

Safe, Clean Water Program

North Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Meeting Minutes:

Thursday, April 30, 2020

10:00am - 12:30pm

WebEx Meeting

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

David Pedersen (LVMWD)

Dave Roberts (LVMWD)

Madelyn Glickfeld (UCLA)

Cung Nguyen (LA County Flood Control District)

David Rydman (LA County – Waterworks District)

Tevin Schmitt (WCFVC)

Kirsten James (Resident)

Alex Farassati (Calabasas)

Joe Bellomo* (Hidden Hills)

Bruce Hamamoto (LA County)

Jessica Duboff (LA Area Chamber of Commerce)

Roxanne Hughes (Westlake Village)

Jessica Forte (Agoura Hills)

Sophie Freeman* (LA County Supervisor District 3)

Mark Johnson* (Malibu)

Committee Members Not Present:

Doug Marian (CA Plumbing & Mechanical)

Chad Christensen (MRCA)

*Committee Member Alternate

See attached WebEx sign-in sheet for full list of attendees.

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Pedersen, chair of the North Santa Monica Bay WASC, called the meeting to order.

All committee members made self-introductions, and quorum was established.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 12, 2020

The District provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting.

Tevin Schmitt made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Madelyn Glickfeld seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes.

- Yay (12)
 - Cung Nguyen
 - Dave Rydman
 - David Pederson
 - Dave Roberts
 - Madelyn Glickfeld
 - Jessica Duboff
 - Tevin Schmitt
 - Kirsten James
 - Jessica Forte
 - Joe Bellomo
 - Bruce Hamamoto
 - Mark Johnson
- Nay (0)
- Abstain (1)
 - Roxanne Hughes
- Not Present for Voting (2)
 - Alex Farassati
 - Sophie Freeman

Safe, Clean Water Program

North Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



3. Committee Member and District Updates

Kirk Allen provided updates from the District, noting: that the RFSQ for Watershed Coordinators would be going out in May due to COVID-19.

David Pederson inquired how tax revenues might be impacted by COVID-19. Kirk Allen noted that the District has collected 85% of all taxes at this time, and that impacts to the collection of taxes are expected to be minimal. Property taxes, unlike other types of taxes, are a stable revenue source.

4. Public Comment Period

A member of the public noted that Our Water LA and Heal the Bay wanted to ensure that the 14 goals of the SCW program were met for future projects and thanked the NSMB WASC for not supporting the regional bacteria study. A comment letter has been attached in addition to this public comment.

Madelyn Glickfeld inquired how accessible the program documents were for members of the public. Kirk Allen noted that he would confirm availability and accessibility through the SCW website.

5. Discussion Items

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

David Pedersen has had conversations with Madelyn Glickfeld and Katy Yaroslavsky on adaptation of the Scoring Criteria.

Madelyn Glickfeld has had conversations with the Pacific Institute and Bruce Hamamoto on potential issues for submitting projects for the NSMB WASC.

Bruce Hamamoto has been involved in communications regarding scoring criteria.

b) Potential Concepts for Adaption of Scoring Criteria

David Pederson and Madelyn Glickfeld have drafted a memo to provide recommendations on modifications to the scoring criteria. Madelyn Glickfeld and David Pederson provided a summary of the memo to the WASC. The memo has been attached to this meetings minutes.

Bruce Hamamoto provided a summary of his project that was pulled from consideration along with three other projects that could not meet the threshold score of 60 points.

Sophie Freeman provided a letter drafted by Katy Yaroslavsky with concerns about unforeseen effects of making early modifications to the scoring criteria. This letter has been attached in the meeting minutes.

Cung Nguyen noted there needs to be some way for projects to be more accessible for the NSMB watershed through the scoring process.

Kirsten James inquired if there was a confirmed problem with scoring criteria that called for modifications in the second year. David Pederson noted that the sample set is currently too small to tell definitively if the scoring criteria poses an unreachable target. Madelyn Glickfeld added that there are limitations in the tributary sizes and other physical limitations for the NSMB that are not present in other watersheds. Roxanne Hughes agreed noting that the NSMB watershed has several physical limitations such as less permeable soil and higher groundwater tables, and that it should be addressed in the scoring criteria.

Safe, Clean Water Program

North Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Tevin Schmitt inquired how reduction of scoring criteria in Katy Yaroslavsky's memo could lead to more gray infrastructure. Sophie Freeman noted that she would work to retrieve clarity on Katy Yaroslavsky's memo.

David Pedersen noted that he would like to have additional discussion on this topic for next meeting.

c) Fund Transfer Agreement Templates

i) Regional Program Version

Madelyn Glickfeld noted that the agreements were only for a year of funding. Kirk Allen clarified that WASCs are only approving one year of budget, but an estimated projection for 5 years. David Pedersen noted that this process was similar to Federal grant programs.

ii) Municipal Program Version

In the interest of time, this item was combined with item 5.c.i.

d) Status of Applications for Municipalities for the Next Round of Call for Projects

Joe Bellomo noted that the city of Hidden Hills is working to get projects into the system.

Cung Nguyen noted that the LACFCD is working to include additional projects for the July 31 deadline.

Bruce Hamamoto noted that he intended to include the Viewridge project again for the second-round call for projects.

6. Voting Items

a) None

7. Items for next agenda

David Pederson recommended including additional discussion on updates to the scoring criteria.

Kirk Allen noted that a more formal discussion on Watershed Coordinators could be included.

8. Adjournment

David Pedersen thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

NORTH SANTA MONICA BAY WASC MEETING - APRIL 30, 2020

		Quorum Present				Items
Member Type	Organization	Member	Voting?	Alternate	Voting?	Meeting Minutes
Agency	LACFCD	Cung Nguyen	x	Carolina Hernandez		Y
Agency	LAC Waterworks District	Dave Rydman	x	Greg Even		Y
Agency	MRCA	Chad Christensen		Sarah Rascon		
Agency	LVMWD	<u>David Pedersen</u>	x	Dave Roberts		Y
Agency	LVMWD	<u>David Pedersen</u>		Dave Roberts	x	Y
Community Stakeholder	UCLA	Madelyn Glickfeld	x	Richard Ambrose		Y
Community Stakeholder	CA Plumbing & Mechanical Contractors	Doug Marian				
Community Stakeholder	LA Area Chamber of Commerce	Jessica Duboff	x	Kendal Asuncion		Y
Community Stakeholder	Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation Ventura County	Tevin Schmitt	x			Y
Community Stakeholder	Community Stakeholder	Kirsten James	x	Fran Diamond		Y
Municipal Members	Agoura Hills	Jessica Forte	x	Louis Celaya		Y
Municipal Members	Calabasas	Alex Farassati	x	Alba Lemus		N/A
Municipal Members	Hidden Hills	Kerry Kallman		Joe Bellomo	x	Y
Municipal Members	LAC Supervisor District 3	Katy Yaroslavsky		Sophie Freeman	x	N/A
Municipal Members	LAC Public Works	Bruce Hamamoto	x	Allen Ma		Y
Municipal Members	Malibu	Shea Cunningham		Mark Johnson	x	Y
Municipal Members	Westlake Village	Roxanne Hughes	x	Phillipe Eskandar		A
Total Non-Vacant Seats		17			Yay (Y)	12
Total Voting Members Present		15			Nay (N)	0
Agency		4			Abstain (A)	1
Community Stakeholder		4			Total	13
Municipal Members		7				Approved

Public Attendees
Alberto Grajeda
Allen Ma
Annelisa Moe
Bronwyn
J Gutierrez
Jessica Arden
Julie Millett
K Asuncion
Kasuncion
kchang
Kelsey Erisman
M Martinez
Mark Johnson
Matthew Frary
Rich Ambrose
Terry Dipple
Tori

April 28, 2020

To: Members of the North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)

From: David Pedersen, Chair, North Santa Monica Bay WASC
Madelyn Glickfeld, Vice Chair, North Santa Monica Bay WASC

Re: Proposed Scoring Criteria Amendment for North Santa Monica Bay (NSMB) WASC

At our last NSMB WASC meeting on March 12, 2020, we discussed the difficulty that project proponents were experiencing to meet the minimum 60-point threshold score for projects in the NSMB. Currently, the NSMB has no eligible projects included in its first Stormwater Investment Plan. This memo describes a rationale and two proposed options to amend the project scoring criteria for the NSMB to address the unique characteristics of the watershed.

Unique Watershed Characteristics Create Scoring Challenges:

Project proponents applying for Regional Program funds under the Safe, Clean Water Program for the NSMB have noted difficulties achieving the 60-point threshold score to qualify their projects for funding. Upon discussion of the issue, it has become apparent that the NSMB's unique characteristics make it particularly difficult to score any points in the water supply benefit area. The volume of water supply generated by projects in the NSMB is significantly limited by scattered development near relatively small tributary waterbodies, the lack of permeable soils due to local geology and the absence of a usable groundwater basin. We understand that Public Works staff has evaluated at least two to three projects that failed to meet the threshold 60-point score.

Following is a summary of the reasons that projects in the NSMB do not score favorably:

- The scoring criteria (see Attachment A) assume that water quality projects can also capture large volumes of water supply via infiltration through permeable soils to underlying groundwater basins. Due to local geology, the soils of the NSMB have very low permeability, and there is no usable groundwater basin.
- The scoring assume that projects can be scaled to capture water from a large, urban area, yielding higher volumes of water. However, urbanization and development in the NSMB, particularly the Santa Monica Mountains, is more distributed and along smaller tributary waterbodies throughout the mountains. Projects in the NSMB are smaller and lower volume than others in the greater Los Angeles Basin.

- The scoring for the Water Supply Benefit area is heavily weighted on cost effectiveness with the highest score (13 points) awarded for producing water at less than the current cost of wholesale imported water (\$1,000 versus \$1,078 per acre-foot). No water supply points are awarded for projects that produce less than 25 acre-feet at a unit cost of more than \$2,500 per acre-foot. In the NSMB, the smaller tributary areas yield projects that produce smaller volumes of water supply for comparable costs to improve water quality.
- There are limited options for storage in the NSMB, and construction of underground cisterns or surface water storage is very expensive. Similarly, it is expensive to pipe and pump water captured on-site to nearby areas landscape irrigation. These substantial expenses increase the per acre-foot cost of the water supply.

Proposed Options to Amend Scoring Criteria for NSMB:

At our last WASC meeting, the Committee Members discussed potential options to amend the scoring criteria to reflect the constraints in the NSMB. Based on further evaluation and discussion of the concern with a representative of the Pacific Institute, we propose the following two options to amend the scoring criteria for the NSMB:

1. Amend the Scoring Criteria as it relates to the Water Supply Benefit area as shown on the strawman proposal (see Attachment B) for the North Santa Monica Bay.
 - a. Provide water supply benefit points to projects with a higher per acre-foot cost, recognizing the difficulty of delivering projects at less than the wholesale cost of imported water. The cost of producing water supply via recycling may provide a more realistic comparison.
 - b. Recognize that the cost per acre-foot of treating polluted runoff and stormwater will be higher for smaller, distributed projects in the Santa Monica Mountains.
 - c. Recognize that smaller volumes of water will be captured in areas with sparse, distributed development and relatively smaller tributary waterbodies.
2. Allocate total project cost to the three major benefit areas (water quality, water supply and community investment) and calculate the unit costs of each benefit area accordingly, rather than based on the total project cost. Also, clarify that ecosystem enhancements qualify as community benefits.

Next Steps:

With support and feedback from the NSMB WASC, we would prepare a revised version of this memo to submit to Mark Pestrella, Director of Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and Bruce Reznick, Chair of the Scoring Committee for the Safe, Clean Water Program.

Attachment A - Existing Scoring Criteria



Exhibit A – Infrastructure Program Project Scoring Criteria

All Regional Program Projects must meet the Threshold Score of **60 points or more** using the following Project Scoring Criteria to be eligible for consideration.

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards			
A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	50 points max	The Project provides water quality benefits			
	20 points max	<p>A.1.1: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)¹ / (Capital Cost in \$Millions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <0.4 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 0 points • 0.4-0.6 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 7 points • 0.6-0.8 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 11 points • 0.8-1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 14 points • >1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 20 points <p>¹. Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum capacity of a Project for a 24-hour period. For water quality focused Projects, this would typically be the 85th percentile design storm capacity. Units are in acre-feet (AF).</p>			
	30 points max	<p>A.1.2: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Benefit - Quantify the pollutant reduction (i.e. concentration, load, exceedance day, etc.) for a class of pollutants using a similar analysis as the E/WMP which uses the Districts Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS). The analysis should be an average percent reduction comparing influent and effluent for the class of pollutant over a ten-year period showing the impact of the Project. Modeling should include the latest performance data to reflect the efficiency of the BMP type.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u></td> <td style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80%= 20 points (20 Points Max) </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80%= 10 points (10 Points Max) </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80%= 20 points (20 Points Max)
<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80%= 20 points (20 Points Max) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80%= 10 points (10 Points Max) 				
- OR -					
A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits	20 points	A.2.1: For dry weather BMPs only, Projects must be designed to capture, infiltrate, treat and release, or divert 100% (unless infeasible or prohibited for habitat, etc) of all tributary dry weather flows.			
	20 points max	<p>A.2.2: For Dry Weather BMPs Only. Tributary Size of the Dry Weather BMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <200 Acres = 10 points • >200 Acres = 20 points 			
B. Significant Water Supply Benefits	25 points max	The Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefits			
	13 points max	<p>B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost² per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >\$2500/ac-ft = 0 points • \$2,000–2,500/ac-ft = 3 points • \$1500-2,000/ac-ft = 6 points • \$1000–1500/ac-ft = 10 points • <\$1000/ac-ft = 13 points <p>². Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.</p>			
	12 points max	<p>B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <25 ac-ft/year = 0 points • 25 - 100 ac-ft/year = 2 points • 100 - 200 ac-ft/year = 5 points • 200 - 300 ac-ft/year = 9 points • >300 ac-ft/year = 12 points 			

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
C. Community Investment Benefits	10 points max	The Project provides Community Investment Benefits
	10 points	<p>C1. Project includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the Community Investment Benefits identified below = 2 points • Three distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 5 points • Six distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 10 points <p>Community Investment Benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved flood management, flood conveyance, or flood risk mitigation • Creation, enhancement, or restoration of parks, habitat, or wetlands • Improved public access to waterways • Enhanced or new recreational opportunities • Greening of schools • Reducing local heat island effect and increasing shade • Increasing the number of trees increase and/or other vegetation at the site location that will increase carbon reduction/sequestration and improve air quality.
D. Nature-Based Solutions	15 points max	The Project implements Nature-Based Solutions
	15 points	<p>D1. Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implements natural processes or mimics natural processes to slow, detain, capture, and absorb/infiltrate water in a manner that protects, enhances and/or restores habitat, green space and/or usable open space = 5 points • Utilizes natural materials such as soils and vegetation with a preference for native vegetation = 5 points • Removes Impermeable Area from Project (1 point per 20% paved area removed) = 5 points
E. Leveraging Funds and Community Support	10 points max	The Project achieves one or more of the following:
	6 points max	<p>E1. Cost-Share. Additional Funding has been awarded for the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >25% Funding Matched = 3 points • >50% Funding Matched = 6 points
	4 points	E2. The Project demonstrates strong local, community-based support and/or has been developed as part of a partnership with local NGOs/CBOs.
Total		Total Points All Sections 110

Attachment B - Strawman Proposal



Exhibit A – Infrastructure Program Project Scoring Criteria

All Regional Program Projects must meet the Threshold Score of **60 points or more** using the following Project Scoring Criteria to be eligible for consideration.

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards			
A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits	50 points max	The Project provides water quality benefits			
	20 points max	<p>A.1.1: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)¹ / (Capital Cost in \$Millions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <0.4 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 0 points • 0.4-0.6 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 7 points • 0.6-0.8 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 11 points • 0.8-1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 14 points • >1.0 (acre feet capacity / \$-Million) = 20 points <p>¹. Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum capacity of a Project for a 24-hour period. For water quality focused Projects, this would typically be the 85th percentile design storm capacity. Units are in acre-feet (AF).</p>			
	30 points max	<p>A.1.2: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Benefit - Quantify the pollutant reduction (i.e. concentration, load, exceedance day, etc.) for a class of pollutants using a similar analysis as the E/WMP which uses the Districts Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS). The analysis should be an average percent reduction comparing influent and effluent for the class of pollutant over a ten-year period showing the impact of the Project. Modeling should include the latest performance data to reflect the efficiency of the BMP type.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u></td> <td style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80%= 20 points (20 Points Max) </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80%= 10 points (10 Points Max) </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80%= 20 points (20 Points Max)
<u>Primary Class of Pollutants</u>	<u>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 15 points • >80%= 20 points (20 Points Max) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50% = 5 points • >80%= 10 points (10 Points Max) 				
- OR -					
A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits	20 points	A.2.1: For dry weather BMPs only, Projects must be designed to capture, infiltrate, treat and release, or divert 100% (unless infeasible or prohibited for habitat, etc) of all tributary dry weather flows.			
	20 points max	<p>A.2.2: For Dry Weather BMPs Only. Tributary Size of the Dry Weather BMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <200 Acres = 10 points • >200 Acres = 20 points 			
B. Significant Water Supply Benefits	25 points max	The Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefits			
	13 points max	<p>B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost² per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >\$6,500/ac-ft = 0 points • \$2,000–2,500/ac-ft = 5 points • \$1500–2,000/ac-ft = 9 points • \$1000–1500/ac-ft = 11 points • <\$1000/ac-ft = 13 points </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4,500–6,500/ac-ft = 1 point • \$2,500–4,500/ac-ft = 2 point </td> </tr> </table> <p>². Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >\$6,500/ac-ft = 0 points • \$2,000–2,500/ac-ft = 5 points • \$1500–2,000/ac-ft = 9 points • \$1000–1500/ac-ft = 11 points • <\$1000/ac-ft = 13 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4,500–6,500/ac-ft = 1 point • \$2,500–4,500/ac-ft = 2 point 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >\$6,500/ac-ft = 0 points • \$2,000–2,500/ac-ft = 5 points • \$1500–2,000/ac-ft = 9 points • \$1000–1500/ac-ft = 11 points • <\$1000/ac-ft = 13 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4,500–6,500/ac-ft = 1 point • \$2,500–4,500/ac-ft = 2 point 				
12 points max	<p>B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <5 ac-ft/year = 0 points • 10 - 15 ac-ft/year = 2 points • 15 - 25 ac-ft/year = 5 points • 25 - 50 ac-ft/year = 9 points • >50 ac-ft/year = 12 points </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 - 10 ac-ft/year = 1 point </td> </tr> </table>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <5 ac-ft/year = 0 points • 10 - 15 ac-ft/year = 2 points • 15 - 25 ac-ft/year = 5 points • 25 - 50 ac-ft/year = 9 points • >50 ac-ft/year = 12 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 - 10 ac-ft/year = 1 point 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <5 ac-ft/year = 0 points • 10 - 15 ac-ft/year = 2 points • 15 - 25 ac-ft/year = 5 points • 25 - 50 ac-ft/year = 9 points • >50 ac-ft/year = 12 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 - 10 ac-ft/year = 1 point 				

Section	Score Range	Scoring Standards
C. Community Investment Benefits	10 points max	The Project provides Community Investment Benefits
	10 points	<p>C1. Project includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the Community Investment Benefits identified below = 2 points Three distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 5 points Six distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 10 points <p>Community Investment Benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved flood management, flood conveyance, or flood risk mitigation Creation, enhancement, or restoration of parks, habitat, or wetlands Improved public access to waterways Enhanced or new recreational opportunities Greening of schools Reducing local heat island effect and increasing shade Increasing the number of trees increase and/or other vegetation at the site location that will increase carbon reduction/sequestration and improve air quality.
D. Nature-Based Solutions	15 points max	The Project implements Nature-Based Solutions
	15 points	<p>D1. Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implements natural processes or mimics natural processes to slow, detain, capture, and absorb/infiltrate water in a manner that protects, enhances and/or restores habitat, green space and/or usable open space = 5 points Utilizes natural materials such as soils and vegetation with a preference for native vegetation = 5 points Removes Impermeable Area from Project (1 point per 20% paved area removed) = 5 points
E. Leveraging Funds and Community Support	10 points max	The Project achieves one or more of the following:
	6 points max	<p>E1. Cost-Share. Additional Funding has been awarded for the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >25% Funding Matched = 3 points >50% Funding Matched = 6 points
	4 points	E2. The Project demonstrates strong local, community-based support and/or has been developed as part of a partnership with local NGOs/CBOs.
Total	Total Points All Sections 110	

Hi Dave and Madelyn,

I'm not going to be able to attend today's meeting (and will be sending my alternate, Sophie Freeman—a new addition to our office), but I wanted to quickly provide my feedback on this, for what it's worth.

I'm frankly concerned about the optics and potential precedent of trying to change the scoring criteria so soon after Board adoption, especially when our WASC has such a small sample size of projects that we're basing this determination on. There are other stakeholders that dislike the scoring criteria for a variety of reasons, and if they see this effort as opening a door on changing what sorts of projects can be funded (and especially if it ultimately proves successful), we are in for serious attempts by stakeholders to weaken the program, particularly around multi-benefit projects. Many cities, for example, want to do less expensive predominantly gray infrastructure projects and they'd love to change the scoring criteria. The argument they've used is very similar to the one posited in the attached proposal. Building green multi-benefit projects is a core goal of the regional program and changing scoring criteria should, in our office's opinion, be approached very carefully.

I think it would be helpful to work directly with FCD staff to figure out what options might be available, before elevating this to Pestrella and the Board of Supervisors. FCD staff is cognizant that each watershed presents its own challenges vis-à-vis the scoring criteria and some watersheds might have a harder time finding qualifying projects than others. That being said, I think the main issue at this point is that the projects that were submitted for scoring in this watershed were projects that were designed for MS4 compliance rather than with the Safe, Clean Water Program's regional multi-benefit program goals – and therefore scoring criteria—in mind. This first round was like trying to fit a square peg in a round hole, and I think the projects (and therefore the scoring) reflected that.

I've asked Sophie (cc'd here) to state as much on today's call, and I hope we can all work together collaboratively on this with FCD staff as part of the conversation. I'm available next week if that works for you two.

Thanks very much for your consideration and partnership on SCW implementation,
Katy

Katy Young Yaroslavsky
Senior Environment & Arts Deputy
Los Angeles County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl



Public Comment Form

Name*: Annelisa Moe Organization*: Heal the Bay / OurWaterLA
Email*: amoe@healthebay.org Phone*: 831-331-7544
Meeting: North Santa Monica Bay WASC Date: 04/30/2020

LA County Public Works may contact me for clarification about my comments

*Per Brown Act, completing this information is optional. At a minimum, please include an identifier so that you may be called upon to speak.

Phone participants and the public are encouraged to submit public comments (or a request to make a public comment) to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov. All public comments will become part of the official record.

Please complete this form and email to SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov by at least 5:00pm the day prior to the meeting with the following subject line: "Public Comment: [Watershed Area] [Meeting Date]" (ex. "Public Comment: USGR 4/8/20").

Comments

The stormwater investment plan must achieve the fourteen programmatic goals clearly laid out in the SCWP Implementation Ordinance including the goals to improve water quality, prioritize nature-based solutions, foster community engagement, ensure the equitable distribution of funds, and provide local quality jobs.

Though there were no projects to fund this year in the North Santa Monica Bay, I urge the WASC to keep these program goals in mind during future funding rounds.

I would like to express support for the WASC's decision to not allocate funding to The Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution, and to instead reserve the remainder of your funds for exemplary projects that may be proposed in the next few rounds of funding allocation.

Thank you all for the considerable time and effort that you have contributed to the implementation of the Safe, Clean Water Program, and thank you for the opportunity to comment on the stormwater investment plan.



DATE: April 24, 2020

TO: Watershed Area Steering Committees (WASC), Scoring and Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) Members
Los Angeles County Safe Clean Water Program Staff
Los Angeles County Board Public Works Deputies

RE: **OurWaterLA Recommendations - Watershed Area Stormwater Investment Plan for 2019-2020**

On March 10, 2020 OurWaterLA (OWLA) submitted a memo for distribution to the WASC committees specifying our recommendations for the Watershed Area Stormwater Investment Plans (SIP) under consideration by the WASCs prior to the Safer at Home order. However, only a few of the WASC groups had the opportunity to review the memo. Given our new reality and the conditions under which extremely important decisions will be considered by the WASCs we wish to summarize and update the points we believe are extremely important to ensure that the decision-making process is transparent and results in only the best projects being funded during these unprecedented times.

The following are the major issues that we believe are critically important for your consideration as you deliberate on the recommendations you will be making for this first round of funding recommendations. Given the vast number of issues you will have to consider we are providing "bullet" points but encourage all members to review our more in-depth recommendations provided in the attached March 10, 2020 memo (Attachment 3). OWLA recommends the following:

Best Practices for Public Participation

- Notify the public of all meetings and hearings at least 72 hours in advance. Information on public meeting times, topics, and how public comments will be received should be easy to find on the SCWP website home page and within the meeting agendas (*currently not the case*). This information, as well as any additional accompanying meeting materials, should be translated into at least Spanish and Mandarin.

- Ensure language access needs are met by providing interpretation during public meetings. For remote meetings, use teleconference lines or audio channels.
- Consider participation barriers for members of the public that may not have access to the internet or a computer. Provide adequate telephone options, with interpretation, for virtual meetings and receiving public comments. Having multiple avenues to engage in a given meeting will ensure more robust dialogue and input.
- Use best practices for public comment periods in virtual hearings and meetings. This includes giving ample time for the public to submit comments prior to a meeting through multiple avenues and live during a meeting.
- Provide links to all materials including presentations at least 72 hours prior to each meeting.

Project Funding Recommendations

- Fund projects that best exemplify the goals (Attachment 2) of the SCWP. The best projects out of the 53 that are eligible for funding are listed in Attachment 1.
- No funding for the Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution. We have serious concerns about the legitimacy of this proposed study.
- Fund projects in phases to get projects through initial project development, such as project design in order to preserve funds for future years.
- Require that all Technical Resources allocations include the development and implementation of a Community Engagement Plan.

Community Engagement, Equity, Community Investments & DAC Benefits

- Require that all project funding recommendations include a sustained community engagement element with the assistance of local experienced NGOs from design through construction and operations and maintenance.
- Require that all projects which claim points for Community Investments submit letters from local community groups verifying that the project includes tangible community investments.
- Those projects which claim that jobs will provide direct community investments, such as high quality local job and training opportunities must include documentation as to how they will achieve this goal.

ATTACHMENT 1

Projects Recommended for Funding

Project Name	WASC	Notes
MacArthur Lake Rehabilitation Project	Central Santa Monica Bay	<u>SCORE: 70</u> A strong water quality improvement project that uses nature-based solutions and provides DAC benefits and some additional community investment benefits.
Monteith Park and View Park Green Alley Stormwater Improvements Project	Central Santa Monica Bay	<u>SCORE: 80</u> A strong nature-based water quality improvement project that provides DAC benefits and some additional community investment benefits.
Salt Lake Park Infiltration Cistern	Lower Los Angeles River	<u>SCORE: 76</u> A strong nature-based water quality improvement project that is leveraging funds to provide DAC benefits and some additional community investment benefits.
Hermosillo Park Regional Stormwater Project	Lower San Gabriel River	<u>SCORE: 84</u> A good water quality improvement project which will provide additional community investment benefits.
East Los Angeles Sustainable Median Stormwater Capture Project	Rio Hondo	<u>SCORE: 83</u> A good water quality improvement project that is leveraging funds and using nature-based solutions to provide significant water supply benefits, DAC benefits, and some additional community investment benefits.
Hasley Canyon Park Stormwater Improvements Project	Santa Clara	<u>SCORE: 63</u> A good water quality improvement project that is leveraging funds and using nature-based solutions to provide some additional community investment benefits.
Rory M. Shaw Wetlands Park Project	Upper Los Angeles River	<u>SCORE: 96</u> Strong water quality improvement project that is leveraging funds and using nature-based solutions to provide significant water supply benefits, DAC benefits, and some additional community investment benefits.
Strathern North Stormwater Capture Project	Upper Los Angeles River	<u>SCORE: 89</u> Good water quality, nature-based elements and community benefits project that would benefit DAC communities and had support letters from local groups.

Bassett High School Stormwater Capture Multi-Benefit Project	Upper San Gabriel River	<u>SCORE: 92</u> Strong water quality improvement project that leverages funds and uses nature-based solutions to provide some water supply benefits, DAC benefits, and some additional community investment benefits.
--	-------------------------------	---

Attachment 2

Safe, Clean Water Program Implementation Ordinance: Section 18.04 SCW Program Goals.

- A. Improve water quality and contribute to attainment of water-quality requirements.
- B. Increase drought preparedness by capturing more Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff to store, clean, reuse, and/or recharge groundwater basins.
- C. Improve public health by preventing and cleaning up contaminated water, increasing access to open space, providing additional recreational opportunities, and helping communities mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change through activities such as increasing shade and green space.
- D. Leverage other funding sources to maximize SCW Program Goals.
- E. Invest in infrastructure that provides multiple benefits.
- F. Prioritize Nature-Based Solutions.
- G. Provide a spectrum of project sizes from neighborhood to regional scales.
- H. Encourage innovation and adoption of new technologies and practices.
- I. Invest in independent scientific research.
- J. Provide DAC Benefits, including Regional Program infrastructure investments, that are not less than one hundred and ten percent (110%) of the ratio of the DAC population to the total population in each Watershed Area.
- K. Provide Regional Program infrastructure funds benefiting each Municipality in proportion to the funds generated within their jurisdiction, after accounting for allocation of the one hundred and ten percent (110%) return to DACs, to the extent feasible.
- L. Implement an iterative planning and evaluation process to ensure adaptive management.
- M. Promote green jobs and career pathways.
- N. Ensure ongoing operations and maintenance for Projects.

Attachment 3
March 10, 2020 Letter from OWLA to WASCs



DATE: March 10, 2020

TO: WASC Chair & Members
CC: LAC SCWP Staff

RE: **OurWaterLA Recommendations Concerning the Watershed Area Stormwater Investment Plan for 2019-2020**

OurWaterLA (OWLA) is a diverse coalition that has engaged communities, businesses, and organizations across Los Angeles County, building support to reinvent and reinvest in our water future using nature based infrastructure that provides community health benefits, environmental health benefits, and economic benefits. OWLA recommends that funding priority be given to the projects that best exemplify the goals of the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP), and that consideration should be given to reserving future funds for future exemplary projects.

FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR STORMWATER PROJECTS

The Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs) must achieve the fourteen programmatic goals clearly laid out in the SCWP Implementation Ordinance (Attachment 1), including the goals to improve water quality and contribute to attainment of water-quality requirements, as well as multiple additional community investments such as prioritization of nature based solutions, community engagement, equity, and quality jobs. Our top issues are shown below in bullet point format and described more robustly in Attachment 1.

Nature Based Solutions

The prioritization of nature based solutions is a specific programmatic goal of the SCWP, and therefore must be reflected in the projects for the SIP.

Community Engagement

A plan for future community outreach is not sufficient for true community engagement in a project. Priority should be given to projects for which local community engagement, designed specifically for the proposed project, has already been initiated.

Equity

One of the most innovative aspects of the SCWP is the written requirements for the equitable distribution of community investments. When assessing the 110% benefit return on investments

for disadvantaged communities, it is important to clarify what type of benefits a project provides, and whether the proposed investments directly benefit the receiving community and verified by local community groups.

Quality Jobs

At a minimum, funding through the SCWP SIP must be contingent upon providing direct community investments, such as high quality local job and training opportunities.

We recommend that all of these programmatic goals be considered when selecting projects for full or partial funding for the 2019-2020 SIP, and that consideration be given to reserving future funds for future exemplary projects. One opportunity to reserve future funding is to fund projects in phases, to get projects through initial project development, such as project design.

FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

There have also been proposals for funding through the SCWP Scientific Studies Program. The purpose of the Scientific Studies Program is to provide funding for scientific and technical activities, including, but not limited to, scientific studies, technical studies, monitoring, and modeling related to *stormwater and urban runoff capture and pollution reduction*.

OWLA recommends that no funding be allocated for the Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution. We have serious concerns about the legitimacy of this proposed study. It has no hypothesis or clear methodology, and no scientific professionals were involved in the development of the study, as is required under the SCWP Scientific Studies Program when feasible.

This proposal is asking for nearly \$10 million region-wide over the next five years to target a specific source of a specific pollutant rather than providing multiple benefits, and to potentially weaken water quality objectives rather than improving our water quality. This proposed study will not support many of the program goals, listed in Attachment 1. Additionally, there are other potential funding sources for this study including the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition, which already has a similar study in its 5-year plan. **This nearly \$10 million should be spent to invest in our communities with multi-benefit stormwater capture projects.**

Further, for those WASCs considering the Wet Weather Zinc study, this proposal is asking for \$500K to potentially weaken water quality objectives, rather than improving our water quality. Funds should instead be spent on multi-benefit stormwater capture projects. The Safe, Clean Water Program is not the right funding source for this study because this study does not support many of the goals of the Safe, Clean Water Program or its Scientific Studies Program. There are other potential ways to achieve this type of recalculation, including working with the State Water Resources Control Board.

Thank you all for the considerable time and effort that you have contributed to the implementation of the Safe, Clean Water Program. We look forward to continuing our collaborative work with each of you, with the County of Los Angeles, and with our communities to most efficiently and effectively reinvest in our water future. Many of us, including WASC members, recognize that this is a complex process, and we would be remiss not to stop and strongly re-evaluate the context for making these critically important funding recommendations. OWLA core team members want to work with you to be part of the solution for meeting water quality standards by implementing multi-benefit projects. Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

OWLA Core Team

ATTACHMENT 1

Safe, Clean Water Program Implementation Ordinance: Section 18.04 SCW Program Goals.

- A. Improve water quality and contribute to attainment of water-quality requirements.
- B. Increase drought preparedness by capturing more Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff to store, clean, reuse, and/or recharge groundwater basins.
- C. Improve public health by preventing and cleaning up contaminated water, increasing access to open space, providing additional recreational opportunities, and helping communities mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change through activities such as increasing shade and green space.
- D. Leverage other funding sources to maximize SCW Program Goals.
- E. Invest in infrastructure that provides multiple benefits.
- F. Prioritize Nature-Based Solutions.
- G. Provide a spectrum of project sizes from neighborhood to regional scales.
- H. Encourage innovation and adoption of new technologies and practices.
- I. Invest in independent scientific research.
- J. Provide DAC Benefits, including Regional Program infrastructure investments, that are not less than one hundred and ten percent (110%) of the ratio of the DAC population to the total population in each Watershed Area.
- K. Provide Regional Program infrastructure funds benefiting each Municipality in proportion to the funds generated within their jurisdiction, after accounting for allocation of the one hundred and ten percent (110%) return to DACs, to the extent feasible.
- L. Implement an iterative planning and evaluation process to ensure adaptive management.
- M. Promote green jobs and career pathways.
- N. Ensure ongoing operations and maintenance for Projects.