Regional Roundtable: Sustainable Streets
Focus Meeting on Funding Solutions

Agenda

1515 Clay Street, Oakland, Room 11
Tuesday, May 23, 2017
8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon

Registration and Continental Breakfast 8:30 – 9:00

1. Opening Remarks 9:00 – 9:10
   Tomas Torres, Director – Water Division
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9, Pacific Southwest

2. Case Study: Sustainable Street Solutions Identified for Two Programs 9:10 – 10:20
   • Role of Case Studies in Developing a Roadmap of Solutions
     Matt Fabry, Chair of the Board
     Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association
   • Proposition 1 Storm Water Grant Program – Potential Solutions
     Laura Prickett, Senior Associate
     Horizon Water and Environment
   • One Bay Area Grant Program – Potential Solutions
     Adrienne Miller, Senior Engineer
     Geosyntec Consultants
   • Roundtable Discussion: Compare Case Studies to Other Programs
     Facilitated by Adrienne Miller, Senior Engineer
     Geosyntec Consultants

3. Prioritizing Solutions in the Roadmap for Funding Sustainable Streets 10:20 - 10:45
   Laura Prickett, Senior Associate
   Horizon Water and Environment
   • Results of survey on priorities for funding solutions
   • Draft prioritization criteria
   • Draft prioritization of solutions
   • Identification of any additional solutions
4. Types of Collaboration to Consider for Roadmap of Funding Solutions 10:55 – 11:20
   Sam Ziegler, Chief, Watersheds Section
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9, Water Division
   Matt Fabry, Chair of the Board
   Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association
   • Review federal agency Green Infrastructure Collaborative letter
   • Roundtable discussion: Types of collaboration that may be feasible to include in the Roadmap

5. Outline for Roadmap of Funding Solutions 11:20 – 11:50
   Laura Prickett, Senior Associate
   Horizon Water and Environment
   • Overview of Draft Outline
   • Roundtable Discussion: Input on concepts in the Draft Outline

6. Closing Remarks / Next Steps 11:50 – 12:00
   Matt Fabry, Chair of the Board
   Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association
   • Development of Draft Roadmap
   • September 19 Focus Meeting on the Draft Roadmap
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program (ACCWP)</td>
<td>James Scanlin</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Regional Collaborative (BARC)</td>
<td>Allison Brooks</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA)</td>
<td>Matt Fabry</td>
<td>Chair of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)</td>
<td>Miriam Torres</td>
<td>Coastal Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)</td>
<td>Julie Alvis</td>
<td>Urban Greening Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Headquarters</td>
<td>Tom Rutsch</td>
<td>Watershed Manager (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans District 4</td>
<td>Hardeep Takhar</td>
<td>District 4 Water Quality Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Sharon Newton</td>
<td>Environmental Services Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Pablo</td>
<td>Amanda Booth</td>
<td>Environmental Program Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Union City</td>
<td>Thomas Ruark</td>
<td>City Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County Clean Water Program (CCCWP)</td>
<td>Dan Cloak</td>
<td>Program consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>Paul Wells</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator, No. Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)</td>
<td>Mallory Atkinson</td>
<td>One Bay Area Grants Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)</td>
<td>Anne Richman</td>
<td>Director of Programming &amp; Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)</td>
<td>Dale Bowyer</td>
<td>Sr. WaterResource Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP)</td>
<td>Josh Bradt</td>
<td>Watershed Specialist &amp; Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)</td>
<td>Eugene Maeda</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP)</td>
<td>Jill Bicknell</td>
<td>Deputy Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPUR</td>
<td>Laura Tam</td>
<td>Sustainability + Resilience Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust for Public Land (TPL)</td>
<td>Alejandra Chiesa</td>
<td>Sustainability + Resilience Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust for Public Land (TPL)</td>
<td>Trudy Garber</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)</td>
<td>Daman Badyal</td>
<td>Senior Engineer/Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)</td>
<td>Kelley List</td>
<td>Grant Manager, Storm Water Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Growth Council (SGC)</td>
<td>Elizabeth Grassi</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Clean Water Program (representing City of Campbell)</td>
<td>Kelly Carroll</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 1</td>
<td>Better Integration of Green Infrastructure and Active Transportation Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Transportation grants would allow for green infrastructure; urban greening and water grants would allow for transportation improvements that reduce greenhouse gases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 2</td>
<td>Coordinate on Grant Application Process: Single Distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Integrate funding sources to create a single distribution of funding for projects that include both green infrastructure and transportation improvements that reduce greenhouse gases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3</td>
<td>Improve Conditions for Using Multiple Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ One or more improvements would be made, to make it easier for one project to be funded by multiple grants; potential solutions are listed as Solutions 3a through 3i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3a</td>
<td>Coordinate on Grant Application Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Different grant programs would use the same basic application form, modified as needed by each program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3b</td>
<td>Coordinate Match Policies Among Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ For example, agencies may jointly establish match, or resource agencies may establish standard local match similar to transportation grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3c</td>
<td>Coordinate Joint Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Funding agencies would coordinate to allow joint reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3d</td>
<td>Broaden Scoring Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Allow project designs that provide multiple benefits. Provide level playing field for project designs that provide multiple benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3e</td>
<td>Coordinate Timing of Funding Cycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Coordinate among agencies to time solicitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3f</td>
<td>Coordinate Information on Funding Cycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Develop a database of grants and upcoming solicitations, including funding source, match requirements, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3g</td>
<td>Advertise Maximum Grant Periods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Describe in solicitations the extensions that may be available, to assist applicants in evaluating the potential alignment of grant periods of different grants that may be combined for a project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3h</td>
<td>Modify Eligibility Criteria for Project Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Allow flexibility in grants for all necessary activities, such as planning, design, construction, short-term maintenance, and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution 3i</td>
<td>Coordinate on Solicitations for Urban Greening Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Standardize urban greening solicitations to the extent possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outline for
Roadmap of Funding Solutions for Sustainable Streets

Executive Summary

1.0 Introduction
   1.1 Statement of Purpose
      - Identify and commit to specific actions to achieve the funding of green stormwater infrastructure as an integral component of multi-benefit projects, with an emphasis on streets due to the water quality impacts of motor vehicles, the stormwater collection and conveyance function provided by roadway surfaces, and the integration of storm drain systems into streets and roads.

1.2 Financial Needs and Anticipated Benefits

1.3 Organization of the Roadmap
   - Explains the interrelationships between:
     o Pathways (Section 2.0)
     o Roles (Section 3.0)

2.0 Pathways
   2.1 Path to Better Integration of Funding for Multi-benefit Projects
      - Identifies relevant solutions and specific commitments by participating agencies seeking to fully fund sustainable streets through identified funding programs
      - Provides schedule of specific actions to improve integration
      - Actions are categorized as immediate solutions, short-term/administrative solutions, and long-term solutions including legislation

   2.2 Path of Coordination Regarding Grant Application Processes
      - Identifies relevant solutions and specific commitments by participating agencies seeking to remove obstacles to funding sustainable streets through coordination regarding grant application processes
      - Provides schedule of specific actions to coordinate regarding grant application processes
      - Actions are categorized as immediate solutions, short-term/administrative solutions, and long-term solutions including legislation

   2.3 Path of Improving Conditions for Projects that Are Funded by Multiple Grants
      - Identifies relevant solutions and specific commitments by participating agencies seeking to improve conditions for projects that receive funding from separate grant programs
      - Provides schedule of specific actions to improve coordination
      - Actions are categorized as immediate solutions, short-term/administrative solutions, and long-term solutions including legislation
2.4 Path to Additional Funding Options

- Identifies relevant solutions and specific commitments by participating agencies seeking additional funding options (fees, loans, etc.) for green stormwater infrastructure
- Provides schedule of specific actions to identify and secure additional funding
- Actions are categorized as immediate solutions, short-term/administrative solutions, and long-term solutions including legislation

3.0 Roles and Responsibilities

3.1 Roadmap Committee

- Describes the body that will oversee implementation of the Roadmap

3.2 Representatives of Participating Agencies

- Lists the point of contact for each participating agency

3.3 Champions

- Identifies champions and describes a process to guide legislative actions

3.4 Tracking and Follow-up

- Describes a process to track and report on progress

Appendix A: List of Acronyms and Definitions
Appendix B: List of Potential Sources of Funding for Green Stormwater Infrastructure
Case Study

Proposition 1 Stormwater Grant Program – Potential Solutions for Sustainable Streets

Matt Fabry, Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association
Laura Prickett, Horizon Water and Environment

Regional Roundtable Focus Meeting
May 23, 2017

Outline

- Role of Case Studies in Roadmap of Solutions
- Key take-aways from research for case study
- Solution 1: Better integration of GI and complete streets
- Solution 2: Coordinate grant application process
- Solution 3: Improvements for using multiple grants for one project
- Roundtable Discussion
Roadmap of Funding Solutions

- The Roundtable will produce a Roadmap of Funding Solutions that:
  - Identifies specific actions to achieve the funding of green stormwater infrastructure as an integral component of complete streets projects, and potentially other types of infrastructure projects.
Case Studies Illustrate Actions for Roadmap

- Today’s case studies to be included in the Roadmap
- The case studies identify specific actions to achieve the funding of “sustainable streets” projects

Sustainable Streets =

“Complete Streets” + Green infrastructure

- Provides safe access for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders
- Enhances public health
- Reduces greenhouse gas emissions
- Reduces air pollution
- Reduces water pollution
- Reduces the urban heat island
- Sequesters carbon
- Provides flood storage
Sustainable Streets

- Provide benefits that advance priorities of various funding agencies
- Current funding sources may not be structured to encourage all of these multiple benefits

Storm Water Grant Program

- Round 1 grant awards in 2016
  - $9.6 million in Planning Grants
  - $105 million in Implementation Grants
- Round 2 solicitation in 2018
  - $86 million anticipated to be awarded
- Multi-benefit storm water management projects
  - Must be in Storm Water Resource Plan/functional equivalent
Key Take-Aways
Eligible costs are listed in proposition

- Costs associated with stormwater or dry weather capture are eligible for funding
- Costs associated with multiple benefits are eligible
- Eligible projects are listed in the proposition and cannot be changed after the voters approve proposition

Key Take-Aways
Some complete street components may be eligible

- Costs for bike lanes/pedestrian pathways/alternate transit lane could be eligible if GHG reduction is shown as a quantifiable benefit
Key Take-Aways
Some complete street components may be eligible

- Components of the design that convey stormwater runoff to a green infrastructure facility are eligible

Berm/speed bump was designed to direct water into the bioretention facility

Key Take-Aways
Impervious materials typically ineligible

- Pervious pavement is eligible
- The costs for impervious materials are typically not eligible
- Any exception must be specifically justified
Key Take-Aways

Ineligible costs do not affect scoring

- Having potentially ineligible costs included in the budget does NOT reduce the scoring of the budget
- Having costs that are not backed up by an engineer’s estimate, previous work experience, etc., DOES reduce the scoring of the budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET (20 Points Possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Do the budget tables 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? Was a cost benefit analysis provided justifying the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Take-Aways

How you describe the project matters!

- Demonstrate that project components were designed to perform eligible functions, such as
  - Convey runoff to green infrastructure
  - Reduce GHG emissions (quantify GHG reduction, e.g., from bike lane, pedestrian improvements)
  - Enhance or create public use areas

Green infrastructure stormwater treatment facility, City of San Mateo
**Solution 1: Better Integration**

**Programmatic**

- **Obstacles to sustainable streets:**
  - Funding of some transportation elements has been denied, based on lack of nexus to grant goals
  - It is infeasible to change eligibility criteria

- **Solutions**
  - Grant applications should quantify GHG reductions from sustainable street projects
  - Solicitation should clarify eligibility of active transportation improvements that are demonstrated to reduce GHG

---

**Solution 1: Better Integration**

**Legislative**

- **Obstacles:**
  - Funding of some transportation elements has been denied, based on lack of nexus to grant goals
  - It is infeasible to change eligibility criteria

- **Solution** - Influence the development of future propositions, related legislation, and incorporation into a chapter of state law – to provide a clear path for full eligibility of sustainable streets
Solution 2: Single Distribution
Not applicable to case study

- **Solution: Single Distribution**
  - Create a single distribution of funding for projects that include both green infrastructure and transportation improvements that reduce greenhouse gases

- **Infeasible because:**
  - Would require stipulations in the proposition
  - Very difficult/cumbersome to mix funds from different sources
  - Need to look at needs statewide; may not be applicable statewide

Solution 3a: Coordinate Application Process Programmatic

- **Obstacles:**
  - Cost of resources to apply for multiple, often complex grants
  - Proposition requirements are too unique to fit into a “single application” solution

- **Solution: Develop guidance:**
  - Statewide guidance on how to “package” sustainable streets projects for specific grants
  - Clarify terms such as “sustainable streets”
  - Incorporate the guidance in future Grant Guidelines
Solution 3a: Coordinate Application Process
Legislative

- **Obstacles:**
  - Cost of resources to apply for multiple, often complex grants
  - Proposition requirements are too unique to fit into a “single application” solution

- **Solution:** Influence the development of future propositions/enacting legislation to coordinate some elements of application requirements with other grant programs that fund sustainable streets

Solution 3b: Coordinate Match Requirements
Programmatic

- **Obstacles:**
  - 50% match for Storm Water Grant Program
  - Some federal transportation funding rejected
  - Prop 1 excludes state funds from match
  - Bond law requires eligibility for match

- **Solution:** Create guidance for applicants on how to demonstrate the eligibility of transportation elements, such as the use of permeable paving
Solution 3b: Coordinate Match Requirements

**Legislative**

- **Obstacles:**
  - 50% match for Storm Water Grant Program
  - Some transportation funding was rejected
  - Prop 1 excludes state funds from match
  - Bond law requires eligibility for match

- **Solution: Influence the development of future propositions to:**
  - Place the program in a Chapter that does not require 50% match
  - Add stormwater into the Prop 218 exemption

Solution 3c: Coordinate Joint Reporting

**Programmatic**

- **Obstacle:** Separate record-keeping and reporting for each grant

- **Solution:** Coordinate joint reporting
  - Compare reporting requirements among grant programs
  - Identify opportunities to coordinate reporting schedule, format, etc. – for example, SWRCB allows grant recipients to establish some milestone dates
Solution 3d: Broaden Scoring Criteria
Not applicable to case study

- Solution - Broaden scoring criteria
  - Provide level playing field for project designs that provide multiple benefits

- Not Applicable Because
  - Currently the scoring criteria do not penalize projects that include ineligible costs

Solution 3e: Coordinate Timing of Funding Cycles
Not applicable to case study

- Solution - Coordinate timing of cycles
  - Coordinate among agencies to time solicitations

- Infeasible Because:
  - Timing subject to state budget allocation
  - Bond law dictates when funds must be spent
Solution 3f: Coordinate Information on Funding Cycles
Programmatic

- Obstacle:
  - Funding cycles are not coordinated
  - Timing subject to state budget allocation
  - Bond law dictates when funds must be spent

- Solution - Coordinate regarding cycles
  - Coordinate with other agencies to join SWRCB in participating in funding fairs & California Financing Coordinating Committee website
  - Develop database of grants/upcoming solicitations
  - Inform other funding agencies on timing of RFPs

Solution 3g: Advertise Maximum Grant Periods
Not applicable to case study

- Solution: Advertise in the solicitation
  - Whether an extension may be available
  - The maximum duration of any extension

- Infeasible Because:
  - Time extension requests are NEVER guaranteed and may be denied by Governor
Solution 3h: Modify Eligible Activities
Not Applicable to the Case Study

- **Solution** - Consider seeking to influence the development of future propositions to allow funding of short-term maintenance

- **Infeasible Because:**
  - Grants can only cover costs incurred within the grant period
  - When a past proposition allowed for advance payment for future costs, there were abuses

Questions?
Case Study

One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG2) – Potential Solutions for Sustainable Streets

Adrienne Miller, Geosyntec Consultants

Outline

- Overview of OBAG 2
- Key take-aways from research for case study
- Solution 1: Better integration of green infrastructure (GI) and complete streets.
- Solution 2: Coordinate grant application process.
- Solution 3: Improvements for using multiple grants for one project.
- Roundtable Discussion
One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG2)

- **One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG):**
  - Guides how federal transportation funds are to be spent in our region (divided into Regional Program and County Program).

- **Green Infrastructure in OBAG:**
  - OBAG Program itself does not preclude GI components from being funded as part of an eligible OBAG project (limitations come from federal law).

---

Key Take-Aways

**Federal Limitations**

- OBAG requirements are determined by federal law, so MTC is limited.
- Caltrans ATP has developed its own requirements beyond the federal requirements, so clarification is needed to determine eligibility.
Key Take-Aways
Some green street components may be eligible

- Under current OBAG eligibility requirements:
  - GI is eligible if required for mitigation.
  - Permeable pavement is eligible.
  - Landscaping as part of streetscape improvement or safety improvement is eligible.

Solution 1: Better Integration Programmatic

- Obstacles to Sustainable Streets:
  - Some GI elements of OBAG projects may be ineligible for federal transportation funds; eligibility criteria governed by federal law.
  - Eligibility is unclear, may vary between programs using same federal sources (ex. ATP, OBAG).

- Solutions:
  - Coordinate with Caltrans to develop guidance clarifying eligibility of GI elements in federally funded (OBAG) transportation projects. Similar guidance exists specific to Caltrans ATP program.
Solution 1: Better Integration
Programmatic

- Additional Solutions:
  - BASMAA to develop guidance for grant applicants to demonstrate multiple benefits of GI components in transportation projects.
  - MTC notes that exchanges can be made for OBAG projects; CMAs can recommend exchanges to transfer OBAG funding from a project with federal eligibility issues onto a project with clear federal eligibility (pavement rehab.) and transfer “clean” money back to the original OBAG project.

Solution 1: Better Integration
Legislative

- Obstacles to Sustainable Streets:
  - Some GI elements of OBAG projects may be ineligible for federal transportation funds; eligibility criteria governed by federal law.
  - Eligibility is unclear, may vary between programs using same federal sources (ex. ATP, OBAG).

- Solutions:
  - BASMAA to work with partners, such as Water Environment Foundation, to influence eligibility of GI in federal surface transportation programs; Support communication with MTC on legislative advocacy.
Solution 2: Single Distribution
Not applicable to case study

- **Solution: Single Distribution**
  - Create a single distribution of funding for projects that include both green infrastructure and transportation improvements that reduce greenhouse gases.

- **Infeasible Because:**
  - Would require changes to federal legislation.
  - Very difficult/cumbersome to mix funds from different sources.

Solution 3a: Coordinate Application Process
Programmatic

- **Obstacles:**
  - Cost of resources to apply for multiple, often complex grants.
  - OBAG2, Proposition, and other funding program requirements are too unique to fit into a “single application” solution.

- **Solution: Develop Internal Application**
  - MTC is looking at ways to coordinate regional programs.
  - Funding agencies may consider other related grant programs (timing, criteria, etc.) in the development of future programs; coordinate where feasible.
Solution 3b: Coordinate Match Requirements
Programmatic

- **Obstacles:**
  - 11.47% non-federal local match required for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program / Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Programs (STP / CMAQ) projects. This match is determined by federal law.
  - Same federal requirements apply to the project components funded with matching funds.

- **Solution: Clarify Match Requirements**
  - *Additional* non-federal funds must be used on ineligible scope elements.

Solution 3c: Coordinate Joint Reporting
Programmatic
Not applicable to case study

- **Solution: Coordinate Joint Reporting**
  - Compare reporting requirements for applicable grant programs.
  - Identify opportunities to coordinate reporting schedule, format, and other requirements.

- **Infeasible Because:**
  - MTC does not have reporting requirements for OBAG, but Caltrans does have federally-mandated reporting requirements for federally-funded projects.
Solution 3d: Broaden Scoring Criteria
Not applicable to case study

- **Solution - Broaden Scoring Criteria:**
  - Provide level playing field for project designs that provide multiple benefits.

- **Infeasible Because:**
  - OBAG program already includes an emphasis on multi-modal, multi-benefit projects.
  - OBAG criteria doesn’t include a requirement to look at cost/benefit.

Solution 3e: Coordinate Timing of Funding Cycles
Programmatic

- **Obstacle:**
  - Funding cycles are not coordinated.
  - Deadlines subject to federal authorization/obligation.
  - Federal legislation dictates when funds are spent.

- **Solution: Coordinate Timing of Cycles**
  - MTC looking to ways to coordinate regional programs.
Solution 3f: Coordinate Information on Funding Cycles  
Programmatic

- **Obstacle:**
  - Release of solicitations and funding are not coordinated.

- **Solution: Coordinate Regarding Cycles**
  - MTC looking to ways to coordinate regional programs.
  - Develop a database of grants/upcoming solicitations.
  - Inform other funding agencies of RFPs.

Solution 3g: Advertise Maximum Grant Periods  
Programmatic

- **Obstacles:**
  - Coordination of different programs with different delivery deadlines and extension possibilities.
  - Grant extensions not available for OBAG.

- **Solution: Advertise in the Solicitation**
  - MTC notes that obligation and delivery deadlines are already described in the OBAG policy resolution; extensions not available.
Solution 3h: Modify Eligible Activities
Legislative
Not applicable to case study

Solution:
• Consider seeking to influence the
development of future grant language to
allow funding of routine maintenance.

Infeasible Because:
• Eligibility for maintenance is determined
by federal law. Federal grants can be
used for short-term establishment only.

Roundtable Discussion
## How do solutions relate to other programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Programmatic</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>Guidance?</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Better integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Single distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a - Coordinate application process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b - Coordinate match policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c - Coordinate joint reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d - Broaden scoring criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e - Coordinate timing of cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## How do solutions relate to other programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Programmatic</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>Guidance?</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3f - Coordinate info on cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g - Advertise max grant periods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h - Modify eligible activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roundtable Discussion

- Where is the low-hanging fruit / easy changes to make?

- Which solutions would provide the greatest relief to sustainable streets projects?

- Who needs to be included in discussions of solutions?
Prioritizing Solutions in the Roadmap for Funding Sustainable Streets

Laura Prickett, Horizon Water and Environment

Outline

- Why prioritize solutions?
- Results of survey on priorities for funding solutions
- Meeting Participant Input for Roadmap Content
Why Prioritize Solutions

- The Roundtable will produce a Roadmap of Solutions that:
  - Identifies specific actions to achieve the funding of green stormwater infrastructure as an integral component of complete streets projects, and potentially other types of infrastructure projects
- Prioritizing solutions will inform timeframes and sequencing of specific actions

Survey on Priorities for Sustainable Streets Funding Solutions

- Survey was sent to
  - Roundtable Participants
  - Roundtable interested parties
  - Local stormwater programs
- Survey was open from May 8 to 17
- Received 28 responses
Who responded to the survey?

- 1 Funding agency
- 21 Agencies that seek funding
- 2 Agencies that provide AND seek funding
- 4 Interested parties/other

Ranking of 3 Categories of Solutions

- Better integration
  - 1st priority: 15
  - 2nd priority: 10
  - 3rd priority: 2
- Single distribution
  - 1st priority: 11
  - 2nd priority: 8
  - 3rd priority: 9
- Improve conditions for using multiple grants
  - 1st priority: 2
  - 2nd priority: 10
  - 3rd priority: 16
Higher Priority Solutions for Using Multiple Grants in a Single Project

- Broaden scoring criteria: 3 (higher priority), 22 (lower priority), 0 (no response)
- One application form, modified for different programs: 5 (higher priority), 18 (lower priority), 7 (no response)
- Modify eligibility criteria for project activities: 7 (higher priority), 14 (lower priority), 0 (no response)

Mid-Range Priority Solutions for Using Multiple Grants in a Single Project

- Coordinate match policies among agencies: 7 (higher priority), 14 (lower priority), 0 (no response)
- Coordinate information on funding cycles: 10 (higher priority), 13 (lower priority), 0 (no response)
- Coordinate timing of funding cycles: 12 (higher priority), 12 (lower priority), 0 (no response)
Agenda Item 3
Prioritizing Solutions

**Lower Priority Solutions for Using Multiple Grants in a Single Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution Description</th>
<th>Higher Priority</th>
<th>Lower Priority</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate on solicitations for urban greening grants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate joint reporting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise maximum grant periods</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Sources You Would Pursue if Obstacles Are Removed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Higher Priority</th>
<th>Lower Priority</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation grants</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water grants</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change grants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality grants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency does not seek grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Input from March 28 Roundtable Meeting

### Higher Priority at Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle to Funding Sustainable Streets</th>
<th>Attendees’ Input on Prioritization</th>
<th>Survey Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible costs – Project Type</td>
<td>A large majority of attendees</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Administration-Applications</td>
<td>Approximately 40% of attendees</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Administration - Tracking</td>
<td>Approximately 30% of attendees</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches for Multiple Grants</td>
<td>Approximately 30% of attendees</td>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring of Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Approx. 20% of attendees, including approx. 50% of Roundtable Participants</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lower Priority at Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle to Funding Sustainable Streets</th>
<th>Attendees’ Input on Prioritization</th>
<th>Survey Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible Costs – Project Activities</td>
<td>Less the 10% of attendees</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Cycles Not Coordinated</td>
<td>Approximately 10% of attendees</td>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Periods May Not Align</td>
<td>Approximately 10% of attendees</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Participant Input for Roadmap Content

- Input will make Roadmap as useful as possible for
  - Implementing agencies and stakeholders
  - Interested parties
- Input requested on:
  - Criteria for identifying high priority solutions and infeasible solutions
  - Identification of next steps including implementation partners

Draft Screening Criteria for Inclusion in Roadmap

- Some solutions may be removed from further consideration in the Roadmap based on:
  - Lack of key support - Agencies that would be responsible for implementation do not support the solution
Draft Criteria for Prioritizing Solutions

- **Effectiveness** - The extent to which the solution would help to make more funding available for sustainable streets projects
- **Ease of implementation** – Level of time and resources, for example:
  - Can the solution be implemented by one agency?
  - Can the solution be implemented in one year?
- **Support** - Support demonstrated for the solution, such as commitments by Roundtable Participants/interested parties

Draft Prioritization of Solutions

Higher Priority

- Better integration
- Coordinate on grant application process
- Broaden scoring criteria
- Modify eligibility criteria for project activities

Input requested
## Draft Prioritization of Solutions

### Lower Priority

- Coordinate match policies among agencies
- Coordinate information on funding cycles
- Coordinate timing of funding cycles
- Coordinate joint reporting
- Coordinate on solicitations for urban greening grants
- Advertise maximum grant periods

Input requested

## Other Solutions to Consider?

- Identify other solutions
- Apply criteria to identified solutions

Input requested
Types of Collaboration to Consider for Roadmap of Funding Solutions

Sam Ziegler, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Matt Fabry, Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association

Outline

- National Green Infrastructure Collaborative (Sam)
  - Background
  - Participating federal agencies
  - Types of agency commitments
- Potential types of collaboration to include in Roadmap (Matt)
- Roundtable Discussion
A network-based learning alliance created to help communities more easily implement green infrastructure

- Established in October 2014 to broaden national engagement
  - Leveraging joint efforts
  - Sharing and building knowledge
  - Facilitating shared inquiry
- Federal agencies, NGOs & private-sector entities

Participants

Federal
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
- U.S. Department of Defense
- U.S. Department of Energy
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
- U.S. Department of the Interior
- U.S. Department of Transportation

Non-Federal
- American Society of Engineers
- Association of Clean Water Administrators
- Environmental Defense Fund
- National Association of Clean Water Agencies
- National Association of Flood & Stormwater Management Agencies
- Tree People
- Others...
Types of Commitments

- EPA
  - Provide 25 communities with assistance
- DOT
  - Investments with livability & environmental benefits
- Department of Interior
  - USFWS builds Visitor Center at Detroit River Wildlife Refuge highlighting green infrastructure

For more information
- https://www.epa.gov/green-infrastructure/green-infrastructure-collaborative#Collaborative Members
Potential Types of Collaboration to Include in Roadmap

- Collaborate on joint application/instructions/policies
- Improve instructions for grant applicants in coordination with other funding agencies
- Collaborate on advocacy for legislative changes
- Encourage/fund actions with mutual benefit
- Convene/lead collaborative processes

Roundtable Discussion

- How would collaborating on sustainable streets benefit your agency?
- What collaborative processes is your agency engaged in now?
- What strengths does your agency offer?
- What commitments could your agency make?

Input requested
Outline for Roadmap of Funding Solutions for Sustainable Streets

Laura Prickett, Horizon Water and Environment

Outline

- Purpose of Roadmap
- Organization of Roadmap
- Input from Roundtable Participants
Purpose of the Roadmap

- Identify and commit to specific actions
  - To achieve the funding of green stormwater infrastructure as an integral component of multi-benefit projects, with an emphasis on streets due to:
    - The water quality impacts of motor vehicles,
    - The stormwater collection and conveyance function provided by roadway surfaces, and
    - The integration of storm drain systems into streets and roads
    - State and regional focus on investing in active transportation

Organization of the Roadmap

- Executive Summary
- 1 - Introduction
- 2 - Pathways
- 3 - Roles and Responsibilities
- Appendices
Section 1: Introduction

- Statement of Purpose
- Financial Needs and Anticipated Benefits
- Organization of the Roadmap
  - Explains Interrelationships between
    - Pathways (lists and schedules of specific actions)
    - Roles (who is acting and how are actions tracked)

Section 2: Pathways

- Path to Better Integration of Funding for Multi-benefit Projects
- Path of Coordination Regarding Grant Application Processes
- Path of Improving Conditions for Projects that Are Funded by Multiple Grants
- Path to Additional Funding Options
Elements Included in Each Path

- Relevant solutions
- Commitments by participating agencies
- Schedule of specific actions
- Actions are categorized as:
  - Immediate solutions
  - Short-term, administrative solutions
  - Long-term solutions, including legislation

Section 3: Roles and Responsibilities

- Roadmap Committee
  - Oversees implementation
- Representatives of Participating Agencies
  - Points of contact
- Champions
  - Advocacy, guiding legislative actions
- Tracking and Follow-up
  - Track and report on progress
Appendices

- List of Acronyms and Definitions
  - Improve cross-sector understanding
- List of Potential Funding Sources
  - Sources of funds for local match
- Solutions Considered and Withdrawn
  - Provides a record of decisions taken

Input from Roundtable Participants

- Questions about the Roadmap?
- Ideas regarding:
  - Specific actions?
  - Agency roles?
- Synergies with actions that agencies are already planning?

Input requested