



California Partnership for the
San Joaquin Valley

Board of Directors Meeting - CONFERENCE CALL

Friday, August 6, 2010
8 a.m. to 8:30 a.m.

Location: California State University, Fresno
Lyles Center Board Room
5010 N. Woodrow Ave, Second Floor
Fresno, CA 93740

Conference Call Directions

Dial 1-877-810-9415
Enter Access Code: 1646538

DRAFT AGENDA

8:00	I.	Convene Meeting & Introductory Remarks	Chair Bradshaw
8:05	II.	Roll Call	Mike Dozier
8:10	III.	Sustainable Communities Initiative Grant Application (Action item)	Mike Dozier
8:25	IV.	Vote	Board
8:30		Adjournment	Chair Bradshaw



California Partnership for the
San Joaquin Valley

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Mike Dozier, Lead Executive

DATE: August 6, 2010

SUBJECT: Sustainable Communities Initiative Grant Application

BACKGROUND

At the May 21 Board meeting in Merced, the Board directed Secretariat staff to continue negotiations with the "compact" of 9 larger urban Valley cities and the 8 county Councils of Government (COG) regarding the roles and responsibilities for the proposed Sustainable Communities grant application for the San Joaquin Valley. At that time, there was concern from several members that certain areas of the Valley were not represented and that the information about the grant was not fully known. The item was placed on the agenda at the request of the 9 urban cities (Cities) to request that the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley be the lead applicant for the Valley application. The Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) had not been released prior to the May meeting. The Cities felt that the request was necessary at the May meeting because it was anticipated that the release of the NOFA and deadline for application would both take place prior to the next Board meeting, August 20, in Tulare. The NOFA has since been released (see Attachment "A" for summary) and the deadline for application is August 23, 2010. The deadline date necessitates that the Board take action on this item prior to the August meeting.

INFORMATION

Since the May meeting, Partnership staff in cooperation with the Cities and COG staff held an all hands meeting on June 22 in Fresno, attended by 32 people throughout the Valley (see Attachment "B" for meeting notes). The purpose of this meeting was to try to reconcile different views of how to respond to the impending NOFA for the HUD Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI). Prior to the meeting the COGs submitted a thoughtful memo requesting to expand the agenda to also consider Prop 84 issues. Upon learning of the 9 Cities Compact idea, the COG directors received feedback from staff that it was not inclusive enough and expressed concerns that the smaller Valley cities may "fall through the cracks". In response, the COG Directors crafted an alternative plan to include Valley cities of all sizes that would be interested in participating. The COG Directors proposal identified the following recommended alternatives:

- Support a cities compact for SCI that is expanded to include all 16 urbanized areas (over 50,000): Stockton, Tracy, Manteca, Lodi, Modesto, Turlock, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Clovis, Hanford, Tulare, Visalia, Porterville, Delano and Bakersfield.

SECRETARIAT:
California State University, Fresno
Office of Community and Economic Development

5010 N Woodrow Ave.
2nd Floor, M/S WC 142
Fresno, California 93740
559.294.6021 T
559.294.6024 F

- Develop an alternate proposal for Prop 84 funding that targets small cities (under 50,000) and unincorporated communities as partners but would be open to all valley cities interested in participating, to address SB 375 and Blueprint implementation.

This recommendation was approved by the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council on June 25, 2010.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following are the roles and responsibilities agreed upon for the HUD Sustainable Communities grant application/Prop 84 strategy:

I. HUD Sustainable Communities Initiative Grant

- A. Compact of Cities (over 50,000 population)
 - 1. Develop the grant application
 - 2. Lead the implementation of the grant
- B. Councils of Government/Regional Policy Council
 - 1. Technical assistance on transportation and land uses, including integration mandated under SB-375
 - 2. Transference of tools, models, templates and “best practices” to communities under 50,000
- C. California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
 - 1. Lead Applicant
 - 2. Coordinate engagement of all Partnership Work Groups
 - a. Transportation
 - b. Land Use, Agriculture and Housing (LUAH)
 - c. Air Quality
 - d. Energy (SJVCEO)
 - e. Water
 - f. Economic Development
 - g. Higher Education and Workforce Development
 - 3. Convener of quarterly all-hands coordination meetings
 - a. Compact of Cities
 - b. Other cities and counties
 - c. COGs/RPC
 - d. Small Communities Network
 - e. Community Leadership for Smart Growth
 - f. Partnership Work Groups
 - 4. Lead on CEQA Streamlining
- D. California State University, Fresno (Fresno State)
 - 1. Fiscal Agent

II. Proposition 84 Focus Area 2

- A. COGs
 - 1. Develop grant application for cities under 50,000
 - 2. Fiscal Agent
 - 3. Lead the implementation of the grant
 - 4. Support technology transfer from HUD grant
- B. Compact
 - 1. Support technology transfer to cities under 50,000
- C. Partnership
 - 1. Support grant application and implementation

III. Proposition 84 – Focus Area 3, Set-aside for economically disadvantaged communities (EDCs)

- A. Small Communities Network
 - 1. Develop grant application for EDCs
 - 2. Lead implementation of the grant
- B. COGs
 - 1. Support development of grant application
 - 2. Fiscal agent
 - 3. Support grant implementation
- C. Partnership
 - 1. Support grant implementation (connection to Partnership Work groups)

IV. Proposition 84 – Focus Area 1

- A. Cities/Counties
 - 1. Individual local initiatives

Note: All parties will support each other's grant applications

ACTION

The Executive Committee has reviewed and considered the above roles and responsibilities (see attached matrix) and recommends that the Partnership Board authorize staff to submit the application to HUD with the Partnership as lead applicant and to work with the COGs for submittal of the Prop 84 grant funds as indicated, with the condition that the Partnership indicators as outlined in the 10 year plan are incorporated into the HUD application.

NOFA Summary – Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program

Approximately \$100 million is available for Sustainable Community Regional Planning Grants.

- \$2 million will be reserved for capacity support grants distributed separately under a future NOFA
- Of the remaining \$98 million, not less than \$25 million shall be awarded to regions with populations of less than 500,000

Application deadline: August 23, 2010

Award Information [p.14]

- Applicants must select only one category when applying.
- Category 1: Regional Plans for Sustainable Development
 - Funds will support the preparation of Regional Plans for Sustainable Development that address housing, economic development, transportation, energy, water, and environmental quality in an integrated fashion where such plans do not currently exist or where they exist but need to be significantly revised or enhanced.
 - Funds will support stakeholder driven visioning and scenario planning exercises that are intended to address and harmonize critical land uses and investment decisions, such as those for the location and the distribution of affordable housing, schools and employment centers throughout the region; support cost-effective and sustainable transportation and water infrastructure investments; designate lands for conservation and ongoing ag use; and proactively consider risks from disasters and climate change.
- Category 2: Detailed Execution Plans and Programs
 - Funds will support efforts to fine-tune existing regional plans so that they address the full complement of Livability Principles in an integrated fashion, the preparation of more detailed execution plans for an adopted Regional Plan for Sustainable Development, and limited predevelopment planning activities for a catalytic project/projects that are a significant aspect of the regional plan, and that would demonstrate the strength of the efforts of the coalition to achieve sustainability through the regional planning process. Applicants will also be expected to outline implementation steps and ongoing governance assignments for the plan.
- Types of Awards:
 - The type of applicant is determined by the population range within the applicants region (Large Metro Regions, Medium-Sized Regions, or Small-Sized Regional, Rural Communities, and Small Town Areas)
 - Large Metro Regions [p.16]
 - Populations of 500,000 or more within the proposed geographical area
 - Geographic Area: Metropolitan Statistical Area, Metropolitan Division; or jurisdiction of one or more MPOs
 - Minimum Grant of \$500,000 and maximum grant of \$5,000,000
 - The period of performance shall not exceed 36 months.

- Awards will be made in the form of *Cooperative Agreements*
 - HUD anticipates having substantial involvement in the work being conducted under this award to ensure the purposes of the program are being carried out across the region
 - Specific reporting requirements are specified [Section VI.C. of the NOFA]

Eligibility Information [p.18]

- Eligible Applicants: a multijurisdictional and multi-sector partnership consisting of a consortium of government entities and nonprofit partners.
- A consortium representing a region that includes the jurisdiction of a MPO or MPOs' a MSA or Metropolitan Division must, at a minimum, include the following:
 - A traditional principal city (or cities) located within the region
 - The city, county or other unit of general local government with the largest population located within the region (if different from above)
 - Additional cities, counties or units of general local government and Indian Tribes that will ensure that the consortium represents no less than 50% of the population residing within the region
 - The MPO or regional planning agency that facilitates planning and associated management activities for the geography represented by the applicant, or if the region has multiple MPOs, all MPOs that have jurisdiction within the designated region;
 - A nonprofit organization, foundation, or education institution within the region that as the capacity to engage a diverse representation of the general population and the ability to work in partnership with the units of the consortium.
- Role of the consortium: collectively have the capacity and experience to carry out the proposed activities in the target geography and enter into an agreement to submit a single application. [p.19]
 - The consortium shall designate a lead applicants
 - Lead applicant may be any one of the required component entities of the consortium
 - The lead applicant shall have responsibility for submitting the application to HUD and if selected for funding, shall execute the cooperative agreement with HUD and assume fiscal responsibility for the grant on behalf of the consortium [pp.19-20]
 - A partnership agreement, MOU or other proof of commitment must be submitted with the application and executed by all consortium members; this partnership agreement must authorize the lead applicant to act in the representative capacity with HUD on behalf of the consortium and assume administrative responsibility for ensuring the consortium's program is carried out in compliance with HUD requirements. [p.20]
 - While the lead applicant holds fiscal and administrative responsibility for regular interaction with HUD, this does not restrict the consortium from developing a governance structure that reflects the diversity of its partners and allows for maximum participation in strategy development and decision making.

- The partnership agreement must state that a formal consortium agreement will be executed no later than 120 days after the effective start date of the grant agreement.
 - The lead applicant will enter into MOUs with any partners receiving funding from the grant.
- Cost Share or Matching [p21]
 - Matching funds are not required; however, applicants must provide 20% of the requested funding amount in leveraged resources in the form of cash and or verified in-kind contributions or the combination of these sources.
 - If the applicant does not include the minimum 20% leveraged resources with its appropriate supporting documentation, that application will be considered ineligible.

Program Outcomes [p.9]

- The outcomes of the Sustainable Community Regional Planning Grant Program will be a generation of regional plans that are configured to produce the following:
 - Creation of shared elements in regional transportation, housing, water and air quality plans tied to local comprehensive land use and capital investment plans.
 - Aligned federal planning and investment resources that mirror the local and regional strategies for achieving sustainable communities.
 - Increased participation and decision-making in developing and implementing a long-range vision for the region by populations traditionally marginalized in public planning processes.
 - Reduced social and economic disparities for the low-income and communities of color with the target region.
 - Decrease in per capita Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) and transportation-related for the region.
 - Decrease in overall combined housing and transportation costs per household.
 - Increase in the share of residential and commercial construction on underutilized infill development sites that encourage revitalization, while minimizing displacement in neighborhoods with significant disadvantaged populations.
 - Increased proportion of low and very low-income households within a 30-minute transit commute of major employment centers in urban, suburban and rural settings.
- Applicants may identify additional outcomes that are priorities for their regional plan.

Preferred Sustainability Status [p.9]

- All applicants achieving a specified threshold score in their submission for the 2010 round of Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program will qualify for Preferred Sustainability Status, which signifies that the region is ready to advance planning that prioritizes sustainability and inclusion as core outcomes of community development.
- Applicants that meet this criterion will qualify for a broad spectrum of benefits, including access to capacity building resources, and secure potential points in a number of funding opportunities managed by other federal agencies such as HUD, DOT, and EPA.
- Applicants receiving the Preferred Sustainability Status that do not receive funds in this funding round will be able to preserve certain aspects of their application for next year's competition.



**Sustainable Communities Initiative Meeting Notes
Fresno COG Conference Room
June 22, 2010**

Participants:

John Dugan, City of Fresno
Kim Espinosa, City of Merced
David Gonsalves, City of Merced
Felicity Lyons, CA Coalition for Rural Housing
Bob Link, City of Visalia
Mike Olmos, City of Visalia
Dwight Kroll, City of Clovis
Patricia Taylor, Madera CTC
Barbara Steck, Fresno COG
Kathy Millison, City of Clovis
John Wright
Tony Boren, Fresno COG
Jesse Brown, MCAG
Ted Smalley, TCAG
Elizabeth Wright, TCAG
Mike Dozier, CA Partnership*
**Indicates participation by teleconference*

Jose Flores, City of Clovis
Tom Webster, Fresno COG
Dave Randall, City of Madera
Terri King, KCAG
Dan Chin, City of Hanford
Hilary Straus, City of Hanford
Cathy Cain, City of Hanford
Katie Stevens, City of Fresno
Ashley Swearengin, City of Fresno
Mark Scott, City of Fresno
Pete Weber, CA Partnership
Stacie Dabbs, CA Partnership
Ron Brummett, Kern COG
Keith Bergthold, City of Fresno
Bill Spriggs, City of Merced*
Greg Meissner, City of Stockton*

I. Opening Comments (P. Weber – Meeting Facilitator)

- The original purpose of this meeting was to try to reconcile different views of how to respond to the impending NOFA for the HUD Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI). A thoughtful memo from the COG directors has caused us to expand the agenda to also consider Prop 84 issues.
- The SCI and Prop 84 give us an opportunity to launch implementation of the Blueprint and address SB 375 requirements. SCI NOFA is expected to be issued Thursday, June 24, 2010 with an anticipated application deadline of August 23, 2010.
- There were 2100-2800 expressions of interest submitted with only 20-30 awards anticipated nationwide.
- Region 9 has indicated support for a San Joaquin Valley application. Thanks to Rollie Smith for his help in making this happen.

- Prop 84 also has a tight turnaround time.
- Goal of the meeting is to discuss and decide how the Valley will move forward from this point in regards to SCI and Prop 84.

II. Overview of Sustainable Communities Initiative (K. Bergthold)

- *See attached “HUD Sustainable Living Initiative” for the following:*
 - Anticipated NOFA Guidelines
 - Smart Valley Places Overview
 - Proposed Grant Application and Implementation Structure

III . Proposal from Valley COG Directors (T. Boren)

- *See attached letter to the SJV Regional Planning Agencies Policy Council*
- Upon learning of the 9 Cities Compact idea, the COG directors received feedback from staff that it was not inclusive enough and expressed concerns that the smaller Valley cities may “fall through the cracks”.
- In response, the COG Directors attempted to craft an alternative plan to include Valley cities of all sizes that would be interested in participating; this recommendation will be presented to the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council on June 25, 2010.
- The COG Directors identified 5 alternatives for action by the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council:
 - 1) Support the nine cities and offer regional support on a technical basis.
 - 2) Support a compact that is expanded to include all 16 urbanized areas.
 - 3) Remain neutral but support regional agencies engaging in activity to support application.
 - 4) Develop an alternate proposal for Prop 84 funding that involves small cities (under 50,000) and unincorporated communities as partners to address SB 375 and Blueprint implementation.
 - 5) Oppose compact and urge that [the RPC] apply another time under a more coordinated approach.
- The COG Directors are recommending a combined approach of alternatives #2 and #4 – support an expanded compact, while the Valley MPOs develop a strategy to submit proposals for the Prop 84 funding under Focus Areas #2 and #3. It is proposed that the Small Communities Network would be involved in the Focus Area #3 application.
- Two caveats were stipulated:
 - The Compact agrees to expand their proposal to include all 16 urbanized areas.
 - All 16 of the urbanized areas are agreeable with this concept.
- The 16 urbanized areas include: Stockton, Tracy, Manteca, Lodi, Modesto, Turlock, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Clovis, Hanford, Tulare, Visalia, Porterville, Delano and Bakersfield.
- Prop 84 Opportunities (T. Webster)
 - Approximately \$60 million remaining in Prop 84 *Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program*
 - Strategic Growth Council intends to competitively distribute these funds in three yearly cycles of \$20 million each.

- Of the \$20 million available statewide in the first cycle, \$4 million will be set aside for economically disadvantaged community planning and the remaining \$16 million will be allocated as follows:
 - Focus Area 1: \$4 million minimum allocation to cities/counties
 - Focus Area 2: \$4 million minimum allocation to MPOs
 - Focus Area 3: \$1.6 million minimum for joint applications that can include community cities, counties, MPOs, JPAs, regional transportation planning agencies, etc
 - Remaining \$6.4 million will be allocated on a competitive basis to applicants in the three focus areas.
- A comprehensive Blueprint plan (RoadMap) is being developed that has three components: urban, medium, small communities that is intended to be a tool as future funding opportunities become available for each component.
 - The urban component of this plan will be set aside as those areas will be addressed through the Smart Valley Places proposal.
 - The medium and small cities components will be addressed through the Prop 84 focus areas 2 and 3, and the set aside for economically disadvantaged communities.
 - This approach will not infringe upon any cities' opportunity to independently go after focus area 1 under Prop 84
- Under Prop 84, the first year funding (\$20 million) will likely bring between \$2.4-5 million to the Valley from all three focus areas and the set-aside for economically disadvantaged communities.

IX. Open Discussion

- A. Swearingin - Indicated that she could only speak for Fresno
 - Complimented the COGs on their proposal and commented that expanding the proposal from 9 to 16 cities is a good change.
 - Requested that the COG letter to the RPC be changed to reflect that the Smart Valley Places proposal was developed by the 9 cities, not by Fresno, as was suggested in the email that transmitted the letter to the Partnership and the City of Fresno.
 - Expressed need to clarify some of the underlying concerns/misunderstandings that have contributed to the tense debate over the last few months because there will be more funding opportunities and the Valley needs to be unified.
 - The conflict is in understanding that the cities need to take the lead on this in order to incorporate and implement the smart growth principles into their General Plans first. She expressed that COG staff should first want cities to change their laws and act on the principles and plans that they have developed through the Blueprint process.
 - The value needs to be placed on outcomes vs. who gets the program.
 - COGs have laid the foundation for cities to implement the principles, now the cities need to do their part.
 - Regarding the specifics of the COG proposal:
 - The distinction of cities above/below 50,000 is a good one.
 - The Prop 84 plan to include small communities is terrific.

- It is highly likely that several cities among the 16 urban cities will pursue focus area 1 funds.
 - Needed to clarify caveat #2 of the COG’s proposal in that the agreement stipulates that all 16 cities will have the opportunity to participate in the compact, but participation of all 16 cities is not required. That is, should any of the cities choose not to opt into the compact, the proposal will still go forward with those interested cities.
- P. Weber – Straw Man Proposal
 - See attached “*Straw Man Proposal for Integrated Roles and Responsibilities*”
- J. Brown
 - Expressed that the dialogue has been helpful, but it would have been great to have had it earlier in the process.
 - COGs through the Blueprint process have attempted to be inclusive and are continuing to do so as the process moves forward, not only by inviting all parties/jurisdictions to the table, but also by not disinviting anyone.
 - Indicated that we are missing the implementation plan that Fresno COG is leading for the Valley Blueprint.
 - Still curious as to why there needs to be a compact between cities?
 - There are several organizational structures already in place in the Valley such as the Regional Policy Council and the Partnership. Why do we need another organization?
 - The RPC or the Partnership should be the convener of a lot of the proposed activities; another organization will just be confusing, especially to the public
- K. Millison
 - Complimented the evolution of work done by the COGs.
 - Commented that the compact is needed because the cities and their councils are responsible for land use decisions and determining the character and destinies of their communities; the compact identifies population centers that can have the greatest impact with sustainability measures; if it doesn’t work in the urban areas, then it will likely not work in the smaller communities; the compact solidifies where decisions will be made to drive the sustainability movement.
 - Indicated that the COG proposal’s inclusion of all 16 cities and smaller communities is very good and addresses concerns she had for the potential of smaller communities falling through the cracks following the Partnership’s May meeting discussion.
 - Agreed that the Small Communities Network is an important role because one size doesn’t fit all and rural interests are different from urban interests.
- A. Swearingin
 - Agreed with J. Brown’s statement that this meeting should have happened earlier and took some responsibility for the perceived lack of inclusiveness in the process.
 - Clarified that she learned that there was dissatisfaction within the COGs regarding the SCI process in early May when Partnership staff contacted her and shared that there had been “tense conversations” with COG staff;

however, since she could not speak for the Compact members, she deferred a response until after a May 13 meeting of the Compact.

- Confirmed that the implementation plan for the Blueprint is helpful but the “toolkit” needs to be put in the hands of the cities to make it happen.
- Clarified that in regards to the Compact, there is agreement that the region doesn’t want or need another regional organization, but it is anticipated that the NOFA will require a framework/tool that will reflect how the SCI will be implemented and the Compact is that tool; internally, each city needs to review and pass the compact and this process will be important towards getting them to embrace Blueprint principles later.
- Reiterated that the Partnership should be the lead applicant.
- Stated that while the RPC is a good roundtable for discussion, decisions made do not go back to the city councils for ratification.
- P. Weber
 - Addressed concerns about the establishment of the Compact, stating that it is a means to an end that will get the cities/city councils to take ownership for implementation of the Blueprint and addressing SB 375 requirements.
 - Acknowledged J.Brown’s comments about the need for early and frequent communications. Working as a region pays dividends, but it inevitably adds complexity. That’s why the Partnership will be convening quarterly all-hands meetings for all involved in SCI and Prop 84 funded activities.
 - Indicated that the COGs through the RPC has requested staffing the Partnership’s Land Use, Housing and Agriculture Work Group; He will be raising the issue with the Executive Committee next week with the request to have the work group staffed by COGs and co-convened by Andy Chesley and Barry Hibbard.

V. Next Steps

- P. Weber suggested that very specific MOUs need to be developed between the Compact/COGs, Compact/Partnership, and Compact/CSUF Foundation. Similar MOU’s are needed for the Prop 84 grant applications.
- K. Bergthold indicated that we need to confirm what the NOFA says when released, proceed with the outline of the proposal and then move into MOU discussions; A meeting of the Compact Cities will be scheduled soon to get inclusivity.
- P. Weber identified the need to reach out to the 7 other cities with population of 50,000 or more, inviting them to participate in the Compact.
- A. Swearingin identified that it will be critical for not only Mayors to reach out to other Mayors, but City Managers to reach out to other City Managers.
- T. Boren indicated that the COG Directors will be taking their recommendation to the RPC on Friday and will report back to the group what decision is made.
- T. Webster confirmed that Prop 84 applications are due August 31st and so they will need to have a meeting soon with the Small Communities Network and the smaller cities to identify priorities for funding, indicating that they need to hear priorities from the mayors and city managers from these cities.
- F. Lyons suggested that the Community Leadership component would be best placed in the Partnership-led SCI piece, rather than the Prop 84 opportunities with the smaller cities.

- J. Wright shared information about a survey that is taking place under the Blueprint group that is asking city planners to identify anticipated growth pressures and development demands, along with assessing their department's capacity to address them today and in the future; all cities/counties are being provided the survey as a tool to identify how ready they are to implement the Blueprint and to better understand our needs, capacities and growth pressures throughout the jurisdictions so that we can strategically apply our limited resources. He asked for the group to encourage their planners to participate in the survey.
- P. Weber discussed the Quarterly All-Hands Meeting to be organized by the Partnership and suggested a mid-August date in advance of the late August deadlines for both SCI and Prop 84 opportunities. K. Bergthold and J. Wright both suggested late July would be better in that it would provide more time to revise/strengthen applications.
- P. Weber stressed the importance of allocating funding from the grants with a strategic lens, aiming at leveraging the funds for the benefit of all, rather than dolling it out indiscriminately for each city to do its own thing.
- A. Swearengin indicated that she will talk to the Mayors not in attendance and ask them to initiate conversations with their neighboring cities – those included among the 16 - about participating in the Compact; K. Bergthold will reach out to the planning directors, and M. Scott will work with K. Millison to coordinate with other city managers. Through this process, they will need to figure out how the money will be divided up within the compact and they will report back to the group at the first quarterly meeting in late July.
- P. Weber confirmed that ultimately, this effort will be a coalition of the willing.

IMPORTANT DATES

June 24, 2010	Anticipated release of the SCI NOFA
June 25, 2010	COG Directors will take their recommendation to the Regional Policy Council for consideration and vote
July 2010 (TBD)	Quarterly All-Hands Meeting will be scheduled
August 23, 2010	Anticipated deadline for SCI applications
August 31, 2010	Deadline for Prop 84 Applications