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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: 22, 3, 18
- One application form, modified for different programs: 18, 5, 7
- Modify eligibility criteria for project activities: 14, 7, 5

Legend:
- Higher priority
- Lower priority
- No response
Mid-Range Priority Solutions for Using Multiple Grants in a Single Project

- Coordinate match policies among agencies: 14 (Higher priority), 7 (Lower priority), 0 (No response)
- Coordinate information on funding cycles: 13 (Higher priority), 10 (Lower priority), 0 (No response)
- Coordinate timing of funding cycles: 12 (Higher priority), 12 (Lower priority), 0 (No response)
Lower Priority Solutions for Using Multiple Grants in a Single Project

- Coordinate on solicitations for urban greening grants: 12 higher priority, 9 lower priority, 3 no response
- Coordinate joint reporting: 12 higher priority, 8 lower priority, no response
- Advertise maximum grant periods: 16 higher priority, 3 lower priority, no response
Funding Sources You Would Pursue if Obstacles Are Removed?

- Transportation grants: 22
- Water grants: 20
- Climate change grants: 19
- Air quality grants: 15
- Emergency preparedness grants: 7
- Agency does not seek grants: 3
- Other: 1
## 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible costs – Project Type</td>
<td>A large majority of attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Administration-Applications</td>
<td>Approximately 40% of attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Administration - Tracking</td>
<td>Approximately 30% of attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches for Multiple Grants</td>
<td>Approximately 30% of attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring of Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Approx. 20% of attendees, including approx. 50% of Roundtable Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Input from March 28 Roundtable Meeting

### Lower Priority at Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle to Funding Sustainable Streets</th>
<th>Attendees’ Input on Prioritization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible Costs – Project Activities</td>
<td>Less the 10% of attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Cycles Not Coordinated</td>
<td>Approximately 10% of attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Periods May Not Align</td>
<td>Approximately 10% of attendees</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

Input requested
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

Input requested
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