

**Summary of *Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program (SWGP) Guidelines Changes*  
(from November 17, 2008, Draft Version to January 30, 2009, Draft Final Version)**

Below is a summary of the **major** changes made to the Guidelines.

1. Draft Guidelines workshops included in Background information. (**Page 2**)
2. Updated flow chart. (**Page 5**)
3. A joint powers authority (JPA) comprised of local public agencies is an eligible applicant. (**Page 6**)
4. An additional match category for disadvantaged communities (DACs) was added. There are now four different match categories: 1) Small Severely DACs, 2) Small DACs, 3) DACs, and 4) Others. (**Page 6**)
5. The maximum grant amount was lowered from \$5 million to \$3 million per project. (**Page 6**)
6. Outreach/education was added as an eligible cost for the funding match. (**Page 7**)
7. Grant funds cannot be used for the required match. (**Page 7**)
8. Five percent (5%) of Proposition 84 SWGP funds are reserved for all disadvantaged communities (DACs), rather than just small DACs. However, preference for these funds will be given to small DACs. (Moved to **Page 8**)
9. An established total maximum daily load (TMDL) is defined as “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.” (**Page 8**)
10. All projects are now required to provide basic education/outreach directly related to the project that increases the understanding and enjoyment of water resources. (**Page 8**)
11. Education and Outreach section added. (**Page 9**)
12. “Facilitation of Grant Monitoring Data Inclusion into SWAMP” was removed from the list of types of planning and monitoring projects under Public Resources Code (PRC) § 75072. (**Page 10**) - REMOVED
13. Education and outreach that is part of a funded project is an eligible reimbursable expense for up to ten percent (10%) of the grant amount. (**Page 15**)
14. Grantees are required to make annual updates to the Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP) for the term of the grant agreement. (**Page 17**)
15. Updated Urban Water Management Plan Section. (**Page 17**)
16. Updated Summary Table. (**Page 19**)
17. Definitions Appendix moved to the very end of the document (Appendix J). Appendix letters updated accordingly. (**Page 70**)
18. Appendix C (Requests for Reduction of Funding Match for Disadvantage Communities) was updated to include the new reduced funding match option for DACs larger than 20,000 persons. (**Page 23 & 26**)

19. Questions 2, 3, and 24 in the Concept Proposal (CP) were added/modified. (**Pages 31-33**)
20. Bonus Points (up to 5 points) are available in the CP, FP, and PRC § 75072 Proposal for projects that directly benefit a disadvantaged community or address environmental justice issues. (**Page 32**)
21. Applicants no longer receive points for a good track record. However, an applicant may lose up to 5 points for a negative track record. (**Page 36**)
22. The minimum amount of points that an applicant is required to receive on the CP, in order to be invited to submit a Full Proposal (FP), has been lowered from 70 points to 65 points, to make up for reduced possible overall score. (**Page 36**)
23. Questions 4, 5, 9, 44, and 45, and Attachments 12 and 13 have been added/modified in the FP. (**Page 39-45**)
24. Eligibility criteria 5 and 6 have been added to the FP “Eligibility” scoring criteria. (**Page 46**)
25. Question 4 was added to PRC, Section 75072 Proposal Questions. (**Page 56**)
26. Education and Outreach has been added as a new category in the Budget Table (Appendix I). (**Page 68-69**)
27. Definitions added for “disadvantaged community,” “restore,” and “water management grants.” (**Pages 71-76**)
28. Definition for “funding match,” “reimbursable costs,” and “total maximum daily load” were modified. (**Pages 71, 74, & 75**)