

**Program Project Information Form
Watershed Program – Full Proposal Cover Sheet**

Attach to the cover of full proposal. All applicants must fill out this Information Form for their proposal. Failure to answer these questions and include them with the application will result in the application being considered nonresponsive and not considered for funding.

1. Full Proposal Title: Watershed Action Plan for Santa Clara Basin

Concept Proposal Title/Number: Watershed Action Plan for Santa Clara Basin
Applicant: Santa Clara Valley Water District
Applicant Name: Jim Fiedler, Deputy Operating Officer
Applicant Mailing Address: 5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118
Applicant Telephone: (408) 265-2607 x2736 Applicant Fax: (408) 266-6256
Applicant Email: jimfied@scvwd.dst.ca.us
Fiscal Agent Name (if different from above): Sarah Young, Special Program Administrator
Fiscal Agent Mailing Address: 5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118
Fiscal Agent Telephone: (408) 265-2607 x 2468 Fiscal Agent Fax: (408) 266-6257
Fiscal Agent Email: sarayoun@scvwd.dst.ca.us

2. Type of Project: Indicate the primary topic for which you are applying (check only one)

<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity Building	<input type="checkbox"/> Outreach
<input type="checkbox"/> Education	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Research

3. Type of Applicant:

<input type="checkbox"/> Academic Institution/University	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Profit
<input type="checkbox"/> Federal Agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Party
<input type="checkbox"/> Joint Venture	<input type="checkbox"/> State Agency
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Government	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribe or Tribal Government

4. Location (including County):

What major watershed is the project primarily located in:

Klamath River (Coast and Cascade Ranges)
 Sacramento River (Coast, Cascade and Sierra Ranges)
 San Joaquin River (Coast and Sierra Ranges)
 Bay-Delta (Coast and Sierra Ranges)
 South CA (Coast and Sierra Ranges)
 Tulare Basin (Coast, Sierra and Tehachapi Ranges)

5. Account of funding requested: \$350,000

Cost share/in-kind partners? Yes No
Identify partners and amount contributed by each:

Cities of San Jose, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale and in-kind services provided by stakeholders participating in the Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative. The total amount is estimated at \$ 409,000.

6. Have you received funding from CALFED before? Yes No
If yes, identify project title and source of funds:

The District has received cost-share funding from CALFED directly or indirectly. CALFED directly supported part of *the Fisheries Aquatic Habit Collaborative Efforts*. Though not directly funded to the District, the District is co-managing another effort along with the City of San Jose for the *Cold Water Fisheries and Water Quality Element for the State of the Santa Clara Basin Report*. This grant helped fund part of the Initiative's Watershed Assessment process.

By signing below, the applicant declares the following:

1. The truthfulness of all representations in their proposal
2. The individual signing this form is entitled to submit the application on behalf of the applicant (if the applicant is an entity or an organization)
3. The person submitting the application has read and understood the conflict interest and confidentiality discussion in the Watershed Program Proposal Solicitation Package and waives any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant, to the extent provided in the Proposal Solicitation Package.

James Fiedler, Deputy Operating Officer, Santa Clara Valley Water District

Printed Name of applicant

Signature of applicant

1. Describe your project, its underlying assumptions, expected outcomes, timetable for completion, and general methodology or process.

a. Project Description

Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative (the Initiative) is aimed at developing an implementable Watershed Action Plan. In the past five years, representatives from over 30 stakeholder entities have been working together, following the process developed by the group.

Exhibit 1 depicts the location and boundary of the watershed, and Exhibit 2 the planning process used for work. At this point, the Initiative has successfully completed watershed characteristic report (Volume 1), developed a consensus-based watershed assessment framework, and is in the process of finishing up the assessment of three pilot watershed areas in the basin.

Building on the Initiative's previous/on-going work, the Watershed Action Plan will serve as a tool, and provide a framework for stakeholders to take on projects and programs in a coordinated, and effective manner. This framework is aimed at achieving the attainment of beneficial uses and the flood protection interest, and facilitating the fulfillment of Initiative's mission, i.e., to protect and enhance the watershed, creating a sustainable future for the community and the environment.

The Plan would address many inter-related elements in the watershed planning process. Such elements may include: local agency-lead efforts, such as the Water District's Clean, Safe Creeks Program, the City of San Jose's Riparian Restoration Action Plan; the Regional Board's Clean Water Act 303 (d) listing efforts; and various community-lead watershed monitoring and hands-on restoration efforts. Ultimately, the framework would serve to:

- improve regulatory efficiency and effectiveness,
- offer performance measures for checking project/program effectiveness and efficiency in addressing watershed issues,
- provide a comprehensive watershed assessment approach,
- devise a data management structure for adaptive resources management practices, and to
- encourage expenditure of both public and private funds for addressing watershed issues.

b. Underlying Assumptions

The underlying assumptions for this project are that the stakeholders from the Initiative are committed to support the work for developing the Watershed Action Plan. Staff support for active and effective representation in the Initiative's work is essential.

Additionally, the Initiative's assessment work for Upper Penitencia, Guadalupe, and the San Francisquito would provide the basis for identifying basin-wide issues, and would help ground-truth action elements developed by the Initiative subgroups.

Finally, adequate funding from regional agencies, such as the CALFED, would help to motivate local government to continue its support the Initiative, by sending their staff, and by cost-sharing contract work needed.

c. Key Outcomes

Key outcomes for developing such a tool and framework would include the following:

- Minimizing repetitive work, measured by multiple uses of and improved distribution for common WMI work products
- Shared framework for bench marking watershed health, measured by the establishment and adoption
- Shared framework for prioritizing, decision making and ownership of the work products,, measured by the level of commitment for implementation
- Increased level of interests and understanding of watershed issues, measured by quantity and quality of workshops hosted by the Initiative's work groups, and attendance at workshops and meetings

Ultimate, this would significantly improve Initiative's capacity to strategically address watershed issues in the basin.

Key work products developed in this process may include the following:

- 1) A comprehensive mechanism to facilitate and improve coordination and assistance among its stakeholders. The Initiative has functioned as a clearinghouse for exchanging information and sharing view points on watershed issues. To institutionalize this function, and to allow the information and knowledge gained through participating in the Initiative infiltrate through the entities that each stakeholder representative serve, would help bring tangible benefits to the operations of these entities and would be important for continued support of the Initiative.
- 2) The Initiative's stakeholders have analyzed the institutional capacities for collecting watershed related data from several resource entities. The next step is to recommend specific mechanisms for effective use of these data, outlining specific mechanisms for sharing, exchanging, and updating watershed information among resource agencies such as the Santa Clara Valley Water District, the Department of Fish and Game, the City of San Jose, the San Francisco Estuary Institute, and the US Geological Survey, and others.
- 3) A set of monitoring/assessment approaches that would allow for adaptive management. The intent is to establish benchmark for documenting and monitoring watershed health improvements, which would expand the foundation for adaptive management. This would involve comparing watershed assessment approaches used by stakeholders, and recommending improvements, and/or developing scenarios for effective uses of approaches evaluated.
- 4) A strategy for environmental compliance. As part of the work process, a strategy needs to be developed for complying with potential regulatory requirements for implementation of the actions developed. The strategy needs to address both programmatic and site-specific elements of the Action Plan.
- 5) A framework for outreach and education to different target audiences. The Initiative has been successful in working at the technical staff level, and has recognized the need to engage more policy or decision makers into the process. Ultimately, the Initiative needs to develop a framework for stakeholder implementation, which would include reaching out to policy or decision makers, technical staff, and the general public.

d. Expected Time-Table

The Initiative already started the process of developing the action items for the Watershed Action Plan. Exhibit 3 depicts the approximate timeline for developing the Watershed Action Plan. As shown the process has begun and grant from the CALFED would allow the Initiative to fund the contracting services needed.

e. Process Used for Developing the Plan

We propose to use a dynamic, progressive and adaptive process for developing these work products and to achieve the expected outcomes. Exhibit 4 depicts the process for completing the Watershed Action Plan.

In this process, stakeholders would participate in Core Group, where decisions are made and consensus is reached. Technical discussions would be facilitated through participation in the Initiative's subgroups, such as groups focused on issues, such flood management, land use, regulatory, sustainable water supply, and wetlands; groups focused on functions, such as communication/outreach, watershed assessment, and data management; and workgroups to focus on completing a specific project. For example, CALFED's grant would be managed through; this process has been practiced by Initiative and is being refined by better effectiveness and efficiency. The Initiative continues to build its institutional capacity to engage in a consensus-based, productive work process.

2. Describe your qualifications and readiness to implement the proposed project.

a. Describe the level of institutional structure, ability and experience to administer funds and conduct the project. Identify the fiscal agent responsible for handling the funds.

The stakeholders for the Initiative have been working together for over four years. Through cost-sharing arrangements, the Initiative funded several contracts for which the District provided fiscal support. The District is experienced in facilitating partnership agreements among stakeholders of the Initiative, e.g., the cities of San Jose, Sunnyvale, and Palo Alto.

For contracting services required for this project, a workgroup would be formed to assist in managing the contract, and to provide the oversight needed to ensure the actions developed are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Initiative.

The District would be the fiscal agent for the project. The District has a strong history of managing local, state, and federal funds. The District also has significant watershed experience, on a basin-wide level and sub-watershed level.

b. Describe technical support available (including support needed for environmental compliance and permitting) to begin and complete the project in a timely manner.

As a major stakeholder in the Initiative, staff from the District has gained great experience in working with the stakeholder process, and in understanding the dynamics and complexity of watershed issues. Technical support that are available included but not limited to:

- Project management/coordination and team work
- Meeting facilitation
- Stakeholder process and public education and outreach
- Data management (including Geographic Information System, and other database systems)
- Watershed assessment/monitoring

Our key staff working on the Initiative is experienced in working with watershed issues and is trained in hydrology, biology, engineering, public health, public administration, data management, public outreach, and other watershed related areas. Additionally, the District's team can always tap into the staff/volunteer resources represented at the Initiative. They bring in the perspectives of the environmental advocacy groups, and community based grass-roots efforts,

c. List any previous projects of this type you or your partners have implemented, funded either by CALFED or other Programs.

The District has received cost-share funding from CALFED directly or indirectly. CALFED directly supported part of *the Fisheries Aquatic Habit Collaborative Efforts*. Though not directly funded to the District, the District is co-managing another effort along with the City of San Jose for the *Cold Water Fisheries and Water Quality Element for the State of the Santa Clara Basin Report*. This grant helped fund part of the Initiative's Watershed Assessment process.

3. Provide a completed budget cost sheet and describe the basis for determining project costs, including comparisons with other similar projects, salary comparisons, and other listed costs. Include all costs of environmental compliance, such as CEQA and/or NEPA, and permits. Describe how the approach to achieving the stated goals of the project demonstrates an effective cost relative to its anticipated benefits.

A budget sheet is provided in Exhibit 5. This estimate is based on the District direct work experience in managing a contract, which amounted to over \$1 million dollars, in support of the Initiative. We also based on the Initiative's financial report (see Exhibit 6) to estimate the monetary amount of in-kind services from local entities, and on the contracting services for the Project Coordinator and the Project Facilitator.

As shown in the budget estimate, CEQA or NEPA compliance, and permits costs were not programmed in this sheet. As our intent here as stated earlier is to bring cost-effective solutions for addressing environmental compliance issues. Such solutions would include

institutionalizing the costs for environmental compliance as part of the operational costs for broad-based implementation. This may involve modeling the CALFED Watershed Program to come up with a programmatic approach for addressing compliance issues.

The budget reflects the intent to integrate CALFED grant, the Initiative's contracting services and in-kind services provided by staff from stakeholder groups, participating in the work of subgroups, Core Groups, or workgroups. It is based upon first-hand working knowledge with the Initiative and it brings a cost-effective solution to achieve the outcomes of the project, and to get the work products outlined in Section 1.

4. Describe the technical feasibility of the proposed project.

a. Describe any similarity to previously implemented successful projects in this community or elsewhere.

The Initiative is attempting a fresh approach in the region. As shown in Exhibit 1, the Basin is defined as the portion of San Francisco Bay (the Bay) south of Dumbarton Bridge and the 840-square-mile area of land that drains to it. Although water quality in this southern extremity of the Bay has improved in the last 30 years, the Lower South Bay is still regarded as an impaired water body as are a number of its tributary streams. Any further improvements depend on implementation of a management program that takes account of all human activities that influence water quality, not just the municipal wastewater and urban runoff discharges that have been the focus of most regulatory attention to date. The purpose of the Initiative is to develop and implement such a comprehensive program.

In 1996, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State Water Resources Control Board, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board), working with local government agencies and special interest groups, established the Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative (the Initiative). It was intended to serve as a pilot project for California's Statewide Watershed Management Initiative. The Initiative is being guided by a group of stakeholders, that is individuals and representatives of organizations, who have a stake or interest in the outcome of the Initiative. The stakeholders include representatives of local, state, and federal government agencies, business, agricultural and industry associations, and environmental and civic groups.

b. If the project proposes a new approach or new method with a high likelihood of adding new knowledge and or techniques, or with the potential to fill identified gaps in existing knowledge, describe how it will do so, and what monitoring components will provide substantiation of results.

The comprehensive and strategic approach and work products outlined in Section 1 would fill many gaps in addressing watershed issues for the region.

The Initiative already has a great track record for coming up with new approaches. For instance, a consensus-based Watershed Assessment Framework had been developed by the Initiative.

As stated in Section 1 watershed monitoring would always be an important component for developing the Watershed Action Plan. The Initiative already completed a Watershed Characteristics Report, and is on its way to start the assessment of three pilot watershed areas using the assessment framework developed. As part of this assessment process, existing monitoring data, data deficiency analysis, along with other processes outlined in the assessment framework would be used to provide substantiation of assessment results.

c. Explain how the finished project will be maintained as necessary, and to what degree it may require continued funding from outside the community.

Once consensus-based action items are identified, prioritized, funding options would be explored. Such options would include seeking external funding, establishing partnerships, and integrating into the operations of the stakeholders. Depends on action items, the degree it may require external funding would vary. Nevertheless, the Initiative has sustained their efforts for the past four years mainly through local funding, and supports from community volunteers. The great interest and enthusiasm to watershed-approach remains high.

5. Describe how the monitoring component of the project will help determine the effectiveness of project implementation and assist the project proponent and CALFED with adaptive management processes.

a. Identify performance measures appropriate for the stated goals and objectives of the project.

Exhibit 7 depicts the worksheet that the Initiative would be used to come up with the action elements for the plan. As shown, all action items developed by the subgroups would be specific, measurable, achievable, result-oriented, and time-bound i.e., SMART. Performance measures would include programmatic and project specific measures. Ultimately watershed monitoring related action items would be derived by the Watershed Assessment subgroup. The subgroup consists of staff, volunteers who are trained and experienced in watershed monitoring issue. Measures developed in the Watershed Action Plan would be quantitative and would be designed to allow timely evaluation of the effectiveness of the watershed management activities, and allow for adaptive management processes.

b. Describe how this project will coordinate with and support other local and regional monitoring efforts.

The Initiative has developed a system to track regional efforts for developing an improved approach to watershed monitoring and assessment. Such a tracking effort is part of the work process of the Initiative. The system is maintained and updated by the Watershed Assessment Subgroup and is shared with any stakeholders who has an interest in watershed monitoring and assessment efforts. This subgroup will continue to work

with others on the Initiative to build on their tracking efforts and to develop action items to address issues related to watershed monitoring and assessment efforts

c. Provide a description of any citizen monitoring programs that will be part of this project.

The process used, as depicted in Exhibit 4, would be an open and inclusive one. It would encourage consensus building and open discussion. Citizen groups are represented at the Watershed Assessment subgroup and other monitoring-issue related groups. Any citizen monitoring program would be considered in the work process.

Additionally, all meeting hosted by the Initiative is open to interested parties and meeting. Citizen monitoring of the work process is always encouraged.

Finally, a key work product for the project is to devise an outreach and education effort to broaden the support and implementation of the action elements developed. Thus, the citizen monitoring program is an integral part of this project.

d. What monitoring protocols will be used, and are they widely accepted as standard protocols?

As shown in Exhibits 3 and 4, watershed assessment work has already been under way. Using the consensus-based Watershed Assessment Framework developed by the Initiative, the assessment of three watershed areas would not only help determine the support levels of beneficial uses and flood management interest, it would also provide an opportunity for recommending improvements to the assessment framework.

Additionally, the Initiative is tracking watershed monitoring efforts in the region and as part of this project, watershed monitoring protocols could be identified.

e. Describe how the type and manner of data collection and analysis will be useful for informing local decision making.

Developing processes for data collection and analysis has been part of the Initiative's work process; it has successfully developed a consensus based framework for conducting watershed assessment in the region. Such a framework would allow a consensus-based approach for determining whether beneficial uses/stakeholder interests are supported, using available data, in various sub-watersheds and stream reaches in the Santa Clara Basin. Using this framework, programmatic recommendations would be developed to begin to identify the factors that affect beneficial use support and achievement of stakeholder interests in Santa Clara Basin's streams as well as provide a scientific basis for selecting and evaluating alternative management strategies. It was recognized that this assessment process would not always yield definitive answers with respect to the fitness of a waterbody for a beneficial use, and in many cases, data deficiencies and methodological difficulties will allow only partial or qualified conclusions.

Additionally, as part of the Watershed Action Plan, outreach strategies for influencing local decision making would be explored.

6. If this project is to develop specific watershed conservation, maintenance or restoration actions, describe the scientific basis for the action(s) described in the proposal. Include the following:

Though the intent of the Watershed Action Plan is to help develop specific watershed conservation, maintenance or restoration action, the project proposed herein would not qualify as such. Therefore, this question does not apply to this proposal. However, we answered the first item, to further demonstrate the Initiative's capacity to build upon the groundwork completed so far.

a. Any assessment of watershed condition(s) that has already been developed by you or others.

Numerous assessment reports are available and are being collected by the Initiative's ongoing watershed assessment process. The following highlights major the assessments completed by the Initiative:

Framework for Watershed Assessment (February 2000). This document describes a suggested procedural framework for using environmental indicators to conduct the Watershed Assessment. The framework consists of a set of decision tools for determining the support levels of five primary uses/stakeholder interests, including cold freshwater habitat, preservation of rare and endangered species, water-contact recreation, municipal and domestic supply and protection of flooding.

Metadata Database System(March 2000). The system was developed to help collecting watershed information for the assessment work. Metadata is information about a data set, which include who owns the data, what watershed the data were obtained in, the years when sampling was conducted, and the format that the data is in. This system has been used for compiling the Watershed Characteristics Report, and is being used for the Watershed Assessment work as well.

Watershed Characteristics Report (May 2000 for the abridged version, and February 2001 for the unabridged version). This report was developed by the Initiative and presents on overall characterization of the environmental setting of the Santa Clara Basin including a description of the Basin's (1) natural setting, (2) land use, (3) cultural setting, (4) regulatory setting, (5) community organizations, and (6) water management facilities.

Impairment Assessment Report (2000). This comprehensive environmental assessment was conducted as part of a project to develop copper and nickel TMDLs for the Lower South Bay. This report summarized existing data in order to evaluate the condition of the beneficial uses of the Lower South Bay.

- b. Previous assessments(s) used to establish your project goals and objectives, or to inform the basic assumptions of your proposal.**

N/A

- c. A description of the scientific assumptions used to develop the project goals, objectives and proposed actions, and the degree to which those assumptions are widely accepted (both in the science community as a whole, and in the watershed community).**

N/A

- d. A discussion of how the proposed actions are (are not) consistent with the scientific assumptions and previous assessments completed in the watershed.**

N/A

- e. A description of what baseline knowledge was used to support the management actions described in the proposal, or likelihood that the management actions will generate more robust baseline knowledge.**

N/A

- 7. a. How will the proposal address multiple CALFED objectives (see Section I) in an integrated fashion, with emphasis on water supply reliability, water quality, ecosystem quality, and levee stability objectives CALFED has established for Stage 1 of the program?**

As shown in Exhibit 1, the Initiative's mission and goals are directly linked to CALFED's objectives. Integration of multiple objectives has been an on-going effort for the Initiative. This integrated approach is reflected an important document for developing the consensus-based Watershed Action Plan- the Watershed Assessment Framework. As outlined in Section 6a, water supply, water quality, ecosystem quality and flood protection interests are integral parts of the assessment process. Means to address these objectives in an integrated way would be continuously explored by the Initiative's work process.

- b. Explain how the proposal will help define and illustrate relationships between watershed processes (including human elements), watershed management, and the primary goals and objectives of the CALFED (see Section I).**

Stakeholders participated in the Initiative have established improved understanding of the complexity of the watershed processes, including technical, political and societal aspects of the issues. In addition to the technical reports produced, the Initiative has also developed process tools for effective stakeholder engagement, these include:

- Signatory Document (the use of a representative stakeholder process)
- The Initiative's Mission/Goals/Vision
- Planning Objectives for development of a watershed management plan
- Implementation Objectives for implementation of the watershed management plan
- Development of a Forum for Short-Term Issues
- Establishment of Mechanisms for Collaborative Input and Decision-Making

- c. Identify a lead agency for environmental compliance, such as CEQA or NEPA. Describe the program's strategy and timetable on environmental compliance.**

CEQA and NEPA documentation should not be required for this project. However, environmental compliance strategy will be outlined in the action plan.

- 8. Describe any other important aspects of your program that you could not address in the above items, and that you feel are critical to fully describing your project.**

The Initiative has been funded primarily by local stakeholders with in-kind services from state and federal agencies and a grant from CALFED, as shown in Exhibit 6. Though local entities remain interested in the Initiative's efforts, and the watershed approach, the Initiative needs stronger regional support for put the Initiative on a more expedient path toward the Watershed Action Plan. Therefore, CALFED's support of the Watershed Action Plan would be critical. As shown Exhibit 8 in letters by the Initiative's chair and project coordinator who substantiated their full support for the proposal.

Funding this proposal, CALFED would help advance the interests of its sponsoring entities, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State Water Resources Control Board, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board, who established this Initiative. It would also give them the opportunity to further demonstrate their commitment to the process and the watershed approach as a whole.

Exhibit 5. Budget Sheet for Watershed Action Plan for Santa Clara Basin

Milestones/Tasks	CALFED Grant (for Consulting Services)	Match			
		Contracting Services		In-kind	
		PC ¹	PF ²	Person-hours	EST. \$ ³
A Prepare for Developing Actions (1st Round)					
1 Develop Training Protocols				90	\$4,500
2 Conduct Training				16	\$800
B Develop Actions					
1 Identify Consensus Actions				768	\$38,400
2 Identify Questionable Actions					
3 Identify Controversial Actions					
C Refine Actions					
1 Obtain Clarifications on Questionable Action Items	\$7,500			768	\$38,400
2 Resolve Conflicts on Controversial Items	\$5,500	\$10,000	\$5,000	384	\$19,200
D Prepare for Ground Truthing Refined Action Items					
1 Familiarize with Watershed Assessment Results	\$5,000	\$1,000		768	\$38,400
2 Develop Training Protocol for Ground Truthing	\$10,000			384	\$19,200
3 Conduct Training	\$5,000		\$5,000		
E Further Develop Actions (2nd Round)					
1 Ground Truth Consensus Action Items	\$50,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	768	\$38,400
F Prioritize Consensus Action Items					
1 Develop Prioritization Protocol	\$30,000	\$1,000		384	\$19,200
2 Conduct Training	\$5,000				
3 Prioritize Action Items	\$5,000	\$10,000		768	\$38,400
G Compile Watershed Action Plan					
1 Obtain Funding				384	\$19,200
2 Select A Team for Compiling the Action Plan				384	\$19,200
3 Compile Draft Action Plan (1st Draft)	\$75,000	\$5,000		384	\$19,200
4 Revise Draft Plan (2nd Draft)	\$20,000	\$5,000		192	\$9,600
H Conduct Peer Review					
1 Plan for Peer Review	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$5,000	180	\$9,000
2 Conduct Peer Review	\$40,000	\$2,000			
3 Conclude Peer Review	\$10,000				
I Finalize the Action Plan (Final Draft)⁴	\$60,000	\$3,000		96	\$4,800
J Promote the Action Plan for Implementation					
1 Outreach Plan	\$20,000			192	\$9,600
2 Implement Outreach Plan ⁵				To Be Determined	
		\$44,000	\$20,000	6,910	\$345,500
	SUBTOTAL	\$350,000		\$409,500	
	GRAND TOTAL			\$759,500	

Notes: This budget sheet is based on the schedule shown in Exhibit 3, and the process shown in Exhibit 4.

1	PC denotes the Initiative's Project Coordinator funded by cost-sharing agreement among four local entities
2	PF denotes the Initiative's Facilitator funded by the City of San Jose
3	Estimated contribution is based on an hourly rate of \$50
4	Portions of the Calfed Grant (up to \$10,000) may be used for printing. Additional cost would be covered by the District or others. Should a programmatic CEQA document be required, additional matching fund will be provided.
5	The implementation of the outreach efforts could be covered by the stakeholders