



SECTION 8

FINAL BUDGET REPORT: FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006

SCVURPPP budget distributed to BATG on December 15, 2004
SCVURPPP budget reviewed and approved by BATG for distribution to MC on January 4, 2005
SCVURPPP budget distributed to MC on January 12, 2005
SCVURPPP budget revised based on BATG direction from January 18 and February 2, 2005 meetings and distributed to Executive Committee and BATG on February 7, 2005.
Revised SCVURPPP budget approved by BATG and distributed to MC on February 14, 2005
SCVURPPP budget reviewed and approved by MC on February 17, 2005

**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

Final Budget Report:

Fiscal Year 2005-2006

Final February 17, 2005

SCVURPPP budget distributed to BATG on December 15, 2004
SCVURPPP budget reviewed and approved by BATG for distribution to MC on January 4, 2005
SCVURPPP budget distributed to MC on January 12, 2005
SCVURPPP budget revised based on BATG direction from January 18 and February 2, 2005 meetings and distributed to Executive Committee and BATG on February 7, 2005.
Revised SCVURPPP budget approved by BATG and distributed to MC on February 14, 2005
SCVURPPP budget reviewed and approved by MC on February 17, 2005

Final Budget Report for FY 05-06

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Budgets

Overall Budget Summary
Program Budget Detail

Information

Backup Information – Program Budget

TOTAL PROGRAM FY 05-06 BUDGET
Backup Information

OPERATIONAL GROUP

A summary of tasks to be performed by EOA, based on EOA's current contract with the Santa Clara Valley Water District (on behalf of the SCVURPPP), is provided in Items (1.), (2.), and (3.) below. The resource requirements are based, in part, on the requirements contained in the RWQCB Order No. 01-024 adopted February 21, 2001 and Order No. 01-119 adopted October 17, 2001 (new and redevelopment requirements).

A summary of the key budget assumptions is shown below and additional detail that defines the basis for the budget are identified in the following sections.

- The Total SCVURPPP FY 05-06 budget is the same as the FY 04-05 total budget.
- Hourly labor rates are increased by 4% above FY 04-05 labor rates.
- Legal Assistance is increased by approximately 10% over the FY 04-05 budget..
- The Projects Group WE&O campaign budget and PI/P budget are decreased from the FY 03-04 & 04-05 levels by approximately 32%. The bulk of the WE&O campaign will be completed during FY 04-05 and planning for future education and outreach efforts will occur during FY 05-06. Resources are included to cover implementation of the Program's PI/P program, Pesticide IPM workplan, the mercury workplan, creek clean-up, RAC, maintenance of the Program's watershed watch website and resources to continue a limited WE&O campaign effort.
- Annual interest accrued is assumed available for use as needed for projects approved by the BATG and MC which has typically been legal assistance.
- The monitoring budget assumes one watershed assessment will be initiated consistent with FY 04-05 MC Integration Report and previous MC planning commitments.
- Assumes no Co-permittee performance reviews.
- Assumes no new sediment assessment conducted, only completion of ongoing FY 04-05 assessment including management/control report.
- Includes the same contribution to CEP as FY 03-04 and FY 04-05.
- Includes resources to assist with implementing the approved Trash Work Plan.
- Includes resources to assist with finalizing guidance for implementation of HMP tasks, holding workshops, development of the regional Bay Area Hydrology Model (BAHM) in collaboration with Alameda County Program and phased development of the local calibration of the model over a two year period., coordination with Co-permittees and assisting Co-permittees with implementation.
- Includes resources for permit renewal negotiations as part of regional permit.
- Includes annual permit fee as a separate line item that is increased by 5% over the FY 04-05 budget. The permit fee has not been absorbed into the main SCVURPPP operating budget. To absorb these fees as was done in past years would require further reductions in Program tasks that would significantly impact meeting permit requirements and further result in a reduction of contributions to regional collaborative programs. Thus the permit fees are shown as direct line item in the budget and the assessment.
- All Regional Collaboration projects/fees are shown in the Collaborative Group (projects are listed in order of priority, i.e., lowest priority first if budget modifications need to be made).
- The RMP fee is increased by 1.5%.

- Includes a new task and budget to review the MOA.
- Increases the fiscal/contract agent reimbursement fee from \$15,000 to \$50,000 FY.

The Budget Ad Hoc Task Group met on January 4, and 18, 2005 and February 2, 2005 to review and discuss Program budget issues. The MC met and approved the budget on February 17, 2005.

1. Program Management/Administration

a. Administrative Assistance

- General administrative assistance
- Maintain Program 800 number
- Distribute PIP and other materials
- Develop partnerships with external organizations

b. Management Committee (MC) and Ad-Hoc Task Group (AHTG) Support

- Monthly MC meetings (up to 12) - develop, distribute, and post agendas; prepare and mail meeting materials; facilitate meetings; draft and finalize minutes; and conduct follow-up activities
- AHTG meetings (up to 40) - support groups formed to address specific tasks (meeting number and times vary)

c. Program Budget Administration

- Develop, draft, and finalize FY 2006-2007 budget; organize and facilitate quarterly Budget AHTG meetings
- Coordinate with Fiscal Agent, track expenditures, and prepare quarterly status reports

d. Coordinate with Legal Consultant

- Communicate with and assist Program legal counsel as needed (up to 5 meetings and 10 extended telephone discussions) on General Program issues.

e. Develop and Manage Program PI/P Program

- Conduct long-range planning for Program PI/P activities
- Manage development of PI/P work plan for FY 2006-2007
- Provide support, as needed, to Co-permittee's requests for public education assistance
- Manage subcontracts
- Coordinate and work with the WMI Communications Subgroup and various other adhoc and work groups to address numerous new people and "pollutants of concern".¹

¹ Over the past several years, the PI/P and WE&O elements have been a key component of the SCVURPPP. As TMDL programs move forward to address new "pollutants of concern" outreach will be important and Program staff will need to spend additional time working as part of a regional effort to address these new needs

f. Performance Evaluation

- Limited budget to assist Co-permittee response.

g. Expenses

- Approximately 10 percent of labor costs

2. Permit Management

a. Report Preparation and Submittal

- Prepare annual report for FY 2004-2005 and submit to Regional Board by September 15, 2005 (includes preparation of 1 draft for MC review, reproduction/distribution of up to 15 copies)
- Review results of Program activities and recommend improvements
- Prepare Program Work Plan (or equivalent) for FY 2006-2007 (includes 2 drafts for MC review, response to Regional Board comments, reproduction and distribution of up to 15 copies)
- Provide guidance for Co-permittees' work plans and SCVURPPP work plans
- Review all Co-permittee Work Plans and Annual Reports for completeness and consistency.

b. Internal Co-permittee Liaison

- Develop guidance on permit requirements
- Provide assistance to Co-permittees as needed.
- Conduct up to four training workshops for co-permittee staff

c. External Organization Liaison

- Represent Program at Regional Board, State Board, BASMAA, Regional Monitoring Program, CASQA, Urban Pesticide Committee, SCBWMI core and relevant subgroups, environmental group/public (up to 88 meetings)
- Obtain and transmit updates from state NOI database

d. New NDC Permit Compliance Issues (Non-HMP)

- Meet with Regional Board staff, Program legal counsel, Program ad hoc task group and/or environmental groups as needed
- Prepare responses to comments and supplementary documentation as needed.
- Conduct the tasks to comply with permit provision C.3. The estimated budgets are based on and consistent with the C3 Work Plan.
- Assist Co-Permittees with implementation of C.3 on projects and with tracking and reporting on C.3 projects.

e. Implement Continuous Improvement Items

- Investigate, develop implementation plans, and implement items for Program continuous improvement identified in Co-permittee reviews, work plan, and annual report within the allocated resources
- Summarize for Program annual report

f. TMDL Tracking, Review and Reporting

- Program staff participation in TMDL tracking, review and reporting to MC.

g. Expenses

- Approximately 10 percent of cost

3. Technical Program Management

a. Prepare RFPs, Technical Project Management

- Develop up to 4 RFPs for technical services
- Implement Multi-Year Monitoring Plan including selection of subcontractors
- Oversee contractors' work
- Coordinate with BATG/MC/Monitoring Ad Hoc Group/WAS and hold up to four Monitoring Ad Hoc meetings annually (quarterly basis) in association with WAS.

b. Technical Review of Work Products

- Provide technical review of contractor work products
- Make recommendations to BATG/MC/Monitoring Ad Hoc Task Group regarding quality of work and any modifications needed for improvement.

c. Develop/Revise Performance Standards

- Assist MC in development of one new performance standard, or substantially improve one or more existing performance standards at the same level of effort.

d. Expenses

- Approximately 10 percent of cost

4. Legal Services

This assumes that the Program will retain the services of Morrison and Foerster (Robert Falk, Esq.) to provide legal advice. The working assumption is that the majority of the legal budget is earmarked for assistance with TMDL, HMP, and permit renewal issues (i.e., work on regional general permit). In addition, implementation issues associated with C3 will also arise and, as appropriate, will be addressed with the available budget.

5. Fiscal Agent

The SCVWD (District) currently serves as the SCVURPPP (Program) Fiscal Agent. On January 28, 2005 the District, pursuant to MOA Section 4.02, notified the Program that they wished to withdraw as the Program's Contracting and Fiscal agent. The Co-permittees met on February 2, 2005 (a Special MC meeting) and wish to establish, forthwith, a new Program Contracting and Fiscal agent pursuant to MOA Section 4. Time is of the essence. The BATG met on February 7, 2005 and initiated selection of a new fiscal agent as well as initiating the steps to transfer the

Program manger contract, establish a SCVURPPP Trust Account, and transfer all remaining funds to the new trust account.

This item represents the amount to be reimbursed to the contract/fiscal agent carrying out this task. The budget for this item has been increased from \$15,000 to \$50,000 per FY. All Program staff time required to coordinate with the Fiscal Agent is included under Budget Item 1.c.

6. Fees (SEE Collaborative Group)

PROJECTS GROUP

7. Monitoring Projects

The purpose of this item is to fund projects that satisfy the monitoring requirements of the Program's NPDES permit. The estimate of the resource requirements are based on implementation of the Multi-Year Monitoring Plan (MY-RWMP) March 1, 2004 (update - originally submitted to the RWQCB by the MC on August 5, 2002) and is consistent with Program's implementation of the fourth year of MY-RWMP. In addition, the budget estimate includes resources to cover the following tasks/projects: SCVURPPP data management including updating the SSI, copper & nickel baseline actions and reporting and update of the website, participation in the LUS, TMDL technical support/liaison (Hg, PCB, Dioxin, other pesticides), other monitoring consistent with the permit will be conducted to the extent that budget allows, one watershed assessment consistent with the MC integration report and previous Coyote assessment, completion of the ongoing sediment assessment and management control report consistent with the MC September 1, 2002 Work Plan, resources for assisting the Co-permittees implementation the Trash Work Plan and investigating and reporting on trash as a "pollutant of concern" within the urban boundary, resources for updating and developing the necessary annual sampling plans, QA plans and reporting the surface water monitoring results (as defined within the MY-RWMP), and limited resources to coordinate/participate with the CEP. The proposed budget breakdown is as follows:

- Implement Multi-Year Monitoring Plan (includes receiving water monitoring including QA plans, bioassessment, sediment toxicity, BAMBI, annual watershed data analysis report and focused loading assessment for Hg and PCBs) - \$340,000
- Program Data Management and Reporting - \$100,000
- Trash/CAP-NAP/WMI-Landuse/CEP -\$ 75,000
- Sediment Management Report and Watershed Assessment \$220,000

8. HMP technical Assistance, Guidance and Workshops

The purpose of this task is to address the additional work effort to complete the HMP. The work effort involves managing subcontractors to complete the technical work (including the BAHM), internal review and approval by the MC, preparation of final Program guidance, conducting workshops and coordination with and addressing RWQCB staff comments.

The budget estimate to complete the development of the BAHM is an upper limit, using estimates of the typical cost of calibrating the model to local watersheds and assuming completion of the work over two FYs (FY 05-06 and FY 06-07). Actual costs may be reduced by limiting the number of watersheds modeled and/or by using existing data from the HMP watershed assessment. In addition, based on the availability of resources from other stormwater programs

that are contributing to the regional portion of the model, the time period for BAHM development may need to be extended into another fiscal year. A more detailed memo is attached.

9. PI/P and WEO Budget

- Watershed Education and Outreach Campaign – assumes all work completed during FY 04-05.
- Assumes that the District will incorporate stormwater messages into District education and outreach materials.
- Assumes limited coordination between District staff , co-permitttees and Program staff.

Proposed Budget breakdown:

- RAC - \$50,000
- Alviso Ed. - \$75,700
- Website Maintenance - \$10,000
- Schools Outreach - \$25,000
- Advertising to support for Creek Cleanup - \$7,500
- Program staff WE&O & future planning - \$50,000
- Campaign - \$90,000

a. Pesticide User (PU) Outreach

This project continues implementation, at a reduced level, of the cost-effective elements of past IPM Store Partnership and Household Chemical Management Projects. Project scope will include items in Program's Pesticide Management Plan (2-15-02), based on provision C.9.d. of the permit, for outreach to residents, commercial businesses, and pest control operators.

b. Mercury Pollution Prevention Outreach

This project encompasses several tasks in the Program's Mercury Pollution Prevention Plan (3-1-02), provision C.9.c. of the permit. It involves public education regarding the effects of mercury on the environment, products containing mercury and proper disposal of such products. The project is in the fourth year of implementing the Program's Mercury Pollution Prevention Plan, is consistent with the public education tasks and is consistent the previous year's budget.

c. Program Supplies

Estimated budget for reprints of materials for Program use and other Program supplies.

10. Project Monitoring Special Studies (see collaborative group)

11. NPDES Permit Renewal

This task includes resources for permit negotiation and renewal. The estimated budget assumes no additional work is required for the application and that all stakeholder meetings will be combined as part of development and negotiation of the regional permit.

COLLABORATIVE GROUP

- a. **Program Monitoring Special Studies:** 10% of monitoring project group allocated to cover any necessary changes in scope of the projects requiring consultant services. The amount is to be set at approximately 10 percent of the total budget of the Projects Group (excluding the PI/P tasks) as per the MOA, however funds are not currently available to met this requirement.
- b. **WE&O – Watershed Support Fund:** No funds available in this FY for WE&O grass roots approach to educate communities via stewardship grants and projects.
- c. **CASQA Dues (Regional Collaboration):** Statewide stormwater Organization dues
- d. **TMDL CEP (Regional Collaboration):** These resources are used to fund the participation (i.e., technical participation annual cost) in the Clean Estuary Program (TMDL MOU between the RWQCB, BASMAA and BACWA). The CEP has requested \$147,000 per year, however, because of other higher priority items all Bay area storm water programs reduced their contributions by approximately 1/3 and plan to continue participation at this reduced rate for the next FY.
- e. **RMP fee (Regional Collaboration):** The RMP is a program initiated by the Regional Board to monitor the water quality of San Francisco Bay. The San Francisco Estuary Institute has a contract to conduct sampling in the Bay and administer the program with oversight from the Regional Board. The Program is one of a number of dischargers contributing to the cost of the program. It is expected that the Program will continue to fund the RMP at about the same level for each fiscal year for the term of the permit.
- f. **BASMAA Fee (Regional Collaboration):** BASMAA is the local regional stormwater association. The Program has and expected to continue to fund the organization at about the same level for each fiscal year for the term of the permit. However, the budget has been increased this FY to allow for an increase in Executive Officer administrative expenses and some collaborative payment for technical and/or legal services in anticipation of development of the RGP.²
- g. **NPDES Fee:** This is the annual fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board for NPDES municipal storm water permits in the San Francisco Bay area. In FY 02-03, the SWRCB increased the annual fee from \$10,000 to \$54,000, which was absorbed into the overall Program budget. During FY 03-04, the SWRCB increased the fees to \$161,000, which again was absorbed into the overall Program budget. The SWRCB individually billed the Co-permittees approximately \$162,000 for FY 04-05. While the SWRCB has initiated meetings with stakeholders relative to the FY 05-06

² The Executive Director of BASMAA at the December 3, 2004 BASMAA meeting proposed an increase to the BASMAA budget to cover joint BASMAA costs related to legal and technical services as well as administrative costs. The Executive Board will be discussing this proposal in January and February. The initial reaction was positive relative to developing an approach to more equitably share legal and technical costs. In addition, the Executive Board expressed the desire once again to shift other expenses such as those associated with the copper initiative to the CEP and to not significantly raise BASMAA's costs. SCVURPPP pointed out that budgets are being squeezed while at the same time new permit requirements are expected and that an increase in the BASMAA budget was unlikely to get SCVURPPP support.

fees, no estimates are currently available. Therefore, the fee has been increased by 5% to \$169,529³. This estimate has not been absorbed into the overall budget. To absorb these fees as was done in past years would require further reductions in Program tasks that would significantly impact meeting permit requirements and further result in a reduction of contributions to regional collaborative programs.

- h. **WERF Dues:** Covers the Programs costs as member of WERF.
- i. **MOA Review:** Based on direction from the MC the Program shall conduct an independent review by December 31, 2005 to evaluate the MOA's cost allocation formula and evaluate the term, scope and cost of the Program MOA (see MOA 2.04.01).

Attachment 1 – HMP memo (revised)
Revised Co-permittee Assessments

³ Results of the December 16, 2004 SWRCB Fee Stakeholder Group meeting indicate that MS4 storm water fees could remain relatively stable for FY 05-06.

**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

Draft Distributed to BATG and MC on Dec.15, 2004, approved by MC on February 17, 2005

TOTAL PROGRAM FY 05-06 BUDGET

Budget Summary

<u>Item</u>	<u>Staff Hours</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
<u>Operational Group</u>		
1. Program Management/Administration (EOA)	3176	\$454,168
2. Permit Management (EOA)	3359	\$481,408
3. Technical Program Management (EOA)	1100	\$143,000
4. Legal Service (MOFO)	0	\$87,818
5. Fiscal Agent (SCVWD)	0	\$50,000
6. RMP Contribution (SFEI) (see Collaborative Budget)		
Sub-total: Operational Group	7635	\$1,216,394
<u>Projects Group</u>		
7. Monitoring Projects (EOA/Subs)	769	\$735,000
8. HMP Technical Assistance/Guidance/Workshops	1806	\$234,797
9. PIP & WEO budget	577	\$378,200
10. Project Monitoring Special Study (10% per MOA - moved to Collaborative Group)		
11. NPDES Permit Renewal	577	\$75,000
Sub-total: Project Group	3729	\$1,422,997
<u>Collaborative Group</u>		
A. Program Monitoring Special Studies		\$80,000
B. WE&O - Watershed Support Fund		\$0
C. CASQA Dues (Regional Collaboration)		\$15,000
D. TMDL CEP Participation (Regional Collaboration)		\$97,000
E. RMP Fee (Regional Collaboration)		\$168,480
F. BASMAA Fee (Regional Collaboration)		\$85,000
G. WERF Dues		\$8,000
H. MOA Review		\$25,000
Subtotal Collaborative Group		\$478,480
NPDES Permit fee		\$169,529
TOTAL PROGRAM BUDGET	11364	\$3,287,400

**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

TOTAL PROGRAM FY 05-06 BUDGET
Budget Summary

<u>Item</u>	<u>Staff Hours</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Budget</u>
<u>Operational Group</u>			
1. Program Management/Administration (EOA)			
a. Administrative Assistance	768	\$99,840	\$99,840
b. Management Committee and Task Group Support			\$177,840
i. Management Committee	576	\$74,880	
ii. Task Groups	792	\$102,960	
c. Program Budget Administration			\$51,480
i. Develop Budgets	140	\$18,200	
ii. Prepare Expenditure Reports ¹	256	\$33,280	
d. Coordinate with Legal Consultant	184	\$23,920	\$23,920
e. Develop and Manage PI/P Program (non-watershed watch campaign tasks)	400	\$52,000	\$52,000
f. Performance Evaluation	60	\$7,800	\$7,800
g. Expenses		\$41,288	\$41,288
Subtotal	3176	\$454,168	\$454,168
2. Permit Management (EOA)			
a. Report Preparation and Submittal			\$96,720
i. Annual Report	384	\$49,920	
ii. Work Plans	360	\$46,800	
b. Internal Co-permittee Liaison			\$68,640
i. Develop Guidance	144	\$18,720	
ii. Local Program Reviews (delay until FY 04-05)	0	\$0	
iii. Conduct Training (4 Workshops)	384	\$49,920	
c. External Organization Meetings ²	1064	\$138,320	\$138,320
d. NDC Implementation Assistance, Tracking & Reporting	400	\$52,000	\$52,000
e. Implement Continuous Improvement Items	238	\$31,000	\$31,000
f. TMDL Program Tracking, Review & Reporting	385	\$50,000	\$50,000
g. Expenses		\$44,728	\$44,728
Subtotal	3359	\$481,408	\$481,408

**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

**TOTAL PROGRAM FY 04-05 BUDGET
Budget Summary**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Staff Hours</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Budget</u>
3. Technical Program Management (EOA)			
a. Prepare RFPs, Technical Project Management	400	\$52,000	\$52,000
b. Technical Review of Work Products	400	\$52,000	\$52,000
c. Develop/Revise Performance Standards	200	\$26,000	\$26,000
d. Expenses	100	\$13,000	\$13,000
Subtotal	1100	\$143,000	\$143,000
4. Legal Services	0	\$87,818	\$87,818
5. Fiscal Agent	0	\$50,000	\$50,000
6. Fees			
a. NPDES Permit Fee (SWRCB) (Moved to Collaborative)	0		
b. Regional Monitoring Program Contribution (moved to collaborative)	0		
Subtotal	1100	\$137,818	\$137,818
Operational Group Total		\$1,216,394	\$1,216,394
<u>Projects Group</u>			
7. Monitoring Projects ¹	769	\$735,000	\$735,000
8. HMP Technical Assistance/Guidance/Workshops	1806	\$234,797	\$234,797
9. PIP & WEO budget ^{2,3}			
a. Watershed Education and Outreach Campaign	385	\$308,200	\$308,200
b. Pesticide User (PU) Outreach		\$40,000	\$40,000
c. Mercury Pollution Prevention Outreach	192	\$25,000	\$25,000
d. BASMAA Regional Collaboration (See Collaborative)			
e. Program Supplies		\$5,000	\$5,000
10. Project Monitoring Special Study (10% per MOA - moved to Collaborative Group)			
11. Permit Renewal			
a. RGP Negotiations	577	\$75,000	\$75,000
	0	\$0	\$0
	0	\$0	\$0
Projects Group Total	3729	\$1,422,997	\$1,422,997

¹ Scope is based on the Program's Multi-Year (8-year) Monitoring Plan.

² On February 15, 2001 the MC approved the Budget Adhoc Task Groups recommendation to incorporate certain elements of the PIP budget into the Projects Group budget.

³ Budget based on WE&O Ad Hoc Task Group draft memo dated December 17, 2003 regarding workplan options and budgets.

**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

TOTAL PROGRAM FY 05-06 BUDGET
Budget Summary

<u>Item</u>	<u>Staff Hours</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Budget</u>
<u>Collaborative Group</u>			
A. Program Monitoring Special Studies		\$80,000	\$80,000
B. WE&O - Watershed Support for Citizen Participation		\$0	\$0
C. CASQA Dues (Regional Collaboration)		\$15,000	\$15,000
D. TMDL CEP Participation (Regional Collaboration)		\$97,000	\$97,000
E. RMP Fee (Regional Collaboartion)		\$168,480	\$168,480
F. BASMAA Fee (Regional Collaboration)		\$85,000	\$85,000
G. WERF Member Dues		\$8,000	\$8,000
H. MOA Review		\$25,000	\$25,000
Subtotal: Collaborative Group		\$478,480	\$478,480
SUBTOTAL PROGRAM FY 05-06 BUDGET		\$3,117,871	\$3,117,871
NPDES Fee		\$169,529	\$169,529
TOTAL BUDGET W/PERMIT FEES		\$3,287,400	\$3,287,400



**Santa Clara Valley
Urban Runoff
Pollution Prevention Program**

Campbell • Cupertino • Los Altos • Los Altos Hills • Los Gatos • Milpitas • Monte Sereno • Mountain View • Palo Alto
San Jose • Santa Clara • Saratoga • Sunnyvale • Santa Clara County • Santa Clara Valley Water District

TO: Adam Olivieri

FROM: Jill Bicknell

DATE: December 15, 2004 (Draft)
January 4, 2005 (Draft)
February 7, 2005 (Draft)
February 17, 2005 (Final)

SUBJECT: FY 05-06 C3/HMP Budget

This memo describes the estimated budget needs for SCVURPPP tasks related to implementation of Permit Provision C.3. (New and Redevelopment) and in particular, the Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP, C.3.f.).

C.3. Tasks and Budget (Not Including HMP)

By the end of FY 04-05, most of the tasks in the original multi-year C.3. Work Plan will be done, except for ongoing reporting and implementation assistance. Anticipated needs for implementation assistance in FY 05-06 include:

- Continued assistance with SCVURPPP agencies' implementation of BMP O&M verification programs (but no Program-wide database development yet).
- Regional roundtable meetings with agency staff from SCVURPPP and other stormwater programs to share information about implementation strategies and experience (facilitate through BASMAA?);
- Continued supervision of BASMAA project for developing automated BMP sizing/design tool (covered by FY 04-05 collaborative budget item).
- Workshop on implementation and design of certain BMPs, such as bioretention, planter boxes, green roofs, etc. (covered by workshops budget);
- Continued guidance and assistance with annual reporting of C.3. information (covered by annual reporting budget).
- Development of model standard drawings and specifications for certain BMPs, to assist developers and City staff with design/review (beyond sizing calcs.);

Note that: 1) several of these items were suggested by San Jose staff, and I would like to work with the C3PO AHTG at its next meeting to come up with an agreed upon list of priorities for the

FY 05-06 Work Plan; and 2) the last two bullet items can be accomplished under other program management task budgets, assuming they stay at about the same level as FY 04-05.

HMP Tasks

It is assumed that by the beginning of FY 05-06, the HMP Report will be finalized and the focus will be on assistance to the local agencies and development community with outreach and implementation. Many of the tasks listed on the "Summary of Next Steps" (rev. 11/22/04) are scheduled for completion in FY 04-05. Anticipated tasks for FY 05-06 include the following:

- Develop fact sheets for outreach to local agencies and developers;
- Conduct one or more workshops on HMP implementation (covered by workshops budget);
- Continue to develop approach for quantifying the flow control benefits of site design measures/ IMPs;
- Conduct additional implementation studies for example sites in SC Valley (recommend separate line item for special studies);
- Continue BAHM development project (continuation of FY 04-05 collaborative budget item);
- Continue to coordinate with other Bay Area stormwater programs to work toward a consistent approach for the Bay Area;

Budget Estimates

The table below describes the FY 04-05 and FY 05-06 budgets for C.3./HMP tasks:

Budget Line Item	FY 04-05 Budget	FY 05-06 Budget	Comments
NDC Implementation Assistance, Tracking and Reporting	\$50,000	\$52,000	
BASMAA Stormwater Design Tool, Phase I and II (Collaborative Budget)	\$28,600	\$0	Design tool project to continue into FY 05-06.
HMP Technical Assistance, Guidance and Workshops	\$100,000	\$80,000	Workshops to be covered under Program workshops budget
HMP Practicability Analysis (Collaborative Budget)	\$36,000	\$0	
Bay Area Hydrology Model (Collaborative Budget)	\$66,845	\$125,000	Total Estimated Project Budget = \$192,000 ⁽¹⁾
Special Study for C.3. or HMP Implementation	\$0	\$29,797	To be designated as needed for SCVURPPP or regional project
TOTAL	\$281,445	\$286,797	

Notes:

- 1) \$30K for contribution to BAHM modifications, \$100K for watershed calibration, and \$30K for BAHM support/training in FY 05-06 (assumed contribution of half of total estimated cost), plus 20% for administration and project management.

**SCVURPPP FY 05-06 ESTIMATED BUDGET ASSESSMENTS
(2/17/05)**

		TOTAL FY 05-06 OPER / PROJ/COLL CONTRIBUTION \$3,117,871	PERMIT FEE \$169,529	TOTAL ASSESSMENT
Co-Permittee	Program Contribution			
Campbell	1.88%	\$58,616	\$7,776	\$66,392
Cupertino	2.46%	\$76,700	\$11,664	\$88,364
Los Altos	1.59%	\$49,574	\$7,776	\$57,350
Los Altos Hills	0.43%	\$13,407	\$3,111	\$16,518
Los Gatos	1.74%	\$54,251	\$7,776	\$62,027
Milpitas	2.75%	\$85,741	\$11,664	\$97,406
Monte Sereno	0.14%	\$4,365	\$3,111	\$7,476
Mountain View	3.91%	\$121,909	\$11,664	\$133,573
Palo Alto	4.06%	\$126,586	\$11,664	\$138,250
San Jose	30.01%	\$935,673	\$31,106	\$966,779
Santa Clara	6.23%	\$194,243	\$19,442	\$213,685
Saratoga	1.59%	\$49,574	\$7,776	\$57,350
Sunnyvale	7.25%	\$226,046	\$19,442	\$245,487
County of Santa Clara	5.94%	\$185,202	\$15,554	\$200,755
SCVWD	30.02%	\$935,985	\$0	\$935,985
	100.00%	\$3,117,871	\$169,529	\$3,287,400
<i>* Permit Fee estimate for budget purposes</i>				