

# Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program: Scoping Meetings - February/March 2008 Summary\* of Comments Received

## MATCH

Requirement:	Proposition 84 requires a match.	
Below are responses to the following types of questions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What match amount or percentage should be required?</li> <li>• Should there be a tiered match tied to funding amount (e.g., higher match for larger projects)?</li> <li>• Should the match requirement be lower for disadvantaged communities (DACs)?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If so, what percentage would you recommend? and/or,</li> <li>▪ Should there be a tiered match (e.g., for severely DACs versus DACs versus others)?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Should DACs be able to use other grant funds for match?</li> </ul>	
Feedback:		
<b>Sacramento February 25, 2008</b>	<b>San Luis Obispo March 3, 2008</b>	<b>Los Angeles March 10, 2008</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>In-kind services eligible for up to 100% of match</b></li> <li>- Low-interest State Revolving Fund (SRF) loans eligible as match funds</li> <li>- Maximum match of 10%</li> <li>- <b>Reduced Match for Disadvantaged Communities (DACs)</b></li> <li>- Funding amount should determine different levels of match</li> <li>- Larger projects should require larger match</li> <li>- Match date – allow match to start at date of Guidelines adoption or earlier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Require higher match for Proposition 218 communities or those with Storm Water Utility fees/funds</b></li> <li>- <b>Allow in-kind match</b></li> <li>- <b>Lower match requirement for DACs</b></li> <li>- Scoring scale based on match percentage               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o More points given to projects with a higher match</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximum of 20% match required</li> <li>- Ineligible portions of project should be eligible for match</li> <li>- 3 tiers of match requirements; DACs, extremely disadvantaged, and all others</li> <li>- DACs are able to use other state grant money for match</li> <li>- Should allow any community to use other grant money for match</li> <li>- Should allow DACs within a larger community to benefit, not just independent DACs</li> <li>- Location of DAC within larger communities could be problematic</li> <li>- SRF loans eligible as match</li> <li>- <b>Allow staff time (“in-kind services”) to be eligible as match</b></li> <li>- <b>Higher match should provide more points in scoring the proposal</b></li> <li>- <b>Different match requirement for different size grants/projects</b></li> </ul>

**Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program: Scoping Meetings - February/March 2008  
Summary\* of Comments Received**

**FUNDING CAP**

Requirement:	Not to exceed \$5 million per project.		
Below are responses to the following types of questions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the maximum project cap be less than \$5 million? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If yes, what should the maximum grant amount be per project?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Should there be a limited number of larger grants?</li> <li>• What should the minimum grant amount be per project?</li> </ul>		
Feedback:			
<b>Sacramento February 25, 2008</b>	<b>San Luis Obispo March 3, 2008</b>	<b>Los Angeles March 10, 2008</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lower maximum funding cap will encourage smaller projects</li> <li>- Set aside money for DACs</li> <li>- Set asides for planning or operations and maintenance</li> <li>- Recommend a \$1 Million - \$2 Million cap</li> <li>- Recommend a \$50,000 minimum</li> <li>- <b>Don't discourage large or small projects. Cap on # of projects worth certain dollar amount (3-\$5 Million, 8-\$3 Million, etc.)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>\$2 Million - \$3 Million maximum, to assist more projects</b></li> <li>- <b>Lower cap to distribute funds more broadly</b></li> <li>- Need minimum grant amount too <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o But do not discourage smaller projects with high match funds available by setting the minimum too low</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Evaluate based on a direct comparison of grant money required to benefits achieved</b></li> <li>- Leave it broad, consider appropriate funding amount on a project specific basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$2 Million - \$5 Million</li> <li>- Some applicants may wish to phase larger projects to make each phase cost less than the funding cap</li> <li>- Construction cost cap</li> <li>- Set aside for smaller and larger projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Apply to large, can still compete for smaller</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>\$5 Million projects should be regional, larger-scale, and should address multiple pollutants</b></li> <li>- Funding minimums <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o \$100,000</li> <li>o \$500,000</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program: Scoping Meetings - February/March 2008  
Summary\* of Comments Received**

**PROJECT PREFERENCES**

Requirements:	Board shall give preference to projects that do one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support sustained, long-term water quality improvements</li> <li>• Coordinated or consistent with any applicable Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan</li> </ul>		
Below are responses to the following types of questions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects that reduce Green House Gas (GHG) emissions?</li> <li>• Projects designed to reduce Climate Change (e.g., energy efficient)?</li> <li>• Applicants that have adopted Ahwahnee Principles and/or Sustainability Principles in their General Plan (or other plans)?</li> <li>• Use of a local match source (e.g., Proposition O)?</li> <li>• Projects that treat and reuse storm water (e.g., augment water supply)?</li> <li>• Projects that implement LID principles?</li> <li>• Projects that provide multiple benefits?</li> <li>• Projects that use source control measures as opposed to end-of-pipe treatment measures?</li> </ul>		
Feedback:			
	<b>Sacramento February 25, 2008</b>	<b>San Luis Obispo March 3, 2008</b>	<b>Los Angeles March 10, 2008</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green House Gas (GHG) emission reduction/alternative energy source projects</li> <li>- <b>Multi-benefit projects</b></li> <li>- Language to encourage source-control projects</li> <li>- Projects that treat and reuse storm water</li> <li>- Preference for GHG reduction projects may shift focus from the primary objectives of the program</li> <li>- Trash reduction</li> <li>- <b>Low Impact Development (LID)</b></li> <li>- Reducing leaking fluids from vehicles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Those with broad support from multiple municipalities</li> <li>- Reduction of GHG emissions may conflict with other priorities</li> <li>- <b>If too specific, may discourage innovative approaches</b></li> <li>- <b>Broader criteria for evaluation are preferable</b></li> <li>- Preferences that do not limit creativity are still useful to guide the proposal writing effort and to help standardize the scoring process</li> <li>- <b>Preferred priorities: multiple benefits, source control, consistency with Regional Water Board priorities</b></li> <li>- More urban areas usually need treatment, not just source control</li> <li>- <b>Do not fund private development projects</b></li> <li>- LID already required in permits for new developments; therefore, no need for a specific preference within grant program</li> <li>- Preferences for LID/restoration within already developed areas make sense</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Projects with completed California Environmental Quality Act requirements and permits</b></li> <li>- <b>Projects with larger than required match</b></li> <li>- Treatment and diversion of storm water</li> <li>- Watershed approach</li> <li>- Potential problems in overlapping preferences (i.e., climate change)</li> <li>- Only use quantifiable preferences</li> <li>- GHG/global warming may not be pertinent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Lose project focus if too many other aspects are incorporated</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Bonus points given to projects that address multiple issues or have multiple benefits</b></li> <li>- Low energy use – quantify and give preference to projects with low energy use</li> <li>- Some pollutants are hard to measure, so therefore hard to quantify and monitor</li> </ul>

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/prop84.html>

\*Comments are summarized for information purposes only.

**Bold Text** indicates that the majority of the participants at the meeting agreed with this idea.

## Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program: Scoping Meetings - February/March 2008 Summary\* of Comments Received

### GRANT SOLICITATION PROCESS

Requirements:	No established requirements.		
Below are responses to the following types of questions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should there be defined funding cycles or a continuous cycle?</li> <li>• Should there be more than one round of funding? – Two rounds planned at this time.</li> <li>• What type of application process should be used? Two-step application process (i.e., short Concept Proposal and longer, more detailed Full Proposal)?</li> </ul>		
Feedback:			
	<b>Sacramento February 25, 2008</b>	<b>San Luis Obispo March 3, 2008</b>	<b>Los Angeles March 10, 2008</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommend 2 rounds of funding</li> <li>- <b>Two-step application process with short concept proposals for first step</b></li> <li>- Suggest 2-page project description rather than concept proposals</li> <li>- Could have directed action; fund projects that meet identified needs rather than scoring proposals</li> <li>- <b>Most would like competitive process</b></li> <li>- <b>Defined funding cycle, rather than accepting applications and funding continuously</b></li> <li>- Need to provide enough state staff and resources to assist applicants</li> <li>- Funding whole projects, not just planning and research</li> <li>- <b>DACs usually have issues with readiness to proceed when competing against larger applicants</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project scoring should be limited to Water Boards and other appropriate agencies, not Storm Water Advisory Task Force</li> <li>- 2-step application process for larger projects only</li> <li>- Set the amount of funding to be distributed in each round (and do not change)</li> <li>- <b>Prefer defined cycles over continuous applications</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Defined funding cycles</li> <li>- <b>Two-step application process with a short Concept Proposal and then a Full Proposal</b></li> <li>- Concept Proposal could be a letter of intent with a standard questionnaire</li> <li>- Defined cycle will help use funds quicker</li> </ul>

## Proposition 84 Storm Water Grant Program: Scoping Meetings - February/March 2008 Summary\* of Comments Received

### OTHER INPUT (SET-ASIDE/DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY)

Requirements:	No established requirements.	
Below are responses to the following types of questions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should there be a set-aside for DACs?</li> <li>• Should there be a split of funding for the categories listed below, or should the funding be strictly determined based on project competitiveness? Possible splits include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ north/south, rural/urban, regionally</li> <li>▪ If a split is implemented, what split would you recommend?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Feedback:		
<b>Sacramento February 25, 2008</b>	<b>San Luis Obispo March 3, 2008</b>	<b>Los Angeles March 10, 2008</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Regional Water Boards involved in reviews/scoring of proposals</b></li> <li>- Want to provide public comments on draft guidelines</li> <li>- Project effectiveness (slide #10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Grant \$ to be applied primarily toward implementation</li> <li>o Assessing project effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Requirements on how to assess project effectiveness will be outlined in guidelines based on input from Storm Water Advisory Task Force (SWATF)</li> <li>▪ Include environmental data and water quality data</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>No north/south split, urban/rural split, or regional split; should be merit based</b></li> <li>- <b>Outreach to small communities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Regional Water Boards coordinators distribute information</li> <li>o Advertise through California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool – public search tool to find out about successful projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A specific set-aside for DACs may not be an effective use of funds if they do not come up with good projects</li> <li>- <b>Instead give extra points for proposals/projects that benefit disadvantaged communities</b></li> <li>- <b>Prefer regional funding split – 1/9 of the \$82 million per region</b></li> <li>- Set-aside certain percent (i.e., 5%) to each of the regions, and assign the rest based on a competitive statewide process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 60% of funding to Southern California (more beach users)</li> <li>- Northern California – more environmental issues, suggest regional division of money</li> <li>- Regional funding based on population</li> <li>- Difficulty in basing on population (DACs, downstream users)</li> <li>- <b>Most competitive projects should get funded</b></li> <li>- Pot of money for Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) compliance</li> <li>- Set-aside for retrofits of existing developments</li> <li>- Regional approach – fund projects in Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) plans</li> <li>- Set-aside for competitive projects and per region</li> </ul>