If the research/project is conducted at a specific location, attach a map or diagram depicting the project location(s), and provide a photograph(s) of the proposed site(s). (Attachment 1)</p> <p><u>Q7.</u> Is this a phased study or part of a larger project effort? Please explain the objectives, framework, and scheduling for the larger project. Note whether there is a commitment to complete the entire project.</p>

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-2: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL APPLICATION

	<u>Q8.</u> Describe any previous studies or data collection efforts that directly relate to the proposed research/project. Attach copies of reports or any data (Attachment 6) that are available, and provide an overview of how the information relates to or informs the proposed research/project.
4.	PROGRAM LINK
	<u>Q9.</u> How will your research/project support the purpose of the SWGP, which is to implement projects that will directly prevent and reduce storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams?
5.	IS THE RESEARCH LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL
	<u>Q10.</u> Explain how the proposed project can or will be applied to advance the understanding and management of storm water?
	<u>Q11.</u> Explain the study design in the context of statistical reliability, controls, and ability to address and resolve potential confounding factors.
	<u>Q12.</u> Describe any computer models, management practices, specialized testing, or other extraordinary methods and materials that will be implemented or used as part of this project.
	<u>Q13.</u> Indicate the expected research benefits to water quality and beneficial uses.
	<u>Q14.</u> If necessary, provide additional information about your planning and monitoring project that are not addressed in the previous questions.
	<u>Q15.</u> Will your anticipated results be beneficial to other projects and/or geographic areas?
6.	PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS
	<u>Q16.</u> Explain the anticipated research/project results.
	<u>Q17.</u> What is the greatest challenge in the proposed research/project, and what are the potential benefits that could be attained if the challenge is successfully overcome? Describe the proposed method(s) to overcome the challenge.
	<u>Q18.</u> How do you propose to measure and document your project's benefits? Use the Project Performance Tables per Appendix H to quantify. Submit Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP) tables. (Attachment 4)
7.	COST EFFECTIVENESS
	<u>Q19.</u> Describe how the match requirement will be met.
	<u>Q20.</u> Does the project leverage any existing or potential funds from the State, local, and other sources? How much and from what source(s)? How secure is each funding source(s)?
	<u>Q21.</u> Explain how project costs were estimated, and provide a reasonable estimate of cost for each work item (i.e., line item) contained in the Proposal, including planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match. Provide a detailed budget. (Attachment 5)
8.	READINESS TO PROCEED
	<u>Q22.</u> Provide a description of all necessary environmental documents, and the status of all environmental documents required for the proposed project. All projects, even research projects, require California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance. Research projects typically require a Notice of Exemption (NOE) filed with County Clerk or State Clearing House. If an NOE has been filed please include a copy. (Attachment 2)

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-2: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL APPLICATION

	<p><u>Q23.</u> Explain the scope and schedule of the research/project. (Attachment 3) Indicate the start and end date of the proposed project. The schedule should include key milestones and potential obstacles.</p>
	<p><u>Q24.</u> Please describe the roles and qualifications of participating researcher(s) and key personnel. Indicate whether the researcher(s)/key personnel are committed to the project.</p>
8.	APPLICANT INFORMATION
	<p><u>Q25.</u> Have you or any cooperating entities applied for other funds from another program for this specific project? (This includes programs not administered by the State Water Board.) If yes, identify the agency and program.</p>
	<p><u>Q26.</u> Has the applicant or any cooperating entities entered into a contract or grant agreement: (1) that was terminated; (2) in which funds were withheld by the State Water Board; or (3) that has been the subject of an audit in which there were findings regarding the management of the project or funds by the applicant or a cooperating entity? If so, please explain in the box below, including actions taken to address the problem(s).</p>
	<p><u>Q27.</u> Is the applicant or was the applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the project? If so, please explain in the box below (include the name and case number in your explanation).</p>
9.	BONUS POINTS
	<p><u>Q28.</u> Describe how the project will directly benefit a disadvantaged community or address environmental justice issues. Applicants must provide strong justification to receive bonus points.</p>
10.	DISCLAIMER
	<p><u>Q29.</u> _____ (Initials): The <u>Project Director</u> has read and understands the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement. If the Project Director does not agree with the terms and conditions, a grant award may be denied. (All applicants will be required to check the box and initial next to the statement.)</p>

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-2: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL APPLICATION

APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Provide the attachments listed below by attaching files, no larger than 10 megabytes, to the FFAST application. For instructions on attaching files, please refer to the FFAST User Manual and the application instructions. When attaching files, applicants must use the naming convention noted in FFAST.

Attachment #	Attachment Title	Description
Attachment 1	Project Location - Map and Photos	Map, diagram, and/or photographs of the proposed project area.
Attachment 2	Environmental Clearance Checklist and CEQA Documentation	Provide a description of the necessary environmental documents, and the status of all environmental documents required for the project. All projects, even research projects, require CEQA compliance. See Appendix G for more information.
Attachment 3	Scope of Work/Schedule	Explain the scope and schedule of the research program/project.
Attachment 4	Project Performance Measures Table(s)	Applicants are required to submit Project Performance Measures Tables specific to their project. Project Performance Measures Tables should include: project goals, desired outcomes, output indicators (measures to effectively track output), outcome indicators (measures to evaluate change that is a direct result of the work), measurement tools and methods, and targets (measurable targets that are feasible to meet during the life of the Proposal). See Appendix H for more information.
Attachment 5	Budget	See Appendix I for detailed guidance on preparation of this attachment.
Attachment 6 (If Applicable)	Previous Studies or Collected Data	Copies of related reports or data.
Attachment 7 (If Applicable)	Letters of Support or Opposition	Submit electronic copies of any letters of support for or opposition to the project or individual projects contained within the project. General letters of support or opposition will not be considered. Letters of support or opposition must clearly state how the implementation of the proposal/project will benefit or adversely impact the individual or entity providing the letter. All letters should be attached to your proposal in FFAST, and may be addressed to the Project Director.
Attachment 8 (If Applicable)	Additional Information	Provide any additional information not contained in the on-line FFAST questionnaire.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-3: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA Applicant must receive "Yes" for ALL questions.	YES / NO
General Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) Information 1. Does the Proposal contain all the required information requested in the FAAST? (Entire Proposal)	
Eligibility 2. Is the applicant type eligible? (Question 1)	
3. Is the project an eligible project type? (Questions 2 & 3)	
4. Is the match requirement met? (Question 19)	
5. Is the project of Regional or Statewide significance? (Question 4)	
Readiness to Proceed 6. Does the project's estimated "Start Date" and "End Date" fall within the SWGP appropriations? (Question 23 and Attachment 3)	
Applicant Information 7. Has the applicant checked the box and initialed that the Project Director has read and understands the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement? (Question 29)	
Overall Evaluation 8. Should the Proposal be scored, based on answers to Questions 1 through 7 above? If yes, the Proposal should be scored; If no, the Proposal should not be scored.	

EVALUATION SCORING CRITERIA		
Note: The question references are provided below to assist the reviewer. However, the information provided throughout the PRC § 75072 Proposal should be used to determine the score.		
SCORING CRITERIA	SCORE	POINTS POSSIBLE
1. How well does the Proposal describe the problem(s) and the need for the proposed study/project? (Questions 4-8)		10
2. Is the research likely to be successful? (Questions 10-15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well will the proposed project advance the understanding and/or management of storm water? • Will the results of the proposed project lead to improved storm water quality? • Will or can the results be used to apply to other projects or geographic areas? 		20
4. Does the approach appear to be technically feasible? Does it include a description of how benefits will be achieved? Does it include a description of methods to be used? (Questions 11 & 12)		20
5. How well qualified are the participating researchers and key personnel? (Question 24)		10

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-3: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SCORED CRITERIA	SCORE	POINTS POSSIBLE
6. How well does the project address the goal of the SWGP? How well will the results of the proposed project be used for the successful design, selection, and implementation of SWGP Projects? (Question 9)		10
7. How well does the applicant address their readiness to proceed? (Questions 22-24)		10
8. How well does the project address project effectiveness? (Questions 16-18)		10
9. Does the applicant have a good track record? If not, are the proposed actions taken to address the problem(s) sufficient? (Question 26) (-5 points if Negative, 0 points if Neutral or Good)		-5
Overall Evaluation 10. What is the score of this Proposal?		90 (additional 5 bonus points available)
Bonus Points 11. Does the project directly benefit a disadvantaged community or address environmental justice issues. (Question 28)		5

TABLE III: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/GENERAL PROGRAM QUESTIONS

The Selection Panel may review the responses to the following questions.

11. Does the Proposal address compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements? Does the reviewer have any concerns regarding environmental compliance requirements for the proposed project?
12. Does this project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation, permit, or order?
13. Is the proposed completion time reasonable?
14. Does the reviewer believe the proposed project is technically and financially feasible?
15. Do you have any concerns about the applicant's ability to secure all of the required funding for accomplishing the expected outcomes of this project?
16. Is the applicant or was the applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the project.
17. Would you recommend the proposed project for funding? Answer Yes or No. Explain your answer.
18. Does the reviewer have any concerns about funding this project? If you answer yes, please explain.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX F-3: PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

PRC § 75072 PROPOSAL SCORING TABLE

Note: The following table will be used to score projects unless otherwise noted. Where applicable, project objectives / goals / outcomes must be reflected in the Project Performance Measures Tables, which should include feasible targets, tracked with effective indicators, and measured with effective tools/methods that can be accomplished by the project within its timeframe.

Score	Scoring Rationale
Full Points	Criteria are fully addressed and supported by thorough and well presented documentation and logical rationale.
↑	Criteria are addressed with sufficient documentation and rationale.
Half Points	Criteria are addressed, but documentation and/or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.
↓	Criteria are partially addressed and little to no documentation and/or rationale is presented.
No Points	Applicant is not responsive (i.e., criteria are not addressed and no documentation or rationale is presented).

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX G: ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

This Appendix details the steps that applicants must take to comply with environmental review requirements for the Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program (SWGP) administered by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Financial Assistance (Division).

The State Water Board is required to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when funding a project. The Division's Regional Programs Unit (RPU) fulfills the State Water Board's responsibility by reviewing the CEQA documents provided by the Lead Agency/Grantee to develop the State Water Board's administrative record and findings.

It is important for the State Water Board to receive the CEQA document during the draft stage for review and comment. This helps ensure that the Water Boards' comments are addressed during the draft stage rather than after the CEQA document has been adopted by the Lead Agency. Grantees are strongly encouraged to submit the draft CEQA document to the State Water Boards' Project Manager before or during the State Clearinghouse review period.

PRC § 75102 requires that before the adoption of a negative declaration or environmental impact report required for any project to be financed with Proposition 84 funds, the lead agency shall notify the proposed action to a California Native American tribe, which is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), if that tribe has traditional lands located within the area of the proposed project.

The NAHC can be contacted at:

915 Capitol Mall, Room 364
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4082

Note: The NAHC will provide a list of Native American tribes that are culturally affiliated with your project area and will likely recommend that all applicable tribes be contacted. A request form for the NAHC contact list can be found online at: <http://nahc.ca.gov> under the *Additional Information Section*. Guidance for Native American consultation can be obtained from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) website at: <http://opr.ca.gov>, under the *Local and Tribal Intergovernmental Consultation* section.

Steps in the RPU review process include:

1. Grantee submits the CEQA documents to the Water Boards' Project Manager following the Public Review Period and adoption of the CEQA findings by the Lead Agency;
2. RPU staff reviews the CEQA Documentation, including the final CEQA document (See the following "CEQA Checklist for the Grantee.");
3. RPU staff develops an administrative record and State Water Board findings for the funding action;
4. Deputy Director or the State Water Board adopts the CEQA findings; and
5. RPU staff notifies the Water Boards' Project Manager when CEQA findings are approved.

State-funded activities subject to CEQA shall not begin until the State Water Board's CEQA findings are finalized and approved.

The CEQA and CEQA Guidelines can be accessed at:

<http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/>

DRAFT FINAL

Additional guidance can be obtained from the *CEQA Deskbook 1999 Edition with 2001 Supplement*, published by Solano Press Books. This book provides a step-by-step guide on how to comply with CEQA and may explain information in a more straight-forward manner than the CEQA Guidelines.

Notes: If the grantee is not the Lead Agency under CEQA (i.e., a responsible agency under CEQA that is using another agency's CEQA document), the grantee will need to:

1. Make its own CEQA findings and approve the mitigations measures applicable to the proposed funded project;
2. File the Notice of Determination (NOD) with the OPR; and
3. Provide the date-stamped copy of the NOD filed with the OPR and a resolution or meeting minutes approving the project and adopting/certifying the CEQA document to the Water Boards' Project Manager.

If the grantee uses a Notice of Exemption (NOE), the grantee files the NOE with the County Clerk of each county in which the project will be located (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15062[c][2]). Since the project is being funded by the State Water Board, the grantee also files the NOE with the OPR. This reduces the statute of limitations from 180 days to 35 days, and notifies other state agencies and the public that the grantee determined the project was exempt from the CEQA requirements. There is no cost for filing an NOE with the OPR.

DRAFT FINAL
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)
CHECKLIST FOR THE GRANTEE
What to Submit to your Water Boards' Project Manager

If project is covered under a **CEQA Categorical or Statutory Exemption**, submit a copy of the following:

- Notice of Exemption** (filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)
- List of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and their locations**, if project implements BMPs

If project is covered under a **Negative Declaration**, submit a copy of the following:

- Draft and Final Initial Study/Negative Declaration**
(or Mitigated Negative Declaration, if applicable)
 - Comments and Responses to the Draft
 - Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (if using a Mitigated Negative Declaration)
- Resolution approving the CEQA documents**
 - Adopting the Negative Declaration
 - Making CEQA Findings
- Notice of Determination** (filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)

If project is covered under an **Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**, submit a copy of the following:

- Draft and Final EIR**
 - Comments and Responses to the Draft
 - Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP)
- Resolution approving the CEQA documents**
 - Certifying the EIR and adopting the MMRP
 - Making CEQA Findings
 - Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations for any adverse impact(s) that cannot be avoided or fully mitigated if project is implemented
- Notice of Determination** (filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)

If EIR is a joint CEQA/National Environmental Policy Act document (EIR/Environmental Impact Statement or EIR/Environmental Assessment), submit the applicable Record of Decision and/or Finding of No Significant Impact.

APPENDIX H: PREPARING PROJECT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PLANS

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Appendix is to provide background information on Project Assessment and Evaluation Plans (PAEPs) and the Project Performance Measures Tables.

II. BACKGROUND

Monitoring, assessment, and performance measures must be designed so that the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) can ensure that the projects meet their intended goals, achieve measurable outcomes, and provide value to the State of California. The State Water Board requires that all grant funded projects monitor and report project performance with respect to the stated benefits or objectives identified in the Proposal. **Applicants are required to prepare and submit Project Performance Measures Tables, specific to their proposed project, as part of the Full Proposal or Public Resources Code (PRC) § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Project Proposal.** As part of the grant agreement, all grantees must prepare a PAEP, which will include the performance measures tables. Guidance and tools for preparing a PAEP and the accompanying Project Performance Measures Tables can be found on our website ([Appendix B](#)).

The goals of a PAEP are to:

- ❖ Provide a framework for assessment and evaluation of project performance;
- ❖ Identify measures that can be used to monitor progress towards achieving project goals and desired outcomes;
- ❖ Provide a tool for grantees and grant managers to monitor and measure project progress and guide final project performance reporting that will fulfill the grant agreement requirements;
- ❖ Provide information to help improve current and future projects; and
- ❖ Quantify the value of public expenditures to achieve environmental results.

Many projects include multiple activities that will require measurement of several parameters to evaluate overall project performance. Successful applicants must be prepared to demonstrate the success of the project through the development and measurement of the appropriate metrics. These metrics may include water quality measurements; measurement-based estimates of pollution load reductions; acres of habitat restored; feet of stream channel stabilized; additional water supply; improved water supply reliability and flexibility; groundwater level measurements; stream flow measurements; or other quantitative measures or indicators. These and other measures and/or indicators should be selected to fit the performance evaluation needs of the project.

III. PROJECT PERFORMANCE MEASURES TABLES

Project Performance Measures Tables must be submitted as part of the Full Proposal or PRC § 75072 Planning and Monitoring Project Proposal. Applicants may be required to complete multiple Performance Measures Tables depending on what types of activities are proposed. If multiple projects are part of a proposal, a Project Performance Measures Table should be submitted for each project included in the proposal.

DRAFT FINAL

Use the following guidance when completing tables for a project:

Project Goals:	Identify the project goals as they relate to activities or items outlined in the proposal/grant agreement.
Desired Outcomes:	Identify the measurable results that the project expects to achieve by implementing project activities consistent with the specified goals.
Project Performance Measures:	Appropriate project performance measures that include: (1) Output Indicators representing measures to efficiently track outputs (activities, products, or deliverables); and (2) Outcome Indicators, measures to evaluate change that is a direct result of the work and can be linked through a weight-of-evidence approach to project activities or outputs (e.g. improvements in environmental conditions, awareness, participation, or community, landowner, or local government capacity).
Measurement Tools and Methods:	Methods of measurement or tools that will be used to document project performance (e.g. California Rapid Assessment Method, California Department of Fish and Game Monitoring Protocols for fisheries restoration projects).
Targets:	Measurable targets that are feasible to meet during the project period, (e.g., ninety percent (90%) reduction in invasive species acreage; or fifty percent (50%) reduction in pesticide use within the watershed.

Example Project Performance Measures Tables are provided on the State Water Board's website ([Appendix B](#)). The example activities are provided for illustrative purposes only, however, and should be used to guide the identification of appropriate categories and performance measures for the project described in the Proposal.

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX I: BUDGET TABLE

Provide a reasonable estimate of the cost for all work items (i.e., line item) including planning, design, and construction costs. If the proposal includes more than one project, complete the following table for each project in the proposal for which funding is requested.

BUDGET TABLE					
PROPOSAL TITLE:		PIN NUMBER:			
	Budget Category	Funding Match	Requested Grant Funding	Other Project Funding	Total
(a)	Direct Project Administration Costs				
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement				
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation				
(d)	Construction/Implementation				
(e)	Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement				
(f)	Project Summary [Sum (a) through (e) for each column]				
(g)	Construction Administration				
(h)	Monitoring Data Integration into SWAMP				
(i)	Education and Outreach				
(j)	Other (Explain):				
(k)	Construction/Implementation Contingency				
(l)	Grand Total [Sum (f) through (k) for each column]				
(m)	Source(s) of Matching Funds				
(n)	Source(s) of Other Project Funding				

Budget Category Explanations

(a) *Direct Project Administration Costs* – Includes: salaries, wages, fringe benefits, office supplies, and equipment needed to support the project, staff travel costs (at or below the rate allowed for unrepresented State employees), and preparation of required progress and final reports. This budget category includes all such costs for the grantee and any partner agencies or organizations. Applicants are encouraged to limit such costs to less than 5% of the total proposed project costs.

DRAFT FINAL

Such administrative expenses are the necessary costs incidentally but directly related to the proposed project.

- (b) *Land Purchase/Easement* – Land acquisition costs will not be considered a reimbursable item if purchased prior to the terms of the grant agreement. Costs for easements will be handled similarly as for land purchases.
- (c) *Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation* – For these efforts, differentiate costs between consulting services and/or organization staff costs. Planning costs include: planning efforts, reconnaissance studies, feasibility studies, and preliminary reports. Design and engineering costs include: conceptual, preliminary and final design efforts, geotechnical reports, hydraulic studies, water quality investigations and efforts, and other engineering types of work. Include the costs of bid preparation and processing here. Environmental documentation costs include all efforts involved in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process up to the point of the Notice of Determination, Finding of No Significant Impact, or Record of Decision.
- (d) *Construction/Implementation* – Includes the summary of labor, materials, and equipment purchases and/or rentals. After bids are received these costs will be the actual construction costs awarded to the qualified low bidder. The construction or implementation costs for pilot projects should be included here.
- (e) *Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement* – Includes those costs required by a CEQA document to offset any potential damages caused by the proposed project. If these costs are included in the grant agreement awarded for construction or implementation of the Proposal, differentiate such costs for purposes of this budget.
- (f) *Project Summary* – The summation of the costs for items (a) through (e) above.
- (g) *Construction Administration* – Includes those costs required to supervise and administer the construction or implementation of the project. Differentiate costs between consulting services and organization staff costs to perform this work.
- (h) *Monitoring Data Integration Into SWAMP* – Include the estimated amount for complying with the requirement to integrate water quality monitoring data into the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP).
- (i) *Education and Outreach* – Includes the costs for education and/or outreach that increases the understanding of the project's benefits and enjoyment of California's water resources directly related to the project. See [Section VI.D](#) for more information
- (j) *Other* – Includes costs for legal services, license fees, permits, any implementation verification costs, and any monitoring and assessment costs required during the construction/implementation of the proposed project. Do not include monitoring and assessment costs for efforts required after construction/implementation of the project is complete. These costs are considered to be operation and maintenance costs and are not reimbursable.
- (k) *Construction/Implementation Contingency* – Includes any contingency costs for the construction/implementation of the proposed project. Specify the percentage used for this contingency cost. For all other contingency costs (e.g. design, land purchase, etc.) include those contingencies in the appropriate cost category.
- (l) *Grand Total [Sum (f) through (k) for each column]* – The summation of the costs for items (f) through (k) above.
- (m) *Source(s) of Matching Funds* – Include the amount and source of each component of match funding.
- (n) *Other Project Funding* – Include the amount(s) and source(s) of any other project funding (e.g., other grant funds, which cannot be used for match)

DRAFT FINAL
APPENDIX J: DEFINITIONS

303(d) List – refers to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act that requires each state to periodically submit to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) a list of impaired waters. Impaired waters are those that are not meeting the State's water quality standards. Once the impaired waters are identified and placed on the list, section 303(d) requires that the State establish total maximum daily loads that will meet water quality standards for each listed water body.

Ahwahnee Principles – a highly acclaimed set of community and regional principles developed by a leading group of architects and urban planners to assist local government officials in planning for quality of life and sustainability. The Ahwahnee Principles have three parts: 1) Community Principles, which provide a definition of land use ideals for communities; 2) Regional Principles, which describe how communities should relate to each other within a region; and 3) Implementation Strategy, which creates a plan for local officials.

Applicant – an entity that files an application for funding under the provisions of Proposition 84 with the State Water Resources Control Board.

Application – refers to the electronic submission to the State Water Resources Control Board that requests grant funding for the project that the applicant intends to implement. It includes the proposal, which may be comprised of responses to the questions included in the on-line application system, as well as attachments.

Basin Plan – also referred to as a Water Quality Control Plan, identifies: 1) beneficial uses to be protected; 2) water quality objectives for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses; and 3) a program of implementation for achieving the water quality objectives as established by the Regional Water Boards or State Water Board.

Beneficial Uses - refers to the uses that streams, lakes, rivers, and other water bodies, have to humans and other life. Beneficial uses are outlined in a Water Quality Control Plan, also called a Basin Plan. Each body of water in the State has a set of beneficial uses it supports. Different beneficial uses require different water quality control(s). Therefore, each beneficial use has a set of water quality objectives designed to protect that beneficial use. Below is a list of some of the beneficial uses.

Beneficial uses may include: domestic (homes, human consumption, etc.), irrigation (crops, lawns), power (hydroelectric), municipal (water supply of a city or town), mining (hydraulic conveyance, drilling), industrial (commerce, trade, industry), fish and wildlife preservation, aquaculture (raising fish, etc. for commercial purposes), recreational (boating, swimming), stockwatering (for commercial livestock), water quality, frost protection (misting or spraying crops to prevent frost damage), heat control (water crops to prevent heat damage), groundwater recharge, agriculture, etc.

Block Group – a census geography used by the United States Census Bureau (USCB) that is a subdivision of a census tract. A block group is the smallest geographic unit for which the USCB tabulates sample data. A block group consists of all the blocks within a census tract with the same beginning (block) number.

Census Designated Place – a census geography used by the USCB that is a statistical entity, defined for each decennial census according to USCB guidelines, comprising a densely settled concentration of population that is not within an incorporated place, but is locally identified by a name. Census designated places are delineated cooperatively by State and local officials and the USCB, following USCB guidelines.

DRAFT FINAL

Census Tract – a census geography used by the USCB that is a small, relatively permanent statistical subdivision of a county delineated by a local committee of census data users for the purpose of presenting data. Census tract boundaries normally follow visible features, but may follow governmental unit boundaries and other non-visible features in some instances; they always nest within counties. Census tracts are designed to be relatively homogeneous units with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions at the time of establishment. Census tracts average about 4,000 inhabitants.

Community – for the purposes of this grant program, a community is a population of persons residing in the same locality under the same local governance.

Disadvantaged Community – a community with a median household income less than 80% of the statewide average (PRC § 75005[g]).

Environmental Justice – the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or social-economic groups should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations, or the execution of Federal, State, local, and tribal programs and policies.

Environmental Justice Community - community that is disproportionately impacted by environmental harms and risks with regard to race, national origin, or income.

Evaluation Criteria – the set of specifications used to select or choose a project based on available funding.

Fiscal Year (FY) – a 12-month period in which an organization plans to use its funds. The fiscal year for the State Water Resources Control Board begins on July 1 and ends on June 30.

Funding Match – funds made available by the applicant including, but not limited to, Federal funds, local and private funding, State financing, or donated and volunteer (“in-kind”) services. Proposition 84 does not limit the sources that are eligible for match. Therefore, unlike previous Proposition 50 funding programs, financing received through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program or any other State sponsored loan programs may be used for match. Additionally, education and outreach may qualify as a portion of the funding match. Regardless of the source, grant funds cannot be used for the required match.

Grantee – refers to a grant recipient such as public agencies, local public agencies, public colleges, or nonprofit organizations, as defined in this Appendix, which are eligible for grant funding.

Granting Agency – the agency that is funding a proposal and with which a grantee has a grant agreement. The State Water Resources Control Board will be the granting agency for the Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program.

Green Infrastructure – management approaches and technologies that infiltrate, evapotranspire, capture, and reuse storm water to maintain or restore natural hydrologies. It is an approach to wet weather management that is cost-effective, sustainable, and environmentally friendly.

Impaired Water Body – surface waters identified by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards as impaired because water quality objectives are not being achieved or where the designated beneficial uses are not fully protected after application of technology-based controls. A list of impaired water bodies is compiled by the State Water Resources Control Board pursuant to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

DRAFT FINAL

International Storm Water Best Management Practices (BMP) Database - database of over 300 BMP studies, performance analysis results, tools for use in BMP performance studies, monitoring guidance and other study-related publications.

Lead Agency – public agency (usually the applicant) that is responsible for preparation and circulation of environmental documents before project approval. If the project will be completed by a non-governmental organization, often the first public agency providing discretionary approval for the project would be the responsible Lead Agency.

Local Public Agency – is any city, county, city and county, or district.

Low Impact Development (LID) – for the purposes of this funding program, Low Impact Development (LID) is a storm water management strategy aimed at maintaining or restoring the natural hydrologic functions of a site or project to achieve natural resource protection objectives and fulfill environmental regulatory requirements; LID employs a variety of natural and built features that reduce the rate of runoff, filter pollutants out of runoff, and facilitate the infiltration of water into the ground and/or on-site storage of water for reuse.

Management Measures – economically achievable measures for the control of the addition of pollutants from existing and new categories and classes of nonpoint sources of pollution, which reflect the greatest degrees of pollutant reduction achievable through the application of the best available nonpoint pollution control practices, technologies, processes, siting criteria, operating methods, or alternatives.

Median Household Income (MHI) - commonly used to provide data about geographic areas. It divides households into two equal segments, with the first half of households earning less than the MHI, and the other half earning more. The MHI is considered by many statisticians to be a better indicator than the average household income, as it is not dramatically affected by unusually high or low values.

Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) - any pipe, ditch or gully, or system of pipes, ditches, or gullies, that is owned or operated by a governmental entity and used for collecting and conveying storm water.

Nonpoint Sources (NPS) Pollution – water pollution that does not originate from a discrete point, such as a sewage treatment plant outlet. NPS pollution is a by-product of land use practices, such as those associated with farming, timber harvesting, construction management, marina and boating activities, road construction and maintenance, and mining. Primary pollutants include sediment, fertilizers, pesticides and other pollutants that are picked up by water traveling over and through the land and are delivered to surface and ground water via precipitation, runoff, and leaching. From a regulatory perspective, pollutant discharges that are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES) are considered to be point sources. By definition, all other discharges are considered NPS pollution.

Nonprofit Organization – any California corporation organized under Sections 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the Federal Internal Revenue Code.

Section 501(c)(3) defines Nonprofit Organizations as:

“Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster national or international amateur sports competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided in subsection (h)), and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or

DRAFT FINAL

distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.”

Section 501(c)(4) defines Nonprofit Organizations as:

“Civic leagues or organizations not organized for profit but operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare, or local associations of employees, the membership of which is limited to the employees of a designated person or persons in a particular municipality, and the net earnings of which are devoted exclusively to charitable, educational, or recreational purposes.

Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an entity unless no part of the net earnings of such entity inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.”

Section 501(c)(5) defines Nonprofit Organizations as:

“Labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations.”

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Program— controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States. Point sources are discrete conveyances such as pipes or man-made ditches. Since its introduction in 1972, the NPDES Permit Program has been responsible for significant improvements to our Nation's and State's water quality.

Place – a census geography used by the USCB that is a concentration of population either legally bounded as an incorporated place, or identified as a Census Designated Place.

Pollutant Load Reduction – the decrease of a particular contaminant in the impaired waterbody resulting from the implementation of the project.

Project – refers to the entire set of actions, including planning, permitting, constructing, monitoring, and reporting on all of the proposed activities, including structural and non-structural implementation of management measures and practices.

Project Area - refers to the geographical boundaries, as defined by the applicant, which encompass the area where the project will be implemented / constructed, including the area where the benefits and impacts of project implementation or planning activities extend.

Proposal – refers to all of the supporting documentation submitted that details the project and actions that are proposed for funding pursuant to an application for a grant.

Proposition 84 – is the “Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006,” as set forth in Division 43 of the Public Resources Code.

Public Agency – is any city, county, city and county, district, the State, or any agency or department thereof.

Public Colleges – refers to State Universities, Universities of California, and community colleges.

Public Works – construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work done under contract and paid for in whole or in part out of public funds, except work done directly by any public utility company pursuant to order of the Public Utilities Commission or other public authority (CLC § 1720).

Regional Agency – public agencies with statutory authority over land use or water management whose jurisdiction encompasses an area greater than the jurisdictional boundaries of any one local public agency.

DRAFT FINAL

Reimbursable Costs – refers to costs that may be funded under Propositions 84. Reimbursable costs include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement, legal fees, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, project monitoring within the term of the agreement, and project implementation.

Under the general provisions of Chapter 5 of Proposition 84, certain education and outreach activities are eligible as a piece of an eligible project type identified in [Section VI.C](#). According to Chapter 5 of Proposition 84, funds shall be available for the “protection and restoration of rivers, lakes, and streams.” (PRC § 75050) Protection means “those actions necessary to allow the continued use and enjoyment of property or natural resources and includes acquisition, development, restoration, preservation and interpretation.” Interpretation includes, but is not limited to, “a visitor serving amenity that educates and communicates the significance and value of natural, historical, and cultural resources in a way that increases the understanding and enjoyment of these resources.” (PRC § 75005) Therefore, projects that include education/outreach designed to increase the public’s understanding of the environmental benefits and the enjoyment of California’s water resources directly related to the project may be eligible for funding.

Costs that are not reimbursable with grant funding include, but are not limited to:

- a. Costs, other than those noted above, incurred outside the terms of the grant agreement with the State;
- b. Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project;
- c. Establishing a reserve fund;
- d. Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs;
- e. Expenses incurred in preparation of the proposal;
- f. Purchase of land or interests in land (except in the case where the minimum required acreage necessary to operate as an integral part of the project, as set forth and detailed by engineering and feasibility studies, is reimbursable);
- g. Payment of principal or interest of existing indebtedness or any interest payments unless the debt is incurred within the terms of the grant agreement with the State, the granting agency agrees in writing to the eligibility of the costs for reimbursement before the debt is incurred, and the purposes for which the debt is incurred are otherwise reimbursable project costs; and
- h. Overhead or indirect costs.

Restore – to improve physical structures or facilities (PRC § 75005).

Selection Panel – comprised of one or more State Water Board management representative(s) that will review and consider proposal evaluations and scores developed by the Technical Review Teams, along with feedback from the SWATF members, in order to make final funding recommendations. Selection panel funding recommendations will be presented to the State Water Board for consideration of adoption.

Small Disadvantaged Community – a community with a population of 20,000 persons or less with a median household income (MHI) less than 80% (80 percent) of the statewide average (PRC § 75005[g]).

Small Severely Disadvantaged Community – a community with a population of 20,000 persons or less with a median household income (MHI) less than 60% (sixty percent) of the statewide average (PRC § 75005[g]).

DRAFT FINAL

Smart Growth - an urban planning and transportation theory that concentrates growth in urban areas to limit urban sprawl to preserve natural lands and critical environmental areas, protect water and air quality, and reuse already-developed land. Smart Growth conserves resources by reinvesting in existing infrastructure and reclaiming historic buildings. By designing neighborhoods that have shops, offices, schools, churches, parks, and other amenities near homes, communities are giving their residents and visitors the option of walking, bicycling, taking public transportation, or driving as they go about their business. Basic Smart Growth principles include:

1. Mixing land uses;
2. Taking advantage of compact building design;
3. Creating a range of housing opportunities and choices;
4. Creating walkable neighborhoods;
5. Fostering distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place;
6. Preserving open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas;
7. Strengthening and direct development towards existing communities;
8. Providing a variety of transportation choices;
9. Making development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective; and
10. Encouraging community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions.

Stakeholder – an individual, group, coalition, agency, or other entity that is involved in, affected by, or has an interest in the implementation of a specific program or project.

Storm Water – water generated by runoff from land and impervious surfaces during rainfall and snow events that often contains pollutants in quantities that could adversely affect water quality. Dry weather flow enters the municipal storm sewer from every day activities such as lawn watering, car washing, and ground water seepage.

Storm Water Advisory Task Force (SWATF) - required by Assembly Bill (AB) 739 (Statutes 2007, Chapter 610) to provide advice to the State Water Board on its Storm Water Management Program that may include program priorities, funding criteria, project selection, and interagency coordination of State Programs that address storm water management. Members for the SWATF are comprised of representatives with an expertise in water quality and storm water management from public agencies, the regulated community, industry, and nonprofit organizations. The SWATF was appointed by the State Water Board on February 19, 2008, under Resolution No. 2008-0012.

Sustainable - resources must only be used at a rate at which they can be replenished naturally.

Technical Review Teams (TRTs) – a group of representatives assembled to evaluate the technical competence of a proposed project and the feasibility of the project being successful if implemented. TRTs will be comprised of subject matter experts from the State Water Board and Regional Water Boards. Reviewers will not be able to review or participate in discussion of proposals for which they have a conflict of interest. All reviewers will be required to submit a statement disclosing any conflict of interest.

DRAFT FINAL

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) – a written plan that describes how an impaired water body will meet water quality standards. It contains: (1) a measurable feature to describe attainment of the water quality standard(s); (2) a description of required actions to remove the impairment; and, (3) an allocation of responsibility among dischargers to act, either in the form of actions or through the establishment of water quality conditions for which each discharger is responsible. An established TMDL is one that has been adopted by both the applicable Regional Water Board and the State Water Board, has been approved by the Office of Administrative Law and paid the appropriate fees to the Department of Fish and Game.

Urban Water Supplier – a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, that provides water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplies more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually (CWC § 10617).

Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) – requirements that are adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards to protect the waters of the state for the use and enjoyment of the people of California.

Water Management Grants - programs or projects for surface water or groundwater storage, recycling, desalination, water conservation, water supply reliability, and water supply augmentation. (CWC § 10631.5)

Water Quality Objectives – the limits or levels of water quality elements or biological characteristics established to reasonably protect the beneficial uses of water or the prevent problems within a specific area. Water quality objectives may be numeric or narrative.

Water Quality Standards - State-adopted and USEPA-approved ambient standards for water bodies that prescribe the use of the water body and establish the water quality criteria that must be met to protect these uses. The three components of water quality standards include the beneficial designated use or uses of a water body (for example, drinking water supply, contact recreation (swimming), and aquatic life support), the numerical and narrative water-quality criteria that are necessary to protect the use or uses of that particular water body, and an antidegradation statement (from federal CWA).