Meeting Minutes:
Thursday, January 30, 2020
2:00pm - 4:00pm
Los Angeles County Public Works
900 South Fremont Ave. Alhambra, CA 91803

Attendees

Committee Members Present:
Maria Mehranian (Cordoba Corp.)
Diana Tang (City of Long Beach)
Kristine Guerrero (League of Cities)
Belinda Faustinos (Nature For All)
Shelley Luce (Heal the Bay)
Lauren Ahkiam (LAANE)
Elva Yanez (Prevention Institute)

Charles Trevino (Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District)
Irma Munoz* (LA Regional Water Quality Control Board)
Carl Blum* (LA County Flood Control District)

Committee Members Absent:
Barbara Romero (City of Los Angeles)

*Non-voting members

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees

1. Welcome and Introductions
Shelley Luce welcomed the committee members. All committee members make self-introductions.

2. Approval of October 28, 2019 meeting minutes
The Los Angeles County Flood Control District (District) provided a copy of the posted draft meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Belinda Faustinos made a motion to approve the minutes. Lauren Ahkiam seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Public Comment Period
No public comment.

4. Committee Member and District Updates
Matthew Frary (District) provided a summary of the General Income-based Tax Reduction Program, other tax relief programs and status, collection of revenue to date, Regional Program updates, Watershed Area and Scoring Committee activities, and tools that WASCs would utilize in the coming weeks. Additional updates on the status
Ms. Mehranian asked if the forecast for the revenue had been provided. Mr. Frary replied the forecast would be done on an annual basis and the current estimates are available online.

Ms. Faustinos asked how the General Income-based Tax Reduction Program was advertised and the extent of the outreach that had occurred. Mr. Frary replied that the Safe, Clean Water Website and eblasts have detailed the new program and that additional willing parties, including other members in the committee, were expected to aid in the outreach efforts once it is adopted next month.

Ms. Munoz inquired about amount of the Credit Program applications received and Mr. Frary reiterated the count to date (14).

Ms. Faustinos asked if the Scoring Committee comments would be available on the Project Module online tool and if all applicants would be presenting at the WASC meetings. Mr. Frary explained the status of the Scoring Committee, that the meeting notes from the Scoring Committee contain the pertinent notes for the scored projects (see project rubric sheets), and that all year-one applicants with completed applications would be presenting to their respective WASCs.

Ms. Crosson asked if the SIP Planning tool that was previewed would be available for the WASCs to utilize. Mr. Frary confirmed the tool would be used to facilitate the SIP discussion and District staff would aid in that discussion.

Ms. Ahkiam noted that the Project Module would need additional clarification to be able to adjust in future submission cycles. Mr. Frary acknowledged the District’s intent to continue to improve the module and cited the example of incorporating better financial breakdowns/details of expenditures over 5 years in the next edition of the tool. Also, the lessons learned from the Scoring Committee will be valuable and can be shared once they are available.

5. **Ex Parte Communication Disclosures**

   Belinda Faustinos, Lauren Ahkiam, and Shelley Luce attended an Our Water LA meeting where Safe, Clean Water Program was discussed. Liz Crosson discussed the SCW Program with LA City departments.

6. **Summary of Submissions received during first Call for Projects**

   Matt Frary gave an overview of the projects submitted to the Regional Program. The committee had questions and comments about the status of certain projects, the examination process used by the WASCs, the specifics to the Technical Resources Program, the Regional Program subprograms and funding split between the
7. **Summary of watershed context presentation provided to WASCs**

Mike Antos led a discussion summarizing Stantec’s role regarding regional coordination and preparing the WASCs with information for watershed-specific priorities and considerations. He presented an online map tool as the backdrop for discussion and decision making for the WASCs.

Ms. Munoz noted concern about what entity would be engaging the community. Mr. Antos responded that the future Watershed Coordinator positions would be the support for technical and community outreach once they are established for each watershed.

Ms. Faustinos noted that stakeholder engagement and engaging community members are different concepts. Mr. Frary responded that the Watershed Coordinator would support engaging the community as well as identifying concepts for projects.

The committee asked for additional GIS layers such as completed projects, localized flooding points, and tree canopy to be added to the online map tool. Mr. Antos noted that he would work with the District to bring in additional and available data sets based on the recommendations provided by the WASCs and ROC for potential future incorporation and use.

Ms. Munoz noted the importance of working closely with Water Board staff to ensure projects funded helped address maximum water quality compliance.

8. **Discussion of benefits to disadvantaged communities**

Mike Antos led a discussion describing the complexity of defining and calculating benefits to disadvantaged communities. General guidance for how attributing and tracking benefit in alignment with current ordinance language was presented.

The committee expressed concerns about the ratio of 110% funding for disadvantaged communities being calculated based on the entire project funding amount. Members discussed the value of considering alternate methods, the need for additional criteria for assigning benefits to disadvantaged communities, and the desire to further shape this process, potentially through additional discussion or a working group.

Ms. Luce stated that she would work with Mr. Frary and Mr. Antos for further guidance.

9. **Public Comment Period**

No public comment.
10. Voting Items
   None

11. Items for Next Agenda
    Some potential discussion items for the next agenda included measuring the success of the Credit Program, follow-up on calculating benefits to a disadvantaged community, the draft transfer agreements, how insight from the RWQCB could be incorporated, and how the SCW program will be evaluated overall.

12. Meeting Adjourned
    Shelley Luce thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.
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*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public*
LA County Public Works
Regional Coordination of the
Safe, Clean Water Program

Disadvantaged
Community
Policy Context
Inclusiveness & Sensitivity

Words Matter

“Dacks”

Strengths and Needs

Empowering voices / giving access

People make communities
California Policies
State Policies for identifying disadvantaged communities

Water Code – MHI

SB535 - CalEnviroScreen

DWR Current – 2016 Data

CES3.0 Current – June 2018
CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Indicators

- **Pollution Burden Exposure:**
  - Air Quality Ozone
  - Air Quality PM2.5
  - Diesel particulate matter
  - Drinking water contaminants
  - Pesticide use
  - Toxic releases from facilities
  - Traffic density

- **Pollution Burden Environmental Effects:**
  - Cleanup Sites
  - Groundwater threats
  - Hazardous waste generators and facilities
  - Impaired water bodies
  - Solid waste sites and facilities

- **Population Characteristics:**
  - Asthma
  - Cardiovascular Disease
  - Low Birth Weight Infants

- **Socioeconomic Factors:**
  - Educational attainment
  - Housing burdened low income households
  - Linguistic isolation
  - Poverty
  - Unemployment

---

*The Environmental Effects component is weighted one-half when combined with the Exposures component.*
Early thinking: Projects in Census tracts
Six “Pilot Projects”

Studies funded via DWR Prop 84 regional assistance grants

CWH among them, along with Coachella, Imperial, Oakland, Inyo/Mono, etc.

Synchronized effort by Alcanza for RMC

Shared conclusion: funding for projects without funding for engagement leads to unwanted / unhelpful projects

Visioning workshop developed next steps statewide
Prop 1 – Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program

“Ensuring Involvement”

Overcoming we know what they need…

A set-aside within IRWM program for community engagement

- Watershed Coordinators are the closest analog in SCWP

DACIP is underway in GLAC region, a Needs Assessment Task kicks off in March.

SCWP and DACIP will synchronize as much as possible
Safe, Clean Water Program Policy Language
16.03(H) – Disadvantaged Community

- means a Census Block Group that has an annual median household income of less than eighty percent (80%) of the Statewide annual median household income (as defined in Water Code section 79505.5).

16.03(I) – Disadvantaged Community Benefit

- means a Water Quality Benefit, Water Supply Benefit, and/or Community Investment Benefit located in a DAC or providing benefits directly to a DAC population.
18.04(J) – Program Goals

- 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.

18.04(K) – Program Goals

- Provide Regional Program infrastructure funds benefitting 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.
18.05(C)1a - District Program Educational Programs

- Public education and community engagement Programs throughout the District, including a sustained education and engagement Program for disadvantaged communities;

18.05(C)3 – District Program Educational Programs

- These Programs will be implemented throughout the District with special attention to the needs of DACs.

18.07(B)2c – Regional Program Stormwater Investment Plans

- Funding for Projects that provide DAC Benefits shall not be less than one hundred and ten percent (110%) of the ratio of the DAC population to the total population in each Watershed Area. To facilitate compliance with this requirement, the District will work with stakeholders and Watershed Coordinator(s) to utilize existing tools to identify high-priority geographies for water-quality improvement projects and other projects that create DAC Benefits within DACs, to help inform WASCs as they consider project recommendations;
18.07(B)2d – Regional Program Implementation

- Each Municipality shall receive benefits in proportion to the funds generated within their jurisdiction, after accounting for allocation of the one hundred ten percent (110%) return to DACs, to the extent feasible, to be evaluated annually over a rolling five (5) year period;

18.07(D)3c(5) - Watershed Coordinators Technical Resource Program

- Conduct community outreach to diverse communities, with an emphasis on disadvantaged communities;

18.07(F)3j – Watershed Coordinator quarterly reporting

- A summary of the outreach activities to DACs and expenditures that achieve DAC benefit.
110% Calculation

A project claiming benefits to a disadvantaged community

Must explain in proposal and during presentation to WASC

If WASC concurs and project added to SIP and draft 110% calculation

And ROC concurs and provides SIP to Supervisors

100% of SCWP funding allocated to the project is counted in the 110% calculation.

And Supervisors adopt SIP
Generic Project for discussion about benefits
Project Need:

- Disadvantaged Community block group
- 40-acre suburban drainage area with no storm sewers
  - all surface flow in roadways
  - local flooding during storms
- Tributary to streams with multiple TMDLs for nonpoint source pollution.
- Good infiltration to drinking water aquifer
- Insufficient parks per population
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grey capture, treat, infiltrate</td>
<td>20 afy treated and infiltrated</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green capture, treat, infiltrate</td>
<td>2 afy treated and infiltrated, urban greening</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley to green pocket park, amenities</td>
<td>6 afy treated, infiltrated, greening, rehab open space</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28 afy treated, infiltrated, greening, new open space</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which benefits are direct ones?

Jobs during construction?

Educational materials in pocket park?

What happens if the park is outside the block group, but the drainage area is within it?
Generic Example Project

**Obvious direct benefits for the block group:**
- Local flooding reduction
- Greening at the site of the project
- A new pocket park

**Less obvious (direct?) benefits for the block group:**
- Progress towards regulatory compliance for block group municipality or county
- Recharge to GW basin that in-part serves the block group

**Hard to quantify (indirect?) benefits for the block group:**
- Direct or indirect economic activity and jobs
- Property value (gentrification?)
Other Dimensions
Another policy dimension for consideration

Insufficient proposals for projects that benefit disadvantaged communities could constrain how much a WASC can allocate to other projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Projects</th>
<th>Funding Request</th>
<th>Disadvantaged Community Benefit?</th>
<th>Funding Allocated</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>$3.2 million</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3.2 million</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>$4.8 million</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,072,727</td>
<td>$2,727,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,272,727</td>
<td>$2,727,273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generic WASC –
$10 million available
40% population in disadvantaged communities
Therefore, $4.4 million is 110% target
Questions and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Area</th>
<th>DAC Ratio*</th>
<th>Annual Funding Recommended for Projects that Benefit DACs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$8.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Los Angeles River</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$8.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower San Gabriel River</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$3.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$3.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$0.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$5.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Los Angeles River</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$18.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper San Gabriel River</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$3.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$51.6 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These figures are based on the 2016 US Census and will be updated periodically.

- SCWP Digital Spatial Data Library
  [https://arcg.is/rbKfm](https://arcg.is/rbKfm)
“’Disadvantaged’, is mean.”

Seventh grader from Riverside Unified School District
Regional Coordination
of the
Safe, Clean Water Program
&
Watershed Coordinators
Scope of Services

**Task 1: Develop (coordination of) Watershed Coordination**
- Interviews with key stakeholders *(complete, report pending)*
- Identify & augment digital library tools *(complete)*
- Develop & document coordination program *(underway)*
- Technical Assistance outreach materials *(underway)*

**Task 2: Support WASC and District with regional coordination**
- Attend WASC meetings, support WASC and District *(underway)*
- WASC education *(underway)*
- Onboard selected Watershed Coordinators
- Convene monthly watershed coordinator meetings
- Develop leverage resource tracking tool

*We are not interim watershed coordinators!*
Mike Antos, Ph.D., ENV SP
Senior Integrated Water Management Specialist
Social Scientist
mike.antos@stantec.com
626-568-6080

- 2008-2015 Council for Watershed Health, Programs Director
- 2013-2016 Member of the Board, Coalition for our Water Future
- 2015-2016 CSU Northridge, Director of Center for Urban Water Resilience
- 2016-2019 Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, Senior Watershed Manager

Tori Klug, P.E.
Environmental Engineer
tori.klug@Stantec.com
626-568-6234

Jon Abelson, P.E., ENV SP
Civil Engineer / Project Manager
jonathan.abelson@stantec.com
626-568-6090
Principals of Watershed Management

- Water, land, and the relationship between
- Water where it flows, regardless of political boundaries
- Interdependence
  - Resilience anywhere is resilience everywhere
- Inclusive of all communities
- Adaptive Management
  - Plan, implement, monitor, assess, repeat...
Watershed Coordination principles

- **Capacity Building**
  - Watershed education
  - Information sharing
  - Grant-writing / funding development

- **Facilitate partnerships**
  - Coordination among decision-makers, managers, and stakeholders
  - Mediate conflicts
  - *Situational awareness*

- **Watershed planning & assessment**
  - Project & program development
  - Performance tracking

Stantec
Watershed Coordinators in SCWP

- "Consultants" to Flood Control District
- Non-voting member(s) of the WASC
- Funded by Regional allocation in each Stormwater Investment Plan
- Part of Technical Resources Program

Table 2. Watershed Coordinator Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Area</th>
<th>Total Population*</th>
<th>Watershed Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>1,757,708</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Los Angeles River</td>
<td>895,933</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower San Gabriel River</td>
<td>903,045</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>71,764</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo</td>
<td>744,634</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>286,114</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>1,003,438</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Los Angeles River</td>
<td>2,969,577</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper San Gabriel River</td>
<td>1,015,552</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures are based on the 2016 US Census and will be updated periodically.

Per the program, the number of WC listed is a minimum, a WASC could decide to fund additional positions.
Watershed Coordinators in SCWP

- **Technical Resource:**
  - Work with TA teams to bring resources to applicants and projects
  - Identify and help leverage non-SCWP funds

- **Project Development Facilitator:**
  - Daylight project concepts / opportunities
  - Coordinate multi-party activities

- **Educator / Communicator:**
  - Provide stakeholder outreach education
  - Convey community goals to decision-makers
Digital Spatial Resources Library

Map Tool:  
https://arcg.is/rbKfm

Data Presentation:  
https://arcg.is/0yvHC5