

SAFE, CLEAN WATER PROGRAM

Project Selection Criteria Subcommittee

Meeting Summary: March 8, 2018

MEETING IN BRIEF

This was the second meeting of the Project Selection Criteria Subcommittee for the Safe, Clean Water Program. The objectives of the meeting were to:

1. Analyze and discuss an updated version of the scoring criteria.
2. Consult on how to address the geological constraints across the regional watersheds.
3. Analyze the results of four project examples, using updated scoring criteria.
4. Analyze how scoring criteria might be weighted to achieve Program Outcomes.

Attendees

Kelly Gardner
Mike Lewis
Diana Mahmud
Judy Nelson
Eric Wolf

Carl Blum
Marty Adams
Liz Crosson
Hany Fangary
Mark Gold

Dave Pedersen
Shelley Luce
Melissa You
Shane Phillips
Adel Hagekhalil

Agenda:

Welcome

The meeting began with opening remarks and a brief introduction from the subcommittee participants.

Review Board of Supervisors' Purpose and Intent for the Safe, Clean Water Program

The objectives and outcome of the Safe, Clean Water Program were reviewed.

Summary of Other Subcommittee Discussions

Meeting facilitators summarized the discussion topics of the Credits/Rebates & Incentives, Governance, and DAC's, Equity, and Stakeholder Involvement Subcommittee's.

Review February 8th Subcommittee Summary Notes

Mr. Russ Bryden reviewed the subcommittee discussion summary of the February 8th, 2018 meeting.

Gather Feedback on Project Selection Criteria

Watershed Regional Map/Update to Scoring Criteria

LADPW staff provided an overview of updates made to the [Project Selection Criteria](#) strawman proposal.

- Member comments that the criteria should be clear, and currently hard to gauge without knowing what the scoring will be.
- Committed member expressed concern with SGV Vector Control. Identified many retention facilities as mosquito breeding grounds and trash collection sites. Issues needs to be addressed. Chemicals are being added to water to prevent mosquito breeding. Should integrate into project designs.
- Committee member comments on water supply component. Based on graphic, water supply projects are not competitive. Sewer connection projects address dry weather flows, but score low on criteria matrix.
 - Municipal program will have minimum requirements. Regional projects will focus on multi-benefit, not just sewer connections.
- Suggestion to weigh water quality at 50% and other benefits at 25%.

Model Existing Projects

- Committee members wanted to discuss weighting of criteria

Discuss Criteria Weighting

- Consider graduated scoring scale, given different geographic areas have different limitations
 - Suggested Yes/No because projects may not provide meaningful benefits
- Support of life cycle cost for water supply, but need to account for different lifespans of different infrastructure. If magnitude is included, then cost-effectiveness should be a higher share of points.
- Suggestion to allow proponent to decide water supply or water quality projects and change the weighting of scoring based on type of project. Provide more flexibility on scoring.
- Member agrees it is beneficial to omit Yes/No threshold. Scoring should be as objective as possible. Suggest granular scoring criteria. Recommend at least five categories in supply. Add \$2000-\$5000/AFY category.

- Suggestion for water supply should have element of volume, cost-effectiveness. Desalination may be able to provide more supply for less cost. Need to consider big picture of how the idea of this funding measure can be communicated to voters.
- Consider minimum cost-effectiveness on water quality or water supply, and award points exponentially so that projects that are very cost-effective on supply or quality will score well.
- Suggestion that funding should go to E/WMP projects.
- Consider including demand reduction for water supply or water quality projects. Lower the standard for whichever benefit is not the main factor.
- Suggestion to omit Nature-Based solution as criteria from either Water Supply (A4) or Water Quality (B4)
- Consider weighting within water supply – should not be a linear scale. Should be more exponential. \$1600/AF is what MWD considered a good mid-point for competitive water supply cost.
- Consider a minimum threshold on water supply. Projects should meet at least 2 of 3 criteria. Consider criteria to avoid token benefits
- Suggestion that cost-effectiveness is a better measure than magnitude point-weighting.
- Suggestion that cost-effectiveness and magnitude should be equally weighted.
- Note that small projects are not very sustainable because of maintenance responsibility is spread among a lot of different people/entities. Need to develop data related to cost-effectiveness.
- Consider whether water quality is a minimum requirement for all projects. Water quality should be first on scoring sheet. Other benefits should be additional points, but not weighed as importantly as water quality.
- Suggestion to study the Freshwater Marsh at Ballona Creek Wetland Project. It is a small multi-benefit project that has been maintained well. That type of project will work well in many places.
- Committee member reminded that all three benefits (supply, quality, community investments) are equally important.
- Member comment that project taking a volumetric approach will have a complete disconnect from a water quality benefit, and considered an ineffective BMP. No relation to water quality standards attainment is troublesome. Suggestion to issue more points to projects that address multiple pollutants.
- Suggestion to obtain examples of effective and good BMP's vs. less effective BMP's.
- Committee members mentioned the business community is concerned about compliance. If liability is not addressed as part of this measure, business community interest is waning. May be able to be addressed in how criteria are weighted. Need more focus on water quality. Dry weather flow shouldn't be excluded in criteria.
- Note that cities are also interested in compliance.
- Consider that supply benefits have a nexus to quality improvements. This group needs to figure out how to make the criteria work with respect to compliance

- Member notes how proposal does seem to address dry weather. Outflow for BMP not contributing to quality degradation should be scored. Keep in mind that other benefits can be funded by other sources, doesn't all have to come from this measure.
- Suggestion that water quality should be weighted at 60%, supply 30%, and community enhancements 10% so that focus is placed on water quality. Challenges with the science we're working with. Revisiting the basin plan is important to ensure a good scientific basis.
- Downtown projects won't score well in magnitude. Agree that water quality should account for more points than other categories. Consider putting together different scenarios of cost-effectiveness vs. magnitude and benefits to see all the options.
- Consider weighting projects as part of E/WMP higher than other new projects. Don't exclude new projects, but EWMP projects have already gone through some vetting and should be given credit for that.
- Nature-Based Solutions need to be clearly defined.
- Committee members discussed what would constitute Nature-Based Solutions.
 - Native vegetation
 - Greening
 - Trees
 - Cistern in a park = gray or green infrastructure
- Nature-Based is not only using nature, but also mimicking natural processes.
- Member questioned criteria items A4, B4, C2, and C3. Mention the items are one in the same. In most cases, there will be overlap – double points for the same thing?
- Suggestion that nature-based solutions should be in a separate category – community enhancements.
- Suggestion to consider a score multiplier for nature-based solutions rather than fitting it into the scoring. Two projects being equal in performance, the nature-based solution project should score higher.
- Consider whether multiplier could work for DACs.
- Suggestion that distribution of funding and designations informs DAC-related scoring. Should be done based on population.
- Suggestion to consider leveraging funds from other sources for nature-based solutions (Caltrans, Department of Natural Resources).
- Member mentioned that the state auditor report released a few days ago; spending time on science of how TMDLs etc. were developed could prove valuable for compliance issues.

Next Steps

- Considering combining certain subcommittees to discuss overlapping topics.

Public Comment

- OurWaterLA has definitions for green project, nature-based solutions and can share with County as well as examples of projects.
- for cost-effectiveness, need to consider how that's calculated – consider job creation and workforce development; keep in mind that there is another pot of funding for municipal water quality projects; in areas like downtown, possibility of other types of projects (green roofs, median projects, etc.).

Closing Remarks

Facilitators thanked all members and attendees for their participation

Written comments can be submitted via www.safecleanwaterla.org or sent to Russ Bryden (rbryden@dpw.lacounty.gov) or Alberto Grajeda (algrajeda@dpw.lacounty.gov).

Adjourn

Meeting Adjourned