File Number:	
(Provided by C	lerk of Board of Supervisors)

Grant Resolution Information Form

(Effective July 2011)

Purpose: Accompanies proposed Board of Supervisors resolutions authorizing a Department to accept and expend grant funds.

The following describes the grant referred to in the accompanying resolution:

- 1. Grant Title: Round 2 Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Funds from the California Department of Water Resources
- 2. Department: SFPUC

3. Contact Person: Erin Hagan Telephone: (415) 554-0706

4. Grant Approval Status (check one):

[X] Approved by funding agency [] Not yet approved

- 5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: \$ 234,000
- **6.** a. Matching Funds Required: \$724,383
 - b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable):

 Funds for the SFPUC match will come from Water Conservation Large Landscape

 Program index code CUW265, 502651
- 7. a. Grant Source Agency: California Department of Water Resources
 - b. Grant Pass-Through Agency (if applicable):
- **8.** Proposed Grant Project Summary:

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) applied for a Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management Program Grant from the State of California, Department of Water Resources (DWR) to help fund the implementation and operation of 19 local, subregional, and regional water conservation, water recycling, ecosystem restoration, green infrastructure, and flood managementwatershed projects to be carried out by the participating agencies. DWR and ABAG entered into a grant agreement in July 2014, whereby State grant funds will be disbursed by DWR to ABAG, the fiscal agent for the grant funds, on a reimbursement basis. DWR awarded ABAG a total grant of \$20,000,000 in State funding, of which \$2.7 million is for regional water conservation projects for 12 agencies, including the SFPUC. On behalf of the 12 agencies slated to receive grant funds for water conservation projects. the Solano County Water Agency (SCWA) has entered into an Implementation Agreement with ABAG by which ABAG agrees to disburse funding from the State Grant to SCWA for SCWA to use in administration and performance of eligible water conservation projects. The SCWA, in turn, seeks to execute MOUs with each of the participating 12 agencies to enable the SCWA to disburse State grant funds for eligible water conservation programs. The SFPUC's portion of the \$2.7 million award for water conservation is \$234,300, which the SFPUC will apply toward implementation of its Large Landscape Water Conservation Program.

9. Grant Project Schedule, as allowed in approval documents, or as proposed:

Start-Date: February 1, 2015

End-Date: Large Landscape Water Conservation Program improvements to be funded in part by these grant funds are expected to be complete by December 2017. This MOU will be in effect as long as the Implementation Agreement between ABAG and SCWA terminates on December 31, 2018, or when all of the Parties' obligations under the State Agreement are fully satisfied, whichever occurs earlier..

10. a.	Amount	budaeted f	or contractual	services: \$234,300
10. a.	AIIIUUIII	Duudeteu i	ui cuilliactuai	SCI VICES. WESTING

- b. Will contractual services be put out to bid? Yes
- c. If so, will contract services help to further the goals of the Department's Local Business Enterprise (LBE) requirements? **Yes**
- d. Is this likely to be a one-time or ongoing request for contracting out? **One time**

11. a.	Does	s the budget include indirect	costs?	
	[] Ye	es [X] No		
b.	1.	If yes, how much? \$		
b.	2.	How was the amount calc	culated?	
C.	1.	If no, why are indirect costs not included?		
		ed by granting agency	[X] To maximize use of grant funds on direct services	
[] Oth	ner (ple	ease explain):		

c. 2. If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs?

12. Any other significant grant requirements or comments:

Disability Access Checklist*(Department must forward a copy of all completed Grant Information Forms to the Mayor's Office of Disability)					
13. This Grant is intended for activities at (check all that apply):					
[] Existing Site(s) [] Rehabilitated Site(s) [] New Site(s)	[] Existing Structure(s) [] Rehabilitated Structure(s) [] New Structure(s)	[] Existing Program(s) or Service(s) [] New Program(s) or Service(s)			
14. The Departmental ADA Coordinator or the Mayor's Office on Disability have reviewed the proposal and concluded that the project as proposed will be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and all other Federal, State and local disability rights laws and regulations and will allow the full inclusion of persons with disabilities. These requirements include, but are not limited to:					
1. Having staff trained in h	now to provide reasonable modifica	ations in policies, practices and procedures;			
2. Having auxiliary aids ar	nd services available in a timely ma	anner in order to ensure communication access;			
3. Ensuring that any service areas and related facilities open to the public are architecturally accessible and have been inspected and approved by the DPW Access Compliance Officer or the Mayor's Office on Disability Compliance Officers.					
If such access would be tecl	nnically infeasible, this is described	I in the comments section below:			
Comments:					
Departmental ADA Coordinator or Mayor's Office of Disability Reviewer:					
(Name)					
(Title)					
Date Reviewed:					
		(Signature Required)			
Department Head or Designee Approval of Grant Information Form:					
(Name)					
(Title)		 			
Date Reviewed:					
		(Signature Required)			