

Safe, Clean Water Program

Rio Hondo

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Meeting Minutes:

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

9:00am - 12:00am

City of Monrovia, Monrovia Room

[321 Myrtle Ave Monrovia, CA 91016](https://www.monrovia.ca.gov/321_Myrtle_Ave_Monrovia_CA_91016)

Attendees

Committee Members and Alternates:

Mark Lombos (LA County)

Julian Juarez (LA County Flood Control District)

Kristen Ruffell (Sanitation Districts)

Mark Hall (Greater LA County Vector Control District)

Brent Maue (City of Pasadena Parks and Recreation)

Michael Hurley (Cal Water)

Thomas Wong (San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District)

Frank Lopez (Monterey Park)

David Dolphin (Alhambra)

Vanessa Hevener (Arcadia)

Sean Singletary (Pasadena)

James Carlson (Sierra Madre)

Gloria Crudgington (Monrovia)

Daniel Rossman (The Wilderness Society)

Committee Members Not Present

Tom Love (Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District)

Kelly Gardner (Main San Gabriel Basin)

Ron Miller (LA/OC Building Trades)

*Committee Member Alternate

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Carlson of Sierra Madre, the Chair of the Rio Hondo welcomed all of the members and confirmed a quorum of the committee was present. All committee members made self-introductions.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 26, 2020

The Los Angeles County Flood Control District (District) provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting. Mr. Carlson asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

The committee voted to approve the meeting minutes from February 26, 2020 (unanimous).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

Mr. Kevin Kim (District) provided a summary of the scoring progress so far by the Scoring Committee (SC), adoption of the General Income Based Tax Reduction Program, and informed the committee of the Meeting of Chairs/Vice Chairs on Thursday, February 27, 2020

Mr. Carlson provided a summary of the Meeting of the Chairs/Vice Chairs on Thursday, February 27, 2020.

Mr. Carlson recognized that Ms. Kelly Gardner was not present but that she expressed concern for the projects claiming water supply benefit and asked that they provide proof of water supply.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Rio Hondo

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Mr. Thomas Wong mentioned a letter written by Our Water LA about overcommitting SCW Program funds and hoped the WASC would consider their recommendations before making budget recommendations.

4. Public Comment Period

Ms. Belinda Faustinos, Nature for All, recommended that the WASC recommend that the WASC fund multi-projects with strong local community support. She also elaborated on specific points and concerns that was addressed on the letter written by Our Water LA (see attached).

5. Discussion Items:

a. SIP Programming Guidelines

Mr. Kim provided an overview of the SIP programming guidelines. The District clarified that for multi-year infrastructure program projects, the WASC may distribute funding without changing the total funding request. If a project that has been programmed into the SIP experience changes in project cost or scope, a revised application will need to be submitted, which will also be re-scored by the scoring committee as requested by the WASC.

b. General discussion of submitted project concepts and scientific studies

The committee began the discussion by stating that they have the option to save fund this year and roll over the funds to next year.

The committee discussed the Scientific Studies LRS Adaption to Address the LAR Bacteria SIP and PreSIP: A platform for Watershed Science. Mr. Lombos asked if the PreSIP study took into consideration the need for funding in two different watersheds (ULAR and RH). The applicants answered that the amount requested included for Rio Hondo and the study would not be impacted if ULAR does not approve the funding for their portion. Mr. Matsumoto mentioned that there is no budget for community engagement and that there should be a way to involve the community. A member of Craftwater replied that all major benefits would be included, as well as community benefits. A member of the public encouraged robust community engagement and suggested coordination with Metro.

The committee discussed the Scientific Study: Regional Bacteria Scientific Study. Mr. Carlson stated that it was difficult to consider since it is so big feasibility depends on how many WASCs fund the study; he also expressed concern that no other consultants had the opportunity to compete or determine if the price of the study was fair. Mr. Daniel Rossman had concerns regarding the scientific method. Mr. Hurley asked about making approval contingent on the other WASC including the study on their SIP. Ms. Ruffell mentioned that the study would have to be included on five WASCs or it would need to be relooked at and that Santa Clara River had included it on their SIP. The OWLA letter (attached) was mentioned.

Ms. Ruffell said a number of WASCs were looking at wetlands treatment and developing a standard for wetlands treatment. Wetlands based treatment does not get us to compliance and that looking at human health marker makes sense as a good starting point. Mr. Lombos mentioned that driver of the study to find direct nexus between stormwater and public health and ultimately prioritize how funds are used in the region.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Rio Hondo

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Mr. Rossman stated that the price tag is high and instead of spending \$10 M on a study that could be used for building a wetlands, then you can have the benefits of creating habitat. Ms. Ruffell stated that creating wetlands is nice, but then you may have to also provide additional treatment for the wetland, and this study would allow data to say it is safe to create that wetlands.

Ms. Hevener also stated a more wholistic approach will help the cities in not having to do as many projects to meet compliance. Mr. Lombos stated that the goal was not to do less projects but to do better projects for the region; new technologies, additional treatments, being mindful to prioritize the best projects.

Mr. Rossman stated he would like the same goal but prefers a different path to get there and fears analysis by paralysis. Mr. Maue recommended a smaller scale. Mr. Lopez mentioned that the total cost to Rio Hondo is not \$10M and the study would help the WASC figure out what project to choose. Mr. Hurley asked if they had the ability to restructure the proposal from the applicant to which Mr. Kim replied that was not possible. The members discussed some details regarding contracting and that the Gateway water management would be the lead agency and would follow public contracting code.

The committee then discussed the Infrastructure Program applicants: East LA Sustainable Median Stormwater Capture Project and Baldwin Lake and Tule Pond Restoration Project. The members noted that both projects were included in an EWMP as approved projects. They mentioned that Baldwin Lake would help with compliance for the WMP, emphasis on multi-benefits including water quality, water supply, and community investment, and the project is a regional park benefiting many schools. A member of the public agreed that the project had a lot of community support.

The East LA Sustainable Median project was noted as providing benefit to a disadvantaged community, included in the ULAR EWMP as a regional project. It was clarified that the project was not fully funded.

The committee discussed the applications for the Technical Resources Program: Monrovia School Project, Vincent Lugo, Ranchito Sierra Vista, and Arcadia Wash. For the Monrovia School Project, Ms. Crudgington stated that the city of Monrovia was still in the process of judging the concept and asked the District to confirm with the applicant that they are still interested in funding. No items were discussed for the Vincent Lugo or Ranchito Sierra Vista project concepts. For the Arcadia Wash concept, Ms. Crudgington mentioned that the project is in a disadvantaged area. Mr. Rossman recommended that we hold off on the TRP concepts because it is intended for DAC or organizations that do not have resources. Mr. Lombos stated that the projects will provide regional benefit and ultimately we are trying to fund TRP's that become infrastructure projects; he stated funding TRP's that will not be good regional projects does not make sense. Ms. Ruffell noted that the concepts for consideration treat only a small portion in the watershed area.

c. Disadvantage Communities Benefit

Mr. Rossman would like the definition of disadvantaged community benefits to be better defined in subsequent years and to be more nuanced. Mr. Lopez does not believe every project needs to benefit a disadvantaged community, but the WASC should strive to meet the goals for the SCW Program.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Rio Hondo

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



d. Ranking worksheet and tool

The Committee ranked the applications for the Regional Program and the District tallied the results.

| Program | Project Name | # of Votes | Score | Program Place | Overall Place |
|---------|--|------------|-------|---------------|---------------|
| IP | East Los Angeles Sustainable Median Stor | 13 | 102 | 1 | 1 |
| TRP | Arcadia Wash Water Conservation Diversio | 11 | 80 | 1 | 2 |
| IP | Baldwin Lake and Tule Pond Restoration P | 11 | 73 | 2 | 3 |
| SS | LRS Adaption to Address the LAR Bacteria | 11 | 60 | 1 | 4 |
| SS | PreSIP: A platform for Watershed Science | 9 | 54 | 2 | 5 |
| TRP | Ranchito Sierra Vista Infiltration Proje | 9 | 41 | 2 | 6 |
| TRP | Monrovia USD Campus Green Infrastructure | 7 | | 0 | |
| TRP | Vincent Lugo Park Stormwater Capture Fea | 7 | | | |
| SS | Regional Bacteria Scientific Study | 8 | | | |

6. Voting Items

a. Assign percent allocation target

The committee decided to assign a percent allocation for the first year and subsequent years. Ms. Ruffell motioned to set 81% for the first year and 50% for subsequent years. Mr. Rossman amended and requested 81% for the first year and 35% for subsequent. A vote by hand was taken; the motion did not pass (Aye: 6, Nay: 7). Mr Dolphin recommended 81% for the first year and 40% for the subsequent years; the motion did not pass (Aye: 6, Nay: 7). Mr. Lombos motioned to discuss this item at the next WASC meeting; the motion passed unanimously.

b. Project selection method

The meeting was adjourned before this voting item.

7. Items for next agenda

a. Continue Stormwater Investment Plan discussion and development

b. Confirm and vote on Final Stormwater Investment Plan

The District recommends the following items for the next agenda. (1) Further Discussion on project selection process and (2) Stormwater Investment Plan discussion and development. The committee voiced general questions about the SIP programming process. Programming guidelines to be shared with the committee at the next meeting. There were general comments from the public regarding the allocation percentages for the three separate programs in the Regional Program. District stated that the allocation percentages are defined in the implementation ordinance and revisions to the ordinance, as well as, the scoring criteria will be

Safe, Clean Water Program

Rio Hondo

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



revisited in future years. The committee agreed to schedule a three-hour meeting to discuss and finalize the SIP.


8. Adjournment

Mr. Carlson thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

Rio Hondo

Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBER AND ALTERNATE SIGN-IN



| Member Name | Municipality/ Organization | Email Address | Signature |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Julian Juarez | FCD | JJUAREZ@dpw.lacounty.gov | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Kelly Gardner | Main San Gabriel Basin | kelly@watermaster.org | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Brent Maue | City of Pasadena Department of Public Works | Bmaue@cityofpasadena.net | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Kristen Ruffell | Sanitation Districts | kruffell@lacsdsd.org | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Tom Love | Upper San Gabriel District | tom@usgvnmwd.org | |
| Thomas Wong | San Gabriel Valley MWD Division 3 | thomaswong05@gmail.com | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Michael Hurley | Cal Water | mhurley00@gmail.com | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Ron Miller | LA/OC Building Trades | rmiller@laocbuildintrades.org | |
| Daniel Rossmann | The Wilderness Society | daniel_rossman@tws.org | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Mark Hall | Vector Control | mhall@glacvcd.org | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| David Dolpin | Alhambra | ddolpin@cityofalhambra.org | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Vanessa Hevener | Arcadia | vhevener@ArcadiaCA.gov | PRESENT |
| Mark Lombos | Los Angeles County | MLOMBOS@dpw.lacounty.gov | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Gloria Crudgington | Monrovia | gcrudgington@ci.monrovia.ca.us | PRESENT |
| Frank Lopez | Monterey Park | flopez@montereypark.ca.gov | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Sean Singletary | Pasadena | ssingletary@cityofpasadena.net | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| James Carlson | Sierra Madre | jcarlson@cityofsierramadre.com | <i>[Signature]</i> |

Rio Hondo
 Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting
 COMMITTEE MEMBER AND ALTERNATE SIGN-IN



| Member Name | Municipality/ Organization | Email Address | | Signature |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------|
| Carolina Hernandez | FCD | CHERNANDEZ@dpw.lacounty.gov | A | |
| Tony Zampiello | Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster | tony@watermaster.org | A | |
| Martha Tremblay | Sanitation Districts | mtremblay@lacsdsd.org | A | |
| Robert Tock | Upper San Gabriel District | | A | |
| Bryan Matsumoto | Nature for All | bryan@lanatureforall.org | A | |
| Liliana Griego | Friends of the Los Angeles River | liliana@folar.org | A | |
| Mark Daniel | Vector Control | mdaniel@glacvcd.org | A | |
| Eddie Chan | Arcadia | echan2@ArcadiaCA.gov | A | |
| Latoya Waters | Alhambra | lwaters@cityofalhambra.org | A | |
| Ferrando Villaluna | Los Angeles County | FVILLALUNA@dpw.lacounty.gov | A | |
| Sean Sullivan | Monrovia | ssullivan@ci.monrovia.ca.us | A | |
| Mark A. McAvoy | Monterey Park | mmcavoy@MontereyPark.ca.gov | A | |
| Kris Markarian | Pasadena | kmarkarian@cityofpasadena.net | A | |
| Chris Cimino | Sierra Madre | CCimino@cityofsierramadre.com | A | |
| | | | | |

Rio Hondo
 Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting
 PUBLIC SIGN-IN



| First Name | Last Name | Municipality/Organization | Email Address |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| OLIVER | GRIFFIN | CRAFT WATER BERB | oliver.grieff@craftwaterinc.com |
| Hans | Fennel | Weston Solutions | hans.fennel@westonsolutions.com |
| DAWN | Petschauer | LASAN | dawn.petschauer@laskan.com |
| Brianna | Datti | Terra Tech | brianna.datti@terratech.com |
| Sandy Swider | | Arboretum | SSwider@arboretum.org |
| AURA | CAZARES | Tetra Tech | laura.cazares@tetratech.com |
| Jen | Waveren | WESTON | robart.waveren@westonsolutions.com |
| JOSHUA | FERTON | LAC PD | |
| JOE | VENZON | LA COUNTY | |
| BLAKE | M HITTINGTON | SELF | |
| BEINDA | FRUSTINOS | OURA/AVYA / Self | beinda@natureforall.org |
| Tony | Gonzalez | City of San Gabriel | Tgonzalez@sgd.uscg.gov |
| Mike | Anders | Orlando | Mike.Anders@stake.com |
| Janet Rodriguez | Rodriguez | Orlando Engineering | JanetRodriguez@gmail.com |
| Vanessa | Forner | Aradia | Vanessa@aradia.ca.gov |

*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public

Safe, Clean Water Program

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

SIP Programming Guidelines



Infrastructure Program

- WASC shall review and recommend projects as they were submitted.
- The SIP shall program the total requested funding amount by the applicant or none. For multi-year infrastructure program projects, the WASC may re-distribute funding without changing the total funding request. There are other methods, which are detailed out in **“Attachment A”**.
 - If a project that has been programmed into the SIP experience changes in project cost or scope, a revised application will need to be submitted, which will also be re-scored by the scoring committee as requested by the WASC.
- The 85/10/5% ratios and DAC benefits will be evaluated over a rolling 5-yr period each year. These criteria are calculated based on the funding allocated, not the regional funding available.
- If the WASC determines a project provides DAC benefits and the project is included in the SIP, the full funding amount will be used toward the DAC criteria calculation.
- Municipality benefits and spectrum of project types and sizes will be evaluated using total project cost, to the extent feasible, over a rolling 5-year period each year. Additional methodology and process to be determined by District in year 2.

Technical Resources Program

- The District has committed to complete feasibility studies for a rate of \$300,000 to be approved and budgeted in the SIP. If less, the excess will be returned to the WASC. If more, District will use District Program SCW Funds to cover the excess cost.
 - The WASC may choose to allocate more than \$300,000 to a TRP, if they choose. Unused funds will be returned to the WASC regional program funds.
- The resulting feasibility studies will, at minimum, address the 19 requirements outlined in the SCW Feasibility Study Guidelines. Additional technical analysis will be included at the District’s discretion.
- Projects that do score above the threshold score cannot be referred to the Technical Resources Program.
- A placeholder of \$200,000 shall be programmed in the current SIP for watershed coordinator services.

General Notes

- For the current year, the District recommends the WASCs allocate no more than 80% of the estimated revenue to account for potential lesser revenue due to tax relief programs, to ensure future capacity for new projects and consider contingencies for programmed projects. For the subsequent 4 years, the District recommends the WASCs earmark no more than 50% of the estimated revenue.
- Under extenuating circumstances where the SIP criteria cannot be met, an exception may be permitted and disclosed in the SIP. For example, if very few IP projects were submitted such that it significantly restricts available funding for TRPs and SSs, up to 10% and 5% of revenue generated by the Watershed Area can be allocated towards TRP and SS, respectively.
- As a part of quarterly/annual reporting, applicants will have the opportunity to adjust their funding distribution for consideration during programming next year’s SIP.

Attachment A

SIP development for multi-year Infrastructure Program Projects- Example Scenarios/Methods

Infrastructure Program Project Developer (IPPD) desires \$30 M over 3 years (design/construction) for Project A; \$20 M elsewhere (\$50 M total)

| | SIP | TOTAL SCW FUNDS REQUESTED | FY 20-21 (Budgeted) | FY 21-22 (Projection) | FY 22-23 (Projection) | FY 23-24 (Projection) | FY 24-25 (Projection) |
|----------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Scenario | INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM | | | | | | |
| 1 | Project A | \$30 M | \$10 M | \$10 M | \$10 M | | |
| 2 | Project A | \$10 M | \$10 M | | | | |
| 3 | Project A | \$30 M | \$10 M | \$10 M | \$10 M | | |
| 4 | Project A | \$30 M | \$5 M | \$10 M | \$15 M | | |
| 5 | Project A | \$30 M | \$30 M | | | | |
| 6 | Project A | \$30 M | | | | \$30 M | |

Scenario 1: Project is structured in phases (or re-structured into phases without changing the overall scope or project cost) that can be funded annually; IPPD receives \$10 M in year 1 with documented anticipation of two subsequent \$10 M allocations for Phases 2 and 3.

Scenario 2: Project is structured in phases that can be funded annually; IPPD receives \$10 M in year 1 but needs to request future \$10 M allocations because the total project cost was not requested initially. This option is discouraged for planning purposes.

Scenario 3: Project is not structured in phases, but IPPD demonstrates the capacity and acknowledges the risk of performing the work without encumbering the entirety of funds in advance (with documented earmarks/anticipation of two subsequent \$10 M allocations)

Scenario 4: Project is not structured in phases and WASC chooses to allocate funding over multiple years/SIPs to be accrued by IPPD. The IPPD will begin work once all funding is in hand (annual amounts accrued could vary).

Scenario 5: Project is granted full request in its entirety up front, even if start of construction is multiple years away. This option is discouraged due to likely long-term uncertainties.

Scenario 6: Project is earmarked for full funding in a future SIP year. WASC may anticipate or plan for rolled over funds from prior years to allow for full funding in single future budget but is not guaranteeing any official recommended budget at this time.

NOTES:

- Future funding requests are subject to WASC annual confirmation of budget, scope, and schedule, and ultimately Board Approval.
- Example assumes that the SIP has met other requirements in LACFCD Code and accompanying guidelines (85/10/5; DAC %; etc.)
- Contingencies should be built-in to recommended SIP allocations at WASCs discretion.
- Operations and Maintenance still can be requested.

SIP Planning Tool Overview

1


Regional Program Overview by Watershed

Anticipated Annual Regional Program Funds \$11.54 M

2

| Fiscal Year | Infrastructure Program (>85%) | Technical Resources (≤10%) | Scientific Studies (≤5%) | TOTAL | Percent Allocated |
|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| FY 20-21 | \$ 3,500,000.00 | \$ 1,400,000.00 | \$ 481,032.00 | \$5,381,032.00 | 47% |
| FY 21-22 | \$ 3,500,000.00 | \$ 200,000.00 | \$ 538,532.00 | \$4,238,532.00 | 37% |
| FY 22-23 | \$ 5,440,000.00 | \$ 200,000.00 | \$ 425,532.00 | \$6,065,532.00 | 53% |
| FY 23-24 | \$ 3,194,750.00 | \$ 200,000.00 | \$ 75,132.00 | \$3,469,882.00 | 30% |
| FY 24-25 | \$ 231,000.00 | \$ 200,000.00 | \$ 75,132.00 | \$506,132.00 | 4% |
| Total | \$ 15,865,750.00 | \$ 2,200,000.00 | \$ 1,595,360.00 | \$ 19,661,110.00 | 34% |

3



4

Toggle Projects

Watershed Area

- Central Santa Monica Bay
- Lower Los Angeles River
- Lower San Gabriel River
- Rio Hondo
- Santa Clara River
- South Santa Monica Bay
- Upper Los Angeles River
- Upper San Gabriel River
- North Santa Monica Bay

Infrastructure Pro...

- Baldwin Lake and Tule P...
- East Los Angeles Sustain...

Watershed Area

- Central Santa Monica Bay
- Lower Los Angeles River
- Lower San Gabriel River
- North Santa Monica Bay
- Rio Hondo
- Santa Clara River
- South Santa Monica Bay
- Upper Los Angeles River
- Upper San Gabriel River

Technical Resourc...

- Arcadia Wash Water Co...
- Monrovia Unified Schoo...
- Ranchito Sierra Vista In...
- Vincent Lugo Park Stom...
- Watershed Coordinator ...

Watershed Area

- Central Santa Monica Bay
- Lower Los Angeles River
- Lower San Gabriel River
- North Santa Monica Bay
- Rio Hondo
- Santa Clara River
- South Santa Monica Bay
- Upper Los Angeles River
- Upper San Gabriel River



Scientific Studies

- LRS Adaptation to Adre...
- preSIP: A Platform for W...
- Regional Scientific Stud...

5

A

Infrastructure Program Breakdown By Watershed



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Required DAC Ratio | 35% |
| Required Funding for DACs FY 20-25 (110%) | \$ 6,108,313.75 |
| Funding Allocated for DACs FY 20-25 | \$ 15,865,750.00 |

| Project Name | DAC | Municipality |
|---|-----|----------------|
| Baldwin Lake and Tule Pond Restoration Proj | Yes | Arcadia |
| East Los Angeles Sustainable Median stormw | Yes | Unincorporated |

B



C

D

E

6

Regional Program Tools Overview

1

Anticipated Annual Regional Program Funds:

- This amount is what the District estimates the watershed area will have for programming into the Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP).
- This estimate does not show the reductions for the Credit Program, tax exemptions and reductions.
- This estimate is used for the estimated projected income

2

Fiscal Year Totals:

- Financial data provided by applicants
- Displays the sum of toggled projects, concepts, and studies
- Calculates the percentage of funds allocated for the fiscal year
- District recommends programming 80% for the first year and 50% for subsequent fiscal years

3

Breakdown by SIP Funding Program:

- Displays the percentage of funding allocated to each of the subprograms (Infrastructure, Technical Resources, and Scientific Studies) over the next five years based on the selected projects, concepts and studies toggled on for selection.

4

Infrastructure Program:

- The available selections for Infrastructure Program.
- The blue color indicates the project has been selected.
- Data from the Project Module and Scoring Committee is pulled into the SIP Tool.

5

Technical Resources Program:

- The available selection for the Technical Resources Program.
- The blue color indicates the project has been selected.
- Data from the Project Module is pulled into the SIP Tool.
- Watershed Coordinators is the minimum number determined by ordinance

6

Scientific Studies:

- The available selection for the Scientific Studies Program.
- The blue color indicates the project has been selected.
- Data from the Project Module is pulled into the SIP Tool.

Infrastructure Program Tools Overview

A

Total Project Cost

- Displays the funding requested as a percentage

B

Project Benefits

- Displays the summary of Water Quality, Water Supply, Community Investment, Nature-Based Solutions, and Leveraged Funds & Community Support finalized by the Scoring Committee.

C

SCW Funding Requested

- Displays the funding requested for each Fiscal Year
- Selected Projects

D

Disadvantaged Community funding

- Required DAC Ratio is the total amount of disadvantaged community population in the watershed area
- Required Funding for DACs FY 20-25 (110%) is the amount of funding that will need to be allocated to DACs over the 5-year period
- Funding Allocated for DACs FY 20-25 is the amount that has been allocated by the WASCs for the current SIP

E

Project Location by municipality

- Displays the municipality that the project is located within.



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.