

**PROPOSITION 84  
STORMWATER GRANT PROGRAM  
ROUND 2 GUIDELINES**



*Adopted February 17, 2009*

*Revised August 20, 2013*

**This Page Intentionally Left Blank  
To Allow for Double-sided Printing**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| TOPIC   | Page #    |
|---|-----------|
| <b>PURPOSE</b> .....  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>OVERVIEW</b> .....   | <b>2</b>  |
| A. FIRST SOLICITATION (ROUND 1).....                            | 2         |
| B. SECOND SOLICITATION (ROUND 2).....                           | 3         |
| <b>ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS</b> .....                           | <b>3</b>  |
| A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS .....                                    | 3         |
| B. GRANT AMOUNT .....   | 3         |
| C. MATCH REQUIREMENT .....                                      | 3         |
| i. <i>Disadvantaged Community Funding Match Reduction</i> ..... | 4         |
| D. SCHEDULE.....  | 4         |
| E. ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES .....                                 | 5         |
| F. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH.....                                  | 5         |
| G. PROGRAM PREFERENCES .....                                    | 5         |
| <b>GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS</b> .....                       | <b>6</b>  |
| A. CONFLICT OF INTEREST .....                                   | 6         |
| B. CONFIDENTIALITY .....  | 6         |
| C. LABOR CODE COMPLIANCE .....                                  | 6         |
| D. CEQA COMPLIANCE .....  | 6         |
| E. WAIVER OF LITIGATION RIGHTS.....                             | 7         |
| F. PROJECT ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION PLANS .....                  | 7         |
| G. MONITORING.....  | 7         |
| H. DATA MANAGEMENT .....  | 8         |
| I. REPORTING.....   | 8         |
| J. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.....                              | 8         |
| K. URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN .....                            | 8         |
| L. GRANT AGREEMENT .....  | 8         |
| M. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS.....                                  | 9         |
| N. GRANT MANAGER NOTIFICATION.....                              | 9         |
| O. DIVISION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY .....  | 10        |
| <b>PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS</b> .....                          | <b>10</b> |
| A. APPLICANT ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS.....                          | 10        |
| B. CONCEPT PROPOSAL SOLICITATION.....                           | 10        |
| i. <i>Concept Proposal Review and Scoring Process</i> .....     | 10        |
| C. FULL PROPOSAL.....   | 11        |
| i. <i>Full Proposal Review and Scoring Criteria</i> .....       | 11        |
| D. COMPLETENESS REVIEW .....                                    | 12        |
| E. ELIGIBILITY REVIEW .....                                     | 12        |
| F. APPLICANT NOTIFICATION .....                                 | 12        |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>APPENDICES .....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A: REQUESTS FOR REDUCED FUNDING MATCH FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.....</b> | <b>14</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX B: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION &amp; EVALUATION CRITERIA.....</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX C: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION &amp; EVALUATION CRITERIA.....</b>              | <b>26</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX D: DEFINITIONS .....</b>   | <b>36</b> |

***ACRONYMS USED IN THESE GUIDELINES AND APPENDICES***

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| AB                   | Assembly Bill   |
| ARB                  | Air Resources Board   |
| Basin Plan           | Water Quality Control Plan  |
| BMP                  | Best Management Practice  |
| CEDEN                | California Environmental Data Exchange Network                                |
| CEQA                 | California Environmental Quality Act  |
| CLC                  | California Labor Code   |
| CWA                  | Clean Water Act   |
| CWC                  | California Water Code   |
| DAC                  | Disadvantaged Community   |
| Division             | Division of Financial Assistance  |
| DWR                  | Department of Water Resources   |
| EIR                  | Environmental Impact Report   |
| FAAST                | Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool                               |
| FY                   | Fiscal Year   |
| GHG                  | Greenhouse Gas  |
| IRWM                 | Integrated Regional Water Management  |
| JPA                  | Joint Powers Authority  |
| LID                  | Low Impact Development  |
| MHI                  | Median Household Income   |
| NPDES                | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System                               |
| NPS                  | Nonpoint Source   |
| PAEP                 | Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan  |
| PRC                  | California Public Resources Code  |
| QAPP                 | Quality Assurance Project Plan  |
| Regional Water Board | Regional Water Quality Control Board  |
| SDAC                 | Severely Disadvantaged Community  |
| State Water Board    | State Water Resources Control Board   |
| SWAMP                | Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program                                      |
| SWATF                | Stormwater Advisory Task Force  |
| SWGPP                | Stormwater Grant Program  |
| TRT                  | Technical Review Team   |
| 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 |

## PURPOSE

These Guidelines 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 reduction and prevention of stormwater contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams through the Proposition 84 Stormwater Grant Program (SWGP), as established in California Public Resources Code (PRC) § 75050(m). The Guidelines used during the first solicitation and round of funding are being revised in order to modify the evaluation criteria and simplify the scoring proposal submittal process.

These Guidelines will also be used to award any unused or re-appropriated Proposition 40 Urban Stormwater Program funds. For the Proposition 40 Urban Stormwater Program, these Guidelines supersede the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program Guidelines, adopted January 4, 2006.

Stormwater 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, stormwater 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 stormwater 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. Stormwater runoff is related to California's hydrologic cycle in three general ways:

**Stormwater quality:** Impaired waterbody listings (also known as 303[d] listings) and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) identify the State's most significant surface 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 pollutants downstream resulting in contamination of rivers, lakes, streams, bays, estuaries, beaches, 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 not as snow, but as rain in the valleys and on the coast, where development tends to occur. Changing precipitation patterns will likely have a transforming effect on California's hydrologic cycle. Much of the State's precipitation 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 challenges of managing flood and hydromodification by increasing the amount of water flowing to and through storm drains and/or 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, stormwater drainage can be used to benefit people, other species, and the environment.

**Greenhouse gas emissions:** California's Global Warming Solutions Act, Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), was signed into law in 2006. The law set a legally binding target that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. The Air Resources Board (ARB) was tasked with creating a scoping plan, which was published in 2008. The ARB found that approximately one-fifth of the electricity and one-third of the non-power plant natural gas consumed in the state are associated with water delivery, treatment and use. GHG emissions can be reduced if water can be moved, treated, and used more

efficiently. Reuse of urban runoff and stormwater capture in areas of imported water can reduce carbon dioxide equivalent by 200,000 metric tons annually.

## OVERVIEW

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 provided the State Water Board \$90 million for matching grants to local public agencies for the reduction and prevention of stormwater contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams (PRC § 75050[m]). After bond and program administration costs, approximately \$82 million was made available for projects.

Assembly Bill (AB) 739 (Statutes 2007, Chapter 610) further defined the stormwater provisions of Proposition 84 and required the development of project selection and evaluation guidelines through additions to the PRC, Water Code, and Government Code. Water Code §13383.8 required the State Water Board to appoint a Stormwater Advisory Task Force (SWATF) to provide advice to the State Water Board on its stormwater management program including program priorities, funding criteria, and project selection. In February 2008, the State Water Board appointed 15 SWATF members with expertise in water quality and stormwater management. Members of the SWATF included representatives from public agencies, the regulated community, nonprofit organizations, and industry. SWATF members and Regional Water Boards staff provided advice to State Water Board staff on the development of the SWGP and the Guidelines used to solicit and select projects for funding. The SWATF recommended that the State Water Board distribute the funding through at least two rounds of solicitation. The State Water Board adopted the SWGP Guidelines on February 17, 2009 ([Resolution No. 2009-0017](#)). The State Water Board solicited projects and awarded the first round of projects in 2012 ([Resolution Nos. 2012-0033](#) and [2012-0050](#)).

### A. FIRST SOLICITATION (ROUND 1)

Approximately \$48.7 million was awarded through the SWGP in October 2012 during the first solicitation. Therefore, the remaining balance of approximately \$33.6 million will be available for award to implementation projects during the second solicitation.

The Guidelines for the first solicitation included criteria for funding planning and monitoring projects. PRC § 75072 allows up to ten percent (10%) of grant funds (up to \$9 million) to be used to finance planning and monitoring projects. During the first solicitation, \$8.9 million was awarded to 18 planning and monitoring projects; there will not be any additional planning and monitoring funding offered in the second solicitation.

Guidelines for the first solicitation also stated that up to \$10 million may be used for stormwater related TMDL projects where the TMDL could not be addressed through an LID approach. During the first solicitation, \$7.9 million was awarded to three TMDL projects; there will not be any additional funding in the second solicitation dedicated solely to TMDL projects.

The first solicitation Guidelines also stated that up to five percent (5%) of the SWGP funds (\$4.5 million) will be reserved to fund projects that provide a direct benefit to disadvantaged communities (DACs), with preference given to small severely disadvantaged communities (SDACs). During the first solicitation, approximately \$26.9 million was awarded to 20 projects that either directly benefit a DAC or where a DAC is included within the project boundaries. There will not be a minimum funding threshold for DACs in Round 2, but priority for small, SDACs will remain.

## B. SECOND SOLICITATION (ROUND 2)

The Guidelines have been revised to capture the lessons learned during the first solicitation application and selection process. The revisions to the Guidelines are intended to clarify eligibility issues, simplify the proposal submittal process, and modify the evaluation criteria to capture the most competitive proposals. The revised Guidelines were provided to the SWATF members for their comments, and they were posted to the State Water Board web site from July 1 to 15, 2013 for public review and feedback. The State Water Board adopted the Guidelines for the second round of funding on August 20, 2013.

Approximately \$33.6 million from Proposition 84 SWGP and approximately \$4.8 million Proposition 40 Urban Stormwater will be available for award to implementation projects during the second solicitation. The awarding of grant funding through the SWGP is a competitive process. The application will be a two-step process that begins with the submittal of a Concept Proposal. The Concept Proposal will be evaluated for eligibility and technical merit, and the most competitive projects will be invited to submit a Full Proposal. The Full Proposals will be evaluated and ranked by applying the evaluation criteria, and the highest ranked Full Proposals will be recommended for funding.

## ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Applications will be evaluated for compliance with the eligibility requirements during the Concept Proposal phase. Eligibility is based on applicant type, minimum and maximum grant amounts, match requirements, project schedule, project eligibility, education and outreach, and program preferences. Proposals that do not meet all the eligibility requirements will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

### A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Proposition 84 states that eligible applicants are restricted to “local public agencies.” 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.

### B. GRANT AMOUNT

The minimum grant amount per proposal is \$250,000 and the maximum grant amount per proposal is \$3,000,000.

### C. MATCH REQUIREMENT

The applicant is required to provide a funding match. The match requirement is 20 percent of the total project cost. Match is not based solely on the size of the grant request. **Eligible reimbursable expenses incurred after adoption of the Guidelines (August 20, 2013)** and prior to the project completion date can be applied to the funding match.

Eligible expenses for funding match include, but are not limited to:

- Planning, engineering, and design;
- Permitting;
- Environmental documentation and mitigation;
- Easements and land purchases made by the applicant;
- Project implementation;
- Project monitoring; and
- Education and outreach.

**Grant funds (including grants from other sources) cannot be used for the required match.**

Federal Cooperative Work Agreements are considered to be grants and cannot be used for match. The funding match may include, but is not limited to: Federal or State loans, local and private funding, or donated and volunteer (“in-kind”) services. Financing received through the Clean Water State Revolving

Fund Program or any other State or Federal sponsored loan program may be used for match. The State Water Board reserves the discretion to review and approve funding match expenditures.

**I. DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY FUNDING MATCH REDUCTION**

Disadvantaged communities (DACs) may request the reduced funding match outlined in Table 1. Applicants in Groups A, B, and C 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 DAC** (See Appendix A for details on how to document DAC status to qualify for match Groups A, B, and C). State Water Board staff will review and make the final determination on funding match reduction eligibility.

**Table 1 - Disadvantaged Community Reduced Match**

| Match Requirement <sup>1</sup>   |
|--|
| <p><b>Group A: Small &amp; Severely Disadvantaged Community<sup>2</sup></b><br/>                     5% if population is less than 20,000 persons <b>AND</b> median household income (MHI) is less than 60% Statewide MHI <sup>2</sup></p>   |
| <p><b>Group B: Small &amp; Disadvantaged Community<sup>3</sup></b><br/>                     10% if population is less than 20,000 persons <b>AND</b> MHI is between 60-80% Statewide MHI <sup>3</sup></p>  |
| <p><b>Group C: Disadvantaged Community<sup>3</sup></b><br/>                     15% if population is greater than 20,000 persons <b>AND</b> MHI is less than 80% Statewide MHI <sup>3</sup></p>  |
| <p><sup>1</sup> Match is calculated based on the <i>total project cost</i>, <b>not</b> on the grant amount.<br/>                     Total Project Cost x %Match = Required Match<br/>                     i.e. - \$3,750,000 (Total Project Cost) x 20% (Percent Match) = \$750,000 Match<br/>                     Grant funds, including grants from other sources, <i>cannot</i> be used for matching funds.</p> <p><sup>2,3</sup> See definition in Appendix D</p> |

**D. SCHEDULE**

SWGPs funds will be appropriated over a two-year period (starting fiscal year [FY] 2013-2014), and disbursed over an additional two years, for a 4-year funding cycle. Division of Financial Assistance (Division) staff will notify applicants regarding updates to the SWGP timeline. The anticipated program timeline for the second solicitation funding is outlined in Table 2. Any program schedule updates will be available on the SWGP website.

**Table 2 – Expected Timeline <sup>1</sup>**

| Award  | Construction Complete <sup>2</sup> | Final Report | Work Completion | Final Invoice |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Spring 2014  | March/ September 2016              | January 2017 | March 2017      | May 2017      |
| <p><sup>1</sup> The 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.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Construction must be completed early enough to perform post-construction monitoring, as appropriate, to determine project effectiveness.</p> |                                    |              |                 |               |

## E. ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

Eligible projects must:

- Reduce and/or prevent stormwater contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams;
- Implement requirements of Municipal Stormwater permits; and
- Implement Low Impact Development (LID) strategies and practices that seek to maintain predevelopment hydrology for existing and new development and redevelopment projects.

The projects may be located on either public or private lands. Projects shall be designed to infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate, or retain runoff in close proximity to the source of water. Specific types of eligible projects include, but are not limited to:

- Bioretention basins;
- Rain gardens;
- Vegetated swales;
- Filter strips;
- Reduced impervious area and road narrowing;
- Permeable pavers/pavement;
- Cisterns or rain barrels;
- Tree box filters;
- Constructed wetlands; and
- Green roofs.

Ineligible projects include:

- Projects that discharge stormwater directly to the ocean, bays, and/or estuaries (Proposition 84 requires that funds prevent contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams; projects that address stormwater pollution of water bodies other than those included in the proposition language are ineligible);
- Projects that must seek eminent domain as part of their project implementation timeline; and
- Projects that consist of only education and outreach activities.

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;
- 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 water quality degradation rather than the symptoms; and
- All projects carried out on lands not owned by the grantee (public or private) must obtain adequate rights of way for the useful life of the project (i.e., at least 20 years).

## F. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

As provided for in PRC § 75005, **all projects must include an education/outreach component** that is designed to increase public understanding of the project's environmental benefits and the enjoyment of California's water resources directly related to the project. Up to 10% (ten percent) of the grant amount may be used to fund education and outreach activities that are directly related to the eligible project. This may include, but is not limited to, project pros and cons, effects on water quality, and techniques implemented. By itself, education and outreach is not an eligible project type. Additional education and outreach expenditures may be used to meet the funding match requirement.

## G. PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Program preferences for the SWGP are identified in PRC § 75050.2(b)(1). 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. Additional points are awarded to projects with multiple benefits, including projects that address urban greening, reduce carbon dioxide emissions, address climate change, reduce transportation impacts, address TMDLs, augment local water supply, or restore stream habitat, amongst others. These preferences are reflected in the Concept Proposal and Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria and will be considered when determining the recommended project funding list.

## **GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

All applicants that are awarded a grant through the SWGP must comply with the following general program requirements. Before proceeding with the application process, applicants must consider their ability to comply with these 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 § 1090 and California Public Contract Code §§10410 and 10411.

### **B. CONFIDENTIALITY**

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

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 may 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 and sampling locations. See item G of the General Program Requirements Section 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 requires, 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 the California Department of Industrial Relations website (<http://www.dir.ca.gov/>) for more information.

### **D. CEQA COMPLIANCE**

All projects funded under the SWGP must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). 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 online at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/grants\\_loans/srf/envcompliance.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/srf/envcompliance.shtml)

## **E. WAIVER OF LITIGATION RIGHTS**

A grantee cannot 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 grantee agrees to complete the project funded by the grant agreement or to repay all grant funds plus interest.

## **F. PROJECT ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION PLANS**

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

All Full Proposals must include a Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP) to summarize how project performance will be assessed, evaluated, and reported. 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.

In addition, grant recipients must submit an updated PAEP after the grant agreement is executed and make annual updates thereafter for the term of the 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 can be found online at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/grants\\_loans/paep/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/paep/)

## **G. MONITORING**

If project effectiveness is being evaluated through water quality or environmental monitoring, then the grantee must prepare a Monitoring Plan (MP). The MP must include a description of the monitoring program and objectives, types of constituents to be monitored, methodology, the frequency and duration of monitoring, and the sampling location for the monitoring activities.

If water quality monitoring is undertaken, then the Grantee shall also prepare, maintain, and implement a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) in accordance with the State Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program's (SWAMP) QAPP and data reporting requirements, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) QAPP, EPA AQ/R5, 3/01. Water quality monitoring data includes physical, chemical, and biological monitoring of any surface water. The SWAMP QAPP template is available online at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/swamp/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/)

## **H. DATA MANAGEMENT**

Projects must include appropriate data management activities so that project data can be incorporated into appropriate statewide data systems. Water quality monitoring data must be integrated into the California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) and be compliant with an approved QAPP. Data will be available to the stakeholders, agencies, and the public. Please see the CEDEN website (<http://www.ceden.org/>) for additional information on the State Water Board's statewide data management efforts.

## **I. REPORTING**

Every grantee is required to submit regular progress reports that detail activities that have occurred during the applicable reporting period. At the conclusion of the project, the grantee must submit a Final Project Summary, Natural Resource Projects Inventory (NRPI) Survey Form, and a comprehensive Draft Final Project Report and Final Project Report.

## **J. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**

The grantee shall maintain and operate the facility and structures constructed or improved as part of the project throughout the life of the project (20 years), consistent with the purposes for which this grant was made. The grantee assumes all operations and maintenance costs of the facilities and structures; the State Water Board shall not be liable for any cost of such maintenance, management, or operation. The grantee may only be excused from operations and maintenance only upon the written approval of the Deputy Director of the Division. Operation costs include direct costs incurred for material and labor needed for operations, utilities, insurance, and similar expenses. Maintenance costs include ordinary repairs and replacements of a recurring nature necessary to prolong the life of capital assets and basic structures, and the expenditure of funds necessary to replace or reconstruct capital assets or basic structures.

## **K. URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The Urban Water Management Planning 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 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 DWR, 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.

## **L. GRANT AGREEMENT**

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.

It is **HIGHLY recommended** that applicants review the Grant Agreement Template prior to submission of their Full Proposal. If applicants are not able to abide by the terms and conditions contained therein, applicants should not submit a Full Proposal. A copy of a Grant Agreement Template can be found online at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/grants\\_loans/prop84/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml)

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 to State Water Board inquiries, requests for information, and invoicing 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 award list.

#### **M. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS**

Only **direct costs** and work performed within the terms of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. **Indirect costs, such as overhead, contingency, or markup are not eligible expenses.** Eligible expenses incurred upon execution of the grant agreement and prior to the project completion date may be directly reimbursed. **Advance funds will not be provided.**

Reimbursable costs include the reasonable costs of planning, engineering, design, permitting, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, easement and land purchases, project implementation, project monitoring within the term of the agreement, and education and outreach.

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

- Costs, other than those noted above, incurred outside the terms of the grant agreement with the State;
- Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project;
- Establishing a reserve fund;
- Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs;
- Expenses incurred in preparation of the proposal;
- Purchase of land or interests in land in excess of that required for project implementation (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);
- 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
- Overhead, markup, or indirect costs.

#### **N. GRANT MANAGER NOTIFICATION**

Grantees will be required to notify the State Water Board Grant Manager prior to conducting construction, monitoring, demonstration, or other implementation activities so that the Grant Manager

may observe to verify activities are conducted in accordance with the grant agreement. The Grant Manager may document the inspection with photographs or notes, which may be included in the SWGP project file.

## **O. 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 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.

## **PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS**

The SWGP will be managed through a two-step solicitation process: 1) Concept Proposal; and 2) invitation only Full Proposal. The solicitation, review, and selection process are described herein. Application requirements and evaluation criteria are included in Appendix B (Concept Proposal) and Appendix C (Full Proposal). Proposals that did not receive funding during Round 1 may be eligible to reapply for Round 2.

### **A. APPLICANT ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS**

State Water Board staff will conduct technical assistance workshops to address questions and provide general assistance to applicants in preparing Concept Proposals. State Water Board staff may conduct workshops on proposal development for applicants invited to submit Full Proposals. The dates and locations of the Concept Proposal and Full Proposal workshops will be announced via the SWGP electronic mailing list, as well as, the State Water Board website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/grants\\_loans/prop84/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml)

### **B. CONCEPT PROPOSAL SOLICITATION**

State Water Board staff will release a Concept Proposal solicitation notice upon adoption of the revised Guidelines. The Concept Proposal solicitation notice will include the application period, due date, and detailed instructions for submitting the Concept Proposal.

The Concept 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](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml)

The Concept Proposal solicitation notice will also be e-mailed to all interested parties on the State Water Board's "Stormwater 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](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email_subscriptions/swrcb_subscribe.shtml)

The Concept Proposal application will consist of an online application submitted using the State Water Board's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) system. The Concept Proposal application and evaluation criteria are presented in Appendix B. The FAAST application will be available following issuance of the Concept Proposal solicitation notice, at the following secure link:

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

#### **I. CONCEPT PROPOSAL REVIEW AND SCORING PROCESS**

All complete and eligible Concept Proposals will be evaluated and scored by Technical Review Teams (TRTs) comprised of two State Water Board reviewers and one Regional Water Board reviewer from the

proposed project region. One State Water Board reviewer will be assigned as lead reviewer for each proposal.

The Concept Proposals will be scored using the criteria outlined in the Concept Proposal Evaluation: Scoring Criteria Form (Appendix B-2). Each member of the TRT will score the Concept Proposal; reviewer scores will be averaged to determine an average Concept Proposal score. The lead reviewer will review the scores for consistency, and may contact reviewers to resolve inconsistencies in determining the average score. Once the scores are averaged, State Water Board staff will generate a list, sorting the Concept Proposals from high to low based on the final average scores.

State Water Board staff will group the Concept Proposals into three categories:

1. Applicant invited to submit Full Proposal;
2. Applicant not invited to submit Full Proposal; and
3. Ineligible Concept Proposals.

The Concept Proposal scores will be the basis for determining whether an applicant should be invited to submit a Full Proposal. The lists will be posted on the State Water Board's website and notification emails will be sent to all applicants.

## C. FULL PROPOSAL

The Concept Proposals that meet the eligibility requirements and are ranked high enough, based on the evaluation criteria, will be invited to submit Full Proposals. The Full Proposal review process will also be competitive, since the requested funding from applicants invited to submit Full Proposals will exceed the total available funding.

For the Full Proposal, the applicant is expected to expand upon the previously submitted Concept Proposal, respond to any review comments received on the Concept Proposal, and provide the detail needed for the State Water Board to make a funding decision.

Applications should include supplemental and supporting materials such as design plans and specifications, detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot projects, additional maps, diagrams, copies of agreements, or other applicable items. All supporting documentation must be submitted in an electronic format through FFAST. Details on Full Proposal requirements and evaluation criteria are presented in Appendix C.

### I. FULL PROPOSAL REVIEW AND SCORING CRITERIA

All complete and eligible Full Proposals will be evaluated and scored by TRTs comprised of two State Water Board reviewers and one Regional Water Board reviewer from the proposed project region. One State Water Board reviewer will be assigned as lead reviewer for each proposal. The technical reviewers will individually score proposals in accordance with criteria in Appendix C.

The Full Proposals will be scored using the criteria outlined in the Full Proposal Evaluation: Scoring Criteria Form (Appendix C-2). Each Full Proposal will be evaluated and scored based on the information the applicant provides in the Full Proposal without regard to the Concept Proposal score. However, Full Proposals will be evaluated for consistency with the Concept Proposal, and major changes to the scope of work may disqualify the proposal. **Previous knowledge, conversations, or outside information that is not provided in the Full Proposal will not be used to evaluate and score the application.** However, an applicant's past performance and grant management track record may be taken into consideration.

Following completion of individual reviews, the lead reviewer will evaluate the TRT scores to verify that the scoring criteria were applied consistently. If the scoring criteria were applied consistently, then an average score will be determined for the proposal. If there is general disagreement regarding the application of the scoring criteria, then TRT members will discuss the Full Proposals to arrive at a final evaluation and score for each proposal.

State Water Board staff 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 reduction would also be weighed against whether the reduced funding would impede project implementation.

Based on the Full Proposal final scores, State Water Board staff will compile a Recommended Funding List. Final approval of the Recommended Funding List will be completed by State Water Board Executive Management.

#### **D. COMPLETENESS REVIEW**

Applications must contain all required items. 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.**

#### **E. ELIGIBILITY REVIEW**

State Water Board staff will evaluate and verify complete applications for compliance with eligibility criteria during the Concept Proposal phase. All proposals must meet the eligible applicant requirements and eligible project types in Parts A and E, respectively, of the Eligibility Requirements section of the Guidelines. **Applications that are determined to be ineligible will not be reviewed or considered for funding, and applicants will be notified.**

#### **F. APPLICANT NOTIFICATION**

State Water Board staff will notify applicants and post the Recommended Funding List on the State Water Board website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/grants\\_loans/prop84/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml)

# APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: REQUESTS FOR REDUCED FUNDING MATCH FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

APPENDIX B: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION & EVALUATION CRITERIA

APPENDIX C: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION & EVALUATION CRITERIA

APPENDIX D: DEFINITIONS

# APPENDIX A: REQUESTS FOR REDUCED FUNDING MATCH FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

(Applicable to Full Proposals)

## I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Appendix is to provide a method for demonstrating eligibility for the reduced funding match for the SWGP.

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 DACs 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 DAC 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 the project provides to the DACs;
- Include descriptions or information on the DAC involvement, such as past, current, and future efforts to include DAC representatives in the planning and/or implementation process; and
- Letters of support from representatives of the DAC indicating their support for the project or portion of the proposal designed to provide direct benefit to the DAC 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 2010 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 (<http://www.census.gov/#>). Applicants may use a single type of census geography or combinations of 2010 or later Census geographies in determining the MHI and population for DACs and the project area. However, the census geography that is used must be consistent for both MHI and population. Official census geographies, such as census tract, place, and block group, are acceptable.

## III. STEPS TO REQUEST A REDUCED FUNDING MATCH

### Step A. Screening based on Maximum Grant Amount

The minimum grant amount per proposal is \$250,000 and the maximum grant amount per proposal is \$3,000,000, regardless of DAC status.

### Step B. Documentation of the Presence of DACs

The DAC must be located in the project area. **If there are no DACs in the project area, do not apply for a reduced funding match.** The DAC should be identified in the description of the project area in the Full Proposal. Applicants should ensure the description of the DAC is adequate to determine whether the community meets the definitions in this Appendix. The DAC should also be shown on maps of the

project area. In describing the DAC, include the relationship to the project objectives and information that supports the determination of DAC in the project area.

**Step C. Documentation of DAC Representation & Participation**

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

**Step D. Determining a Reduced Funding Match**

The required funding matches for the SWGP are presented in Table A-1. Where the project directly benefits a DAC, a reduction in the required funding match may be allowed.

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

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

**Step E. Benefits and Impacts to DACs**

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

**Table A - 1: Example of Reduced Funding Match Calculation**

| Calculations based on a Total Project Cost of \$2,000,000 (\$2 M) |  |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Group A<br>Calculation of 5% funding match                        |  | Group B<br>Calculation of 10% funding match        |  | Group C<br>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 x \$2 M =<br><b>\$100,000</b>                                | \$2 M – \$0.1 M<br>=<br><b>\$1,900,000</b> | 0.1 x \$2 M =<br><b>\$200,000</b>                  | \$2 M – \$0.2 M<br>=<br><b>\$1,800,000</b> | 0.15 x \$2 M =<br><b>\$300,000</b>                 | \$2 M – \$0.3 M =<br><b>\$1,700,000</b> |

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 DAC must be provided. For assistance with accessing census data, see the 2010 Census data website (<http://www.census.gov/#>). Include the method used for population determination, the population of the project area, the population of DACs in the project area, MHI data for DACs, and the calculation of the reduced funding match.

## Exhibit A-1: Certification of Understanding

The undersigned certifies that:

The application submitted by <Insert Name of Applicant> for <Insert Proposal Title> for a Proposition 84 Stormwater 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: \_\_\_\_\_

# **APPENDIX B: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION & EVALUATION CRITERIA**

## **Appendix B-1 Concept Proposal Application**

## **Appendix B-2 Concept Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

Please note that the application and/or review questions outlined in Appendix B may be slightly reworded, combined, or separated as the information is transferred to the online FFAST. The technical content and requirements will not change.

## APPENDIX B – 1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION

### Appendix B-1: Concept Proposal Application

The following information is provided as a guide for applicants to ensure that they have submitted the required information. Character limits refer to character limits in FFAST.

| A. Program Selection & General FFAST Information |  |
|--|--|
| <b>1.</b>  | <b>PROJECT SELECTION</b>   |
|  | Select the "Proposition 84 Stormwater Grant Program."  |
| <b>2.</b>  | <b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>   |
|  | <u>Project Title</u> – Provide the title of the proposal. <b>If this item is not completed, FFAST will not accept the application.</b>   |
|  | <u>Project Description</u> – Provide a brief description of the project. The length of the Project Description is limited to 250 characters (including spaces). <b>If this item is not completed, FFAST will not accept the application.</b>   |
|  | <u>Applicant Details</u> – Provide the name and address of the applicant organization.   |
|  | <u>Project Director</u> – The Project Director (PD) is responsible for adhering to the terms of the grant agreement, keeping the project on track, submitting deliverables in a timely manner, and overall management of the administrative and technical aspects of the grant agreement. The PD must be an employee of the Grantee. Persons that are subcontractors to be paid by the grant cannot be listed as the PD.   |
|  | <u>Grant Contact</u> – The Grant Contact 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> – Includes the grant funds requested, funding match and other funding sources not reported as match (e.g., other grant funds).   |
|  | <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 names of the watersheds 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. <b>If this item is not completed, FFAST will not accept the application.</b>   |
| <b>3.</b>  | <b>LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION</b>   |
|  | 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.  |
| <b>4.</b>  | <b>COOPERATING ENTITIES</b>  |
|  | Include entities that have/will assist the applicant in project development or implementation. Provide names of cooperating entities, role/contribution to project, first and last name of entity contact, phone number, and email address.  |
| <b>5.</b>  | <b>AGENCY CONTACTS</b>   |
|  | If the applicant has been collaborating with State and Federal agencies (Department of Water Resources [DWR], Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, 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. |
| <b>6.</b>  | <b>APPLICATION QUESTIONNAIRE</b>   |
|  | The answers to these questions will be used in processing the application and determining the eligibility and completeness of the application.   |

**APPENDIX B – 1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 7.  | <p><b>PROJECT CLASSIFICATION</b></p> <p>These questions allow State Water Board staff to categorize the types of activities the project is proposing to implement.</p>  |
| <p><b>B. Background Information</b></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> Select whether the applicant is a DAC, whether the project directly benefits a DAC, or Not Applicable.</p>  |
|   | <p><u>Q3.</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)? Is the project a water management project, as defined in Appendix J? If yes, has the applicant prepared, adopted, and submitted to DWR an urban water management plan and has the applicant submitted documentation to DWR requesting compliance verification with Assembly Bill (AB) 1420 (Statutes 2007, Chapter 628)? (250 Characters)</p>   |
|   | <p><u>Q4.</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 management of the project or funds by the applicant or cooperating entity? If so, explain the actions taken to address the problems. (250 Characters)</p>   |
|   | <p><u>Q5.</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). (250 Characters)</p>   |
| <p><b>C. Concept Proposal Questions</b></p> |   |
| 1.  | <p><b>WORKPLAN</b></p>  |
|   | <p><u>Q6.</u> Prepare a concept-level workplan (Attachment 1, 2 pages maximum) that describes the project and how it meets the eligible project types outlined in Part E - Eligible Project Types of the SWGP Guidelines. The concept-level workplan must address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Goals and Objectives: how the proposed project meets the goals, objectives, and requirements of a municipal stormwater permit;</li> <li>b) Project Components: the BMPs, their locations and anticipated capture or treatment volumes</li> <li>c) Work Tasks: a brief summary of the tasks required to implement the project;</li> <li>d) Sustainability: how the project supports sustained, long-term water quality improvement, anticipated project outcomes;</li> <li>e) Deliverables: the anticipated deliverables associated with the completion of the tasks listed;</li> <li>f) Regional and Project Maps: a discussion on the project location including the current site conditions, land use, and maps depicting the project location and stormwater capture area (note: maps do not count against the two-page concept workplan maximum length);</li> <li>g) Impaired Waters: a description of the impaired waters, their beneficial uses, and the water quality problems that interfere with the beneficial uses of those waters; and</li> <li>h) Project Timing and Phasing: a discussion of whether this is a phased project or part of a larger project effort.</li> </ul> |
|   | <p><u>Q7.</u> Identify the water quality problems the project is proposing to address. What are possible or known sources of stormwater contamination applicable to this project? What is the approximate quantity and origin of the stormwater flow to be treated or captured? (1000 Characters)</p>   |

**APPENDIX B – 1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION**

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
|           | <u>Q8.</u> What is the technical basis for the selected approach? Have the proposed LID BMPs been proven to be effective at addressing the problem discussed in Question 7? How does the project help solve the identified water quality problems identified in Question 7? (1000 Characters)  |
|           | <u>Q9.</u> Describe any studies or data collection efforts that have been done to support the implementation of LID projects to address the known water quality issue. Additional information may be submitted as part of Attachment 4. (1000 Characters)  |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>BUDGET</b>  |
|           | <u>Q10.</u> Provide a summary budget table (Attachment 2) that describes the budget for the completion of all known work tasks. Include a written narrative (one page maximum) that describes each line item task in the summary budget to explain how the cost estimates were determined. Describe the status and source of all other funding that will be used to complete the project. Describe the anticipated sources and amount of proposed funding match for the project. Discuss whether the applicant will be requesting a match reduction as part of the Full Proposal application. If a request for a match reduction is expected, provide the amount of match reduction and the basis for the request (Eligibility Requirements; Part E).  |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>SCHEDULE</b>  |
|           | <p><u>Q11.</u> Provide a schedule table (Attachment 3) that documents the steps needed to accomplish the goals and deliverables described in the concept workplan, and include a narrative description (one page maximum) describing the pacing and scheduling of the project. The schedule should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The start and end dates of the overall project;</li> <li>b) Estimated completion dates for major milestones associated with the project (for example, planning, construction commencement and completion dates, etc.);</li> <li>c) Current status of environmental documentation and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance, and estimated status of the proposed start date of the project;</li> <li>d) The project design and bid solicitation process, acquisition of rights-of-way, and identification and acquisition of all necessary permits;</li> <li>e) Implementation of any environmental mitigation or enhancement efforts; and</li> <li>f) Project administration, including preparation of invoicing, reporting, and deliverables.</li> </ul> |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>  |
|           | <u>Q12.</u> How will you measure or evaluate the effectiveness of your project, and whether the project is meeting the proposed goals and targets? Can the benefits of the proposed project be measured in terms of specific numeric targets (for example, acre-feet per year), or will the benefits be measured relative to existing conditions (for example, a percentage reduction in sediment load)? Can the effectiveness of the project be monitored within the lifetime of the grant?   |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>MULTIPLE BENEFITS</b>   |
|           | <u>Q13.</u> Describe if the implementation of LID best management practices will also contribute to meeting the goals or requirements of a TMDL. Please identify the impacted water body and the TMDL(s), if applicable.   |
|           | <u>Q14.</u> Is the project consistent with or included in any applicable Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan? If yes, identify the Plan and describe how the project is consistent with, or included in the Plan.   |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>DISCLAIMER</b>  |
|           | <u>Q15.</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 are required to check the box and initial next to the statement.)  |

## APPENDIX B – 1: CONCEPT 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 ([https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/LoginLinks/FAAST\\_UserManual\\_v3\\_120711.pdf](https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/LoginLinks/FAAST_UserManual_v3_120711.pdf)). When attaching files, applicants must use the naming convention noted in FAAST.

| Attachment #               | Title                  | Description  |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Attachment 1               | Workplan               | <p>Workplan, including maps, diagram(s), and/or photograph(s) of the proposed project area. For guidance on the workplan, please see our website at:<br/> <a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/pro84/index.shtml">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/pro84/index.shtml</a>.</p> <p>For the Concept Proposal, the written portions of the Workplan should be no more than 2-pages and address each of the items in Question 6. The guidance document provided on the website is intended for a Full Proposal workplan; the amount of detail required for the Full Proposal is not expected for the Concept Proposal. Maps, figures, and diagrams do not count towards the two page maximum for the Concept Proposal.</p> |
| Attachment 2               | Budget                 | <p>The budget template (Excel), the example budget (PDF), and a Word document that provides guidance on how to write a budget is located on the SWGP website at:<br/> <a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/pro84/index.shtml">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/pro84/index.shtml</a></p> <p>Please use the Summary Budget only for the Concept Proposal. Any written description should focus on the general budget categories listed in the Summary Budget table.</p>  |
| Attachment 3               | Schedule               | Schedule should show the sequence and timing of project tasks and should be in a horizontal bar or Gantt chart format.   |
| Attachment 4<br>(Optional) | Project<br>Information | Provide any additional information not contained in the online FAAST questionnaire (e.g., preliminary investigation reports, site specific studies, geotechnical reports, topographic surveys). The information should summarize available reports, and should be limited to 10 pages or less, not including maps and figures.   |

**APPENDIX B – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**Appendix B-2: Concept Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

| <b>PROPOSITION 84 STORMWATER GRANT PROGRAM<br/>CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION: ELIGIBILITY REVIEW</b>  |                    |   |
|---|--------------------|---|
| <b>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</b>   | <b>YES/<br/>NO</b> | <b>KEY</b>  |
| <p><b>General FFAST Information</b></p> <p>1. Does the Concept Proposal contain all the required information requested in FFAST? (e.g., <i>General Information, Budget, Location, Funding Source, Legislative Information, Agency Information, Cooperating Entity Information, etc.</i>)</p>  |                    | <p><b>Applicant must receive “Yes” to be eligible for Full Proposal invitation.</b></p>   |
| <p><b>Background Information</b></p> <p>1. Is the applicant eligible for funding? (Question 1)</p>  |                    |   |
| <p>2. Does the project support sustained, long-term water quality improvement and is that description realistic? (Question 6)</p>   |                    |   |
| <p>3. If the applicant is an Urban Water Supplier, has the applicant submitted to DWR an urban water management plan or submitted documentation to DWR requesting compliance verification with AB 1420? (Question 3)</p>  |                    |   |
| <p><b>Schedule</b></p> <p>4. Does the project’s estimated “start date” and “end date” fall within the SWGP appropriations? (Question 11)</p>  |                    |   |
| <p><b>Additional Questions</b></p> <p>5. Has the applicant or any cooperating entities entered into a contract or grant agreement that was terminated, where funds were withheld, whether the grantee was notified of a Breach of Agreement, or the grantee subject to an audit where there were auditable findings? (Question 4)</p> |                    | <p><b>Applicants who answer “Yes” to these questions must provide a description on actions used to address the problem. These questions may be used as a “tie breaker.”</b></p> |
| <p>6. 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? (Question 5)</p>  |                    |   |
| <p><b>Disclaimer</b></p> <p>7. Has the applicant checked the box and initialed that the Project Director has read, understands and agrees to the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement? (Question 15)</p>   |                    |   |
| <p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p> <p>8. Indicate if the Concept Proposal should be scored, based on answers to Questions 1 through 7 above?</p>  |                    | <p><b>Yes = Concept Proposal should be scored.</b></p> <p><b>No = Concept Proposal should not be scored.</b></p>  |

**APPENDIX B – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

| <b>PROPOSITION 84 STORMWATER GRANT PROGRAM<br/>CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORING CRITERIA</b>   |              |               |                     |
|---|--------------|---------------|---------------------|
| <b>SCORED CRITERIA</b>  | <b>SCORE</b> | <b>WEIGHT</b> | <b>TOTAL POINTS</b> |
| <b>WORKPLAN</b>   |              |               |                     |
| 1. How well does the project, as described in the workplan:<br>a. Have goals and objectives that are consistent with the SWGP requirements, and are technically feasible and realistic;<br>b. Include necessary tasks required to implement the project; and<br>c. Include anticipated deliverables associated with the completion of the tasks.  | 0-5          | 3             | 15                  |
| 2. How well does the project, as described by the workplan, support sustained, long-term water quality improvement through meeting the requirements of a municipal stormwater permit? How realistic are the goals and projected outcomes of the project?  | 0-5          | 1             | 5                   |
| 3. How well does the workplan describe the project location, including current site conditions, land use, and a map depicting the project location and stormwater capture area?   | 0-5          | 1             | 5                   |
| 4. How well does the project, as described in the workplan, identify the benefits to impaired waters and the beneficial uses of those waters, through implementation of the proposed project? How does the project address the water quality problem(s) that interfere with the beneficial uses of those waters?  | 0-5          | 1             | 5                   |
| 5. Does the workplan clearly describe how the proposed LID project will address noted/observed water quality problems associated with stormwater? Are the possible or known sources of stormwater contamination addressed by this project? Was the approximate quantity and origin of the stormwater flow to be treated or captured provided? Does that quantity and origin seem reasonable, given the proposed budget? | 0-5          | 2             | 10                  |
| 6. How well does the applicant justify the effectiveness of the selected LID BMPs discussed in the proposal? Are the selected LID BMPs proven to be effective at addressing the problem? Was the technical basis for selecting the proposed LID BMPs provided?  | 0-5          | 2             | 10                  |
| 7. How thoroughly does the applicant support the technical approach described by the proposal? Are there studies or data to support their approach?   | 0-5          | 2             | 10                  |
| <b>BUDGET</b>   |              |               |                     |
| 8. Did the summary budget table and narrative provide a rationale for the project costs? Are the costs reasonable? Are the tasks shown in the budget consistent with the tasks shown in the workplan and schedule? Is the project cost effective?   | 0-5          | 3             | 15                  |

**APPENDIX B – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

| SCORED CRITERIA   | SCORE                      | WEIGHT | TOTAL POINTS |
|---|----------------------------|--------|--------------|
| <b>SCHEDULE</b>   |                            |        |              |
| 9. Are the tasks in the schedule consistent with the tasks described in the workplan and budget? Does the schedule seem reasonable given the tasks listed? Are the start dates and end dates within the required timeframe as indicated in the Guidelines? Are all necessary permits identified?  | 0-5                        | 2      | 10           |
| <b>MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>   |                            |        |              |
| 10. Are the goals and targets reasonable and feasible within the life of the grant? Will the measurement tools and methods effectively monitor project performance and target progress? Is the monitoring appropriate for the benefits claimed?   | 0-5                        | 3      | 15           |
| <b>MULTIPLE BENEFITS</b>  |                            |        |              |
| 11. Does the project provide any of the following multiple benefits: address an existing TMDL, is part of an urban greening or smart growth plan, reduce carbon dioxide emissions or address climate change, reduce transportation impacts, capture stormwater for reuse or augmentation of local water supplies, reduce runoff, reduce flood risk, reduce sanitary sewer overflows, restore or enhance stream habitat? | 0-5                        | 1      | 5            |
| 12. Is the project consistent with or included in any applicable IRWM Plan?<br><br>Included in an applicable IRWM Plan = 5 Points<br><br>Consistent with an applicable IRWM Plan = 3 Points   | 0-5                        | 1      | 5            |
| <b>DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY BENEFITS</b>   |                            |        |              |
| 13. Based on the answer to Question 2 of the Concept Proposal:<br><br>Is the applicant a DAC? (10 Points)<br><br>Do 100% of the grant funds benefit a DAC? (5 Points)<br><br>Does some portion of the grant funds benefit a DAC? (3 Points)<br><br>No DAC benefits from the grant funds. (0 Points)   | 0, 3, 5<br>or 10<br>Points | 1      | 10           |
| <b>OVERALL TOTAL POINTS:</b>  |                            |        | <b>120</b>   |

## APPENDIX B – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

### OVERALL EVALUATION

14. Should the applicant be invited back to submit a Full Proposal? Discuss any concerns with respect to the proposed project. If this applicant is invited to submit a Full Proposal, then discuss suggestions on how to improve the proposal and/or project. (Note to Reviewers: This text will be provided to the applicant. Be clear and concise.)

# **APPENDIX C: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION & EVALUATION CRITERIA**

## **Appendix C-1 Full Proposal Application**

## **Appendix C-2 Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

Please note that the application and/or review questions outlined in Appendix C may be slightly reworded, combined, or separated as the information is transferred to the online FFAST. The technical content and requirements will not change.

**APPENDIX C – 1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION**

**Appendix C-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 Board’s FFAST.

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

| <b>A. Background Information</b> |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>1.</b>                        | <b>ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS</b>  |
|                                  | <u>Q1.</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, then explain why.  |
|                                  | <u>Q2.</u> Is the proposed project consistent with the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)? Is the project type consistent with the eligible project types described in the Guidelines (Eligibility Requirements; Part E)? Is the project protective of water quality? Does the project support present and potential beneficial uses? Does this project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any Water Board’s regulation, permit, or order? Please explain.  |
|                                  | <u>Q3.</u> What percent funding match will be provided? If less than 20% is proposed, provide the required attachments (Attachments 7 and 8) and supporting documentation in the application. See Appendix A for further details.  |
|                                  | <u>Q4.</u> Does the proposed 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.   |
|                                  | <u>Q5.</u> Is 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.  |
|                                  | <u>Q6.</u> Submit the Application Completeness Checklist as Attachment 11.   |
|                                  | <b>DISCLAIMER</b>  |
|                                  | <p><u>Q7.</u> _____(initials): By initialing the box, the <u>Project Director</u> is certifying that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The applicant is a local public agency, that the proposed project is an eligible project type, and that the proposed project will contribute to sustained, long-term water quality benefits for a period of 20 years and addresses the causes of degradation rather than the symptoms;</li> <li>b) They are aware that, once the proposal has been submitted in FFAST, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections offered by law with respect to the application package and project location are waived; and</li> <li>c) They have read and agree to the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement. If the Project Director does not agree with the terms and conditions, then a grant award may be denied. <b><u>(All applicants are required to check the box and initial next to the statement.)</u></b></li> </ul> |

**APPENDIX C – 1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION**

| <b>B. Full Proposal Questions</b> |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>2.</b>                         | <b>WORKPLAN</b>  |
|                                   | <p><u>Q8.</u> Prepare a workplan (Attachment 1) that describes the project in detail and how it meets the eligible project types outlined in Part E of the Eligibility Requirements. Describe the tasks for the project with enough detail and completeness that it is clear the project can be implemented.</p> <p>Provide an <b>Introduction</b> that includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) <b>Goals and Objectives:</b> a brief description of how the project meets the goals, objectives, and requirements of a municipal stormwater permit;</li><li>b) <b>Purpose and Need:</b> a description of the water quality, possible or known sources of stormwater contamination, and the approximate quantity and origin of the stormwater flow to be treated and/or captured;</li><li>c) <b>Sustainability:</b> discuss how the project supports sustained, long-term water quality improvement;</li><li>d) <b>Regional Map:</b> a figure with a discussion of the project location including the current site conditions and land use;</li><li>e) <b>Project Map:</b> maps depicting the project location and stormwater capture area, size of area to be treated, and 303(d) listed water bodies;</li><li>f) <b>Impaired Waters:</b> a description of the impaired waters, their beneficial uses, and the water quality problems that interfere with the beneficial uses of those waters;</li><li>g) <b>Watershed Description:</b> a description of whether the project is located within a high priority watershed; and</li><li>h) <b>Project Timing and Phasing:</b> a discussion of whether this is a phased project or part of a larger project effort; and</li></ul> <p>Provide a <b>Proposed Work Tasks</b> section that includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) <b>Work Tasks:</b> a detailed description of the work tasks with adequate detail and completeness to clarify the project can be implemented;</li><li>b) <b>Procedures:</b> a discussion on coordination with cooperating entities, agencies, and/or organizations;</li><li>c) <b>Implementation:</b> a detailed description of the proposed approach, including a thorough discussion of the practices the project is proposing to use to solve the problem, and the technical basis for the selected approach;</li><li>d) <b>Existing Data and Studies:</b> the necessary scientific and technical information to support the feasibility of the project;</li><li>e) <b>Integrated Elements:</b> a discussion on how the tasks can collectively implement the project;</li><li>f) <b>Deliverables:</b> a list of deliverables and reporting for each task;</li><li>g) <b>Permitting and Environmental Review:</b> a list of permits, environmental documentation, and land owner/access agreements required to implement the project and the status of those items;</li><li>h) <b>Plans and Specifications:</b> the status of the plans and specifications;</li><li>i) <b>Data Management:</b> a discussion of the data management and monitoring proposed; and</li><li>j) <b>Education and Outreach:</b> a description of the type of education and outreach proposed for the project.</li></ul> |

**APPENDIX C – 1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION**

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
|           | <p><u>Q9.</u> Describe how the applicant demonstrates the experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the project. Include this information in a section of the workplan. The applicant may provide examples of past successes in completing previous grant funded projects or other relevant supporting information.</p>  |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>BUDGET</b>   |
|           | <p><u>Q10.</u> Provide summary and detailed budget tables (Attachment 2) for the proposal. Be sure that the tasks listed in the budget are consistent with the workplan and schedule, and provide the necessary supporting documentation to justify the costs shown. Be sure that the tasks and subtasks in the budget summary and the detailed budget tables match.</p>  |
|           | <p><u>Q11.</u> Provide detailed written explanation (Attachment 2) that includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A description to support each budget category, tasks, and important subtasks</li> <li>b) An explanation of how the costs were estimated, the preliminary bids provided, and past experience used to justify the costs;</li> <li>c) A discussion on the project capital and operations and maintenance (O&amp;M) costs, how those costs compare to industry standards, the life cycle of the project, and how long the project will remain operational before it requires replacement;</li> <li>d) A description on the ongoing support and financing to continue the O&amp;M for the useful life of the project (20 years);</li> <li>e) A discussion on how the project is economically feasible and a good use of State funds, the cost per unit of pollutant reduction, and/or a description of how the project data will be used to demonstrate the economic benefit of the implemented approach;</li> <li>f) An explanation of the sources of matching funds (does the project leverage any existing or potential funds from the State, local, and other sources), how much and from what sources the matching funds are provided, and how secure each funding source is; and</li> <li>g) A discussion on whether a reduction in matching funds will be requested, the amount of reduction of match, the justification for the reduction in match, and the percent of grant funds that will solely benefit a DAC.</li> </ul> |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>SCHEDULE</b>   |
|           | <p><u>Q12.</u> Provide a Gantt Chart, or other similar type of chart, that provides the start dates and end dates of each category, task, and subtask (Attachment 3). Be sure that the categories, tasks, and subtasks are consistent with the budget and workplan.</p>   |
|           | <p><u>Q13.</u> Provide a detailed written explanation (Attachment 3) that includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A discussion on how the timeline is consistent with the workplan and budget;</li> <li>b) A description of the possible obstacles to completing the tasks or subtasks;</li> <li>c) A discussion relating to the elements of the project, their current status, and how the completion of the tasks and subtasks will be completed in a timely manner;</li> <li>d) A description on the status of the environmental documents required for the project, what permits are required to complete the project and the status of those permits, site access issues, and the status of obtaining access agreements or land purchases.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>   |
|           | <p><u>Q14.</u> Include a Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan Table (Attachment 5) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Identifies monitoring targets appropriate for the benefits claimed, with emphasis on the benefits that are obtainable using the requested grant funds;</li> <li>b) Discusses the proposed measurement tools and methods needed to effectively monitor project performance and progress toward meeting targets;</li> <li>c) Specifies the methods that will be used to determine the pollutant load reductions, why the</li> </ul>  |

**APPENDIX C – 1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION**

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>methods were chosen, the quantity of predicted load reductions, and how the reductions were determined;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Describes how effectively proposed BMPs are known to remove the pollutant, and the resources cited to substantiate the claim;</li> <li>e) Describes the monitoring activities proposed, the parameters and frequency of monitoring, whether a QAPP is required, and how the data will be integrated into CEDEN; and</li> <li>f) Describes whether the proposal leverages existing monitoring efforts.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>6. MULTIPLE BENEFITS</b>                |   |
|  | <p><u>Q15.</u> Does the project address a current TMDL or one likely to be approved in the next 5 years? If yes, explain.</p>   |
|  | <p><u>Q16.</u> Is the project part of an urban greening or other smart growth plan? Does the project reduce carbon dioxide emissions or address climate change? If yes, quantify and describe.</p>  |
|  | <p><u>Q17.</u> Does the project capture stormwater runoff for infiltration into the ground and/or onsite storage of water for reuse? Does that water augment the local water supply? If yes, quantify and describe (e.g., enhancing aquifer and/or surface water resources, water conservation, etc.).</p>  |
|  | <p><u>Q18.</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 projected influent concentrations and projected effluent concentrations for the targeted pollutants?</p>  |
|  | <p><u>Q19.</u> Does the project reduce runoff, flood risk, or sanitary sewer overflows (e.g., retaining, detaining, or slowing flows)? Describe and quantify.</p>   |
|  | <p><u>Q20.</u> Does the project restore or enhance stream habitat? If yes, then describe how the project will achieve these benefits.</p>   |
| <b>7. DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY BENEFITS</b> |   |
|  | <p><u>Q21.</u> Is the applicant a DAC or is a DAC directly involved in the planning of the proposed project? Does the project benefit a DAC? To obtain points for benefiting a DAC, please provide an attachment (Attachment 8) discussing, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The demographics of the DAC and/or environmental justice communities in the project area; explain the methodology used in determining the total population in the project area; include the census geographies used and how they were applied;</li> <li>b) How land-use in the project area impacts the DAC and/or environmental justice communities;</li> <li>c) Efforts made to identify and address DAC and/or environmental justice communities' needs and issues within the project area; how the project will address those needs and issues;</li> <li>d) The direct benefits to the DAC and/or environmental justice communities; and</li> <li>e) Any negative impact the proposed project may have on the DAC and/or environmental justice communities.</li> </ul> |

## APPENDIX C – 1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

### APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Provide the attachments listed below by attaching files, no larger than 10 megabytes, to the FFAST application. When attaching files, applicants must use the naming convention noted in the Solicitation Notice.

| Attachment #                    | 1. Title   | Description   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Attachment 1                    | Workplan   | Workplan including maps, diagrams, and/or photographs of the proposed project area. For guidance on the workplan, please see our website at:<br><a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml</a>   |
| Attachment 2                    | Budget   | Use budget template in an Excel format, the example budget in a PDF format, and a Word document that provides guidance on how to write a budget located on the SWGP website at:<br><a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/prop84/index.shtml</a>  |
| Attachment 3                    | 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.  |
| Attachment 4                    | Environmental Clearance Checklist & CEQA Documentation | Provide the status of all environmental documents required for the project. Attach any draft or final CEQA documents that are available. For guidance on the environmental clearance, please see our website at:<br><a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/grant_info/index.shtml#ceqa">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/grant_info/index.shtml#ceqa</a> |
| Attachment 5                    | Performance Measures                                   | Applicants are required to submit a PAEP table specific to their proposed project. For guidance on the PAEP table, please see our website at:<br><a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/paep/paep_training.shtml">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/paep/paep_training.shtml</a>  |
| Attachment 6                    | Technical Reports                                      | 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 BMPs, 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.      |
| Attachment 7<br>(If Applicable) | Request for Reduced Funding Match                      | Applicants requesting a reduced funding match must demonstrate that they are DACs. See Appendix A (Steps A through D) for more information. For assistance regarding requesting a match reduction, please contact State Water Board staff, Ms. Kelley List, at (916) 319-9226.  |
| Attachment 8<br>(if Applicable) | DAC Benefits   | Applicant's response to the questions provided in the application will be used to determine whether the proposal should receive any points for benefiting DACs. See Appendix A, Step E, for further information.  |

## APPENDIX C – 1: FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

|                                 |  |   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Attachment 9<br>(If Applicable) | Letters of<br>Support or<br>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. |
|---------------------------------|--|---|

**APPENDIX C – 2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**Appendix C-2: Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

This Section includes the Full Proposal eligibility and evaluation criteria that will be used by reviewers. This Section is broken into two sections: Eligibility Review Criteria and Project Evaluation Criteria.

| <b>TABLE I: ELIGIBILITY REVIEW CRITERIA</b>  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <i>The Eligibility Criteria listed below will be used to screen Full Proposals. State Water Board staff will complete the eligibility review. A “No” response to any of the following may deem the proposal ineligible for funding.</i>  |                 |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Response</b> |
| <u>Q1.</u> Did the applicant respond adequately to comments made to the Concept Proposal?  |                 |
| <u>Q2.</u> Does the project satisfy, in part or full, the requirements of a municipal stormwater permit, or a stormwater-related regulation or order?  |                 |
| <u>Q3.</u> Did the applicant provide the appropriate amount of matching funds? Did the applicant provide sufficient backup documentation to support a reduction in matching funds, if applicable?  |                 |
| <u>Q4.</u> Is the applicant and/or cooperating entities in violation of any water right permit requirements including, payment of fees? If yes, did the applicant provide an explanation on the progress taken to resolve the violation? |                 |
| <u>Q5.</u> Has the applicant checked the box and initialed that the Project Director has read the Disclaimer?  |                 |

**APPENDIX C – 2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

| <b>PROPOSITION 84 STORMWATER GRANT PROGRAM<br/>FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORING CRITERIA</b>   |              |               |                     |
|--|--------------|---------------|---------------------|
| <b>SCORED CRITERIA</b>   | <b>SCORE</b> | <b>WEIGHT</b> | <b>TOTAL POINTS</b> |
| <b>WORKPLAN</b>  |              |               |                     |
| 1. How well does the project, as described in the workplan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Implement goals and objectives that are consistent with the SWGP requirements, and that are technically feasible and realistic;</li> <li>b. Identify a known water quality issue related to stormwater discharge, and clearly describe the approach proposed to solve the target water quality problem;</li> <li>c. Produce long-term water quality benefits and sustainability;</li> <li>d. Clearly describe how the project will satisfy the requirements of a municipal stormwater permit;</li> <li>e. Contain the required information as indicated in Question 8 of the Full Proposal FFAST application?</li> </ul> | 0-5          | 4             | 20                  |
| 2. How well does the project, as described in the workplan tasks section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Have a clear indication of the detailed work tasks necessary to complete the project;</li> <li>b. Contain clear and realistic timing and phasing;</li> <li>c. Integrate existing data and studies in the proposed approach to address the identified water quality issue;</li> <li>d. Provide a list of deliverables for each work task; and</li> <li>e. Contain the required information as indicated in Question 8 of the Full Proposal FFAST application?</li> </ul>  | 0-5          | 4             | 20                  |
| 3. How well does the applicant demonstrate the appropriate experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the project?   | 0-5          | 1             | 5                   |
| <b>BUDGET</b>  |              |               |                     |
| 4. How well do the budget tables and narrative provide a rationale for the costs? Are the costs reasonable? Are the tasks shown in the budget consistent with the tasks shown in the workplan and schedule? Was supporting documentation provided to justify the costs?  | 0-5          | 3             | 15                  |
| <b>SCHEDULE</b>  |              |               |                     |
| 5. How well do the tasks in the schedule align with the tasks described in the workplan and budget? Does the schedule seem reasonable given the tasks listed? Are the start dates and end dates within the required timeframe as indicated in the Guidelines?  | 0-5          | 2             | 10                  |

**APPENDIX C – 2: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

| <b>MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>  |                            |   |            |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------|
| 6. How well will the measurement tools and methods effectively monitor project performance and target progress? Is the monitoring appropriate for the benefits claimed? Are the goals and targets reasonable and feasible within the life of the grant?  | 0-5                        | 3 | 15         |
| <b>MULTIPLE BENEFITS</b>   |                            |   |            |
| 7. Does the proposed project provide any of the following multiple benefits? Award one point for each benefit obtained.<br>a. Does the project address a current TMDL or one likely to be approved in the next 5 years? Did the applicant provide sufficient documentation to back this claim?<br>b. Does the applicant provide documentation showing how the project is part of an urban greening or other smart growth plan? Does the applicant provide documentation to exhibit that the project reduces carbon dioxide emissions or addresses climate change? Does the project reduce transportation impacts?<br>c. Does the project capture stormwater runoff for infiltration and/or onsite storage for reuse? Will the project augment the local water supply?<br>d. Will the project reduce runoff, flood risk, or sanitary sewer overflows?<br>e. Does the project restore or enhance stream habitat? Did the applicant provide documentation on how the project will achieve these benefits? | 0-5                        | 1 | 5          |
| <b>DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY BENEFITS</b>  |                            |   |            |
| 8. Based on the answer to Question 21 of the Full Proposal:<br><br>Is the applicant a DAC? (10 Points)<br><br>Do 100% of the grant funds benefit a DAC? (5 Points)<br><br>Does some portion of the grant funds benefit a DAC? (3 Points)<br><br>No DAC benefits from the grant funds. (0 Points)   | 0, 3, 5<br>or 10<br>Points | 1 | 10         |
| <b>OVERALL TOTAL POINTS:</b>   |                            |   | <b>100</b> |
| <b>OVERALL EVALUATION</b>  |                            |   |            |
| 9. Does the reviewer believe that the proposed project is technically and financially feasible? Does the reviewer have any concerns about funding the project? Does the reviewer recommend the project for funding? (Note to Reviewers: This text will be provided to the applicant. Be clear and concise.)  |                            |   |            |

## APPENDIX D: DEFINITIONS

**303(d) List** – refers to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act that requires each state to periodically submit a list of impaired water to the U.S. EPA. 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 help each listed water body meet water quality standards.

**Applicant** – an entity that files an application for SWGP funding.

**Application** – the electronic submission to the State Water 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** - the uses of streams, lakes, rivers, and other water bodies, have to humans and other life. Beneficial uses are outlined in a Basin Plan. Each body of water in the State has a set of beneficial uses. 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, and agriculture.

**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.

**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]).

**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 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. 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.

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

**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).

**Lead Agency** – public agency (usually the applicant) that is responsible for preparation and circulation of environmental documents before project approval.

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

**Low Impact Development (LID)** – for the purposes of this funding program, LID is a stormwater 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.

**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.

**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.

**Project Director** – The Project Director is responsible for adhering to the terms of the grant agreement, keeping the project on track, submitting deliverables in a timely manner, and overall management of the administrative and technical aspects of the grant agreement. The Project Director must be an employee of the Grantee. Persons that are subcontractors to be paid by the grant cannot be listed as the Project Director.

**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 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).

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

**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 and 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]).

**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:

- Mixing land uses;
- Taking advantage of compact building design;
- Creating a range of housing opportunities and choices;
- Creating walkable neighborhoods;
- Fostering distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place;
- Preserving open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas;
- Strengthening and direct development towards existing communities;
- Providing a variety of transportation choices;
- Making development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective; and
- 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.

**Stormwater** – 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.

**Stormwater Advisory Task Force (SWATF)** - required by Water Code § 13383.8 to provide advice to the State Water Board on its Stormwater Management Program that may include program priorities, funding criteria, project selection, and interagency coordination of State Programs that address stormwater management. Members for the SWATF are comprised of representatives with an expertise in water quality and stormwater 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.

**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. Additionally, TMDLs developed by and subsequently adopted by the USEPA shall be considered established for purposes of the SWGP.

**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 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).