

Safe, Clean Water Program

Santa Clara River

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Meeting Minutes:

Thursday, May 14, 2020
10:00am – 12:00pm
WebEx Video Conferencing

Attendees:

Committee Members Present:

Kristen Ruffell (LA County – Sanitation)
Jason Gibbs (GP Strategies)
Janine Prado (Santa Clarita Recreation & Community Services)
Darren Hernandez (Santa Clarita)
Bruce Hamamoto (LA County Public Works)
Julian Juarez (District)
Dirk Marks (Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency)
Steve Cole (Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency)

Hunt Braly (Poole & Shaffery)
Heather Merenda (Santa Clarita)
David Peterson* (Santa Clarita)
Sandra Cattell (Santa Clarita Sierra Club)
Dianne Erskine-Hellrigel (St. Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Foundation)
Mary Johnson (Agua Dulce Town Council)
Robert Newman (Santa Clarita)

Committee Members Not Present:

None

*Committee Member Alternate

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Jason Gibbs, the Vice-Chair of the Santa Clara River WASC, called the meeting to order, and invited all participants to join the Pledge of Allegiance of the United States.

As the official host of the WebEx meeting, Mr. CJ Caluag of the District introduced himself, and asked for a roll-call of Committee members, and with a majority present, quorum was established.

Mr. Caluag then went over the various WebEx housekeeping items for both the Committee members and the general public's participation, and reminded participants that public comment cards can be sent to the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) email. Mr. Caluag referred to the WebEx Conferencing Guidelines document and displayed it on his screen to further illustrate the various functions available on the WebEx platform, including the "raised hand" feature.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 5, 2020

The District uploaded a copy of the meeting minutes from the March 5th meeting on the SCW website. Mr. Gibbs asked the committee members for comments or revisions.

Ms. Sandra Cattell asked where in the meeting minutes was the discussion on having local workers hired for the funded projects to satisfy the community-based component of the SCW program, and recalls being told that contractors cannot be asked to hire local workers, but does not agree with this and would like this captured in the March 5th meeting minutes. Mr. Caluag asked if Ms. Cattell has read the fund Transfer

Safe, Clean Water Program

Santa Clara River

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Agreement (TA) templates available on the SCW website, which speak on the hiring requirements. Ms. Cattell stated that she has read the FTA, but has also spoken to people that helped craft Measure W and that hiring local workers was an important component.

Mr. Hunt Braly made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from March 5th, 2020. Mr. Julian Juarez seconded this motion. A roll call of the Committee was done on approving or not approving the meeting minutes, and all Committee members approved the meeting minutes. **With this, the March 5, 2020 meeting minutes stand as unanimously approved.**

3. Committee Member and District Updates

Mr. Caluag gave a brief update on the Watershed Coordinator. The solicitation (Request for Statement of Qualifications) is anticipated to be out for public review on May 26th, with a pre-bid virtual meeting and this Committee interviewing the candidates in August/September.

Mr. Caluag then gave a brief update on the fund Transfer Agreements (TAs). The TAs were released for public review and are now being revised, and will be posted on the SCW website by the end of May. The TAs are expected to go to the Board of Supervisors in June.

The District anticipates that each of the nine WASCs will be approving their respective Stormwater Investment Plans (SIP) by late May or early June. The SIPs will go to the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC), which will convene on May 20th, June 18th, and June 24th to review each SIP. For the Santa Clara River SIP, the ROC will review it on May 20th and depending on the comments, there may be a need for this WASC to reconvene in June to revise the SIP. The District asks that projects included in the SIP have staff, consultants, and the SCR WASC chair available for the May 20th ROC meeting should questions be raised during this meeting. For updates on other WASC's SIPs, the Rio Hondo, Lower San Gabriel, North Santa Monica Bay, and Lower Los Angeles River WASCs have approved their SIPs.

Ms. Kristen Ruffell noted that the regional bacterial scientific study was not approved for funding in a number of the already approved SIPs, and is not aware of any SIPs supporting this study for funding. Mr. Caluag confirmed that all of the already-approved SIPs did not approve this scientific study for funding, and we are awaiting the results from the remaining outstanding SIPs.

Ms. Sandra Cattell stated that there is an April 24th communication from OurWaterLA, and that the letter spoke about not funding the scientific study, and inquired why the letter was not distributed to the Committee. Mr. Caluag confirmed that the letter was sent to the District and in prior WASC meetings, a representative would speak on behalf of OurWaterLA and the letter during the public comment period.

Ms. Heather Merenda asked for clarification on which day the ROC meeting staff is being asked to be present, and Mr. Caluag stated May 20th is the date. A follow up e-mail will be sent with the correct date.

Mr. Gibbs asked to confirm that projects are being accepted now for the next round of projects to be considered, and Mr. Caluag confirmed that this is the case through July 31, 2020.

4. Public Comment Period

As Ms. Cattell stated earlier, there were two letters from OurWaterLA that were distributed at our other WASC meetings, one dated March 10th and the latest dated April 24th. OurWaterLA was provided the opportunity to speak during this time, but no representatives were available at this time.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Santa Clara River

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Ms. Mary Johnson asked when letters such as these from OurWaterLA are provided to the District, will the District forward these letters to the WASC when they receive them. Mr. Caluag stated that the District's protocol has been to attach the letters to the meeting minutes, as the District is not the advocate of certain projects or requests included in these letters. Ms. Johnson referred to the top of the letter being addressed to the WASCs, but that this letter was not shared with the WASC until today's meeting, and Mr. Caluag stated that this letter is part of the record and is to be discussed now during the public comment period. Ms. Johnson requested that any letters sent to the District for the WASC must be forwarded on, but Mr. Caluag stated that as letters come in, they are to be brought into the public comment period of the agenda. Ms. Johnson does not agree, and Mr. Caluag stated that the District will need to follow up with County Counsel for further direction on this request. Ms. Johnson asked the WASC if she is the only one that would like this request granted, and Mr. Darren Hernandez stated that he agrees with Ms. Johnson and requested as the Chair to work this out with the District between this meeting and the next, but having this attached letters or public comments as part of the meeting minutes has been done in the past by other public agencies.

Ms. Jacqueline Ayer stated that if the Acton Town Council sends a letter to the WASC, we would like to make sure that it is distributed to all members before the meeting. Additionally, both Ms. Ayer and Ms. Cattell agree with Ms. Johnson's request that correspondence should be distributed to all the members before the meeting so that they can consider it before the meeting.

5. Discussion and Voting Items

a) Ex Parte Communication Disclosures

Mr. Bruce Hamamoto stated he had a discussion with Mr. Darren Hernandez regarding the proposed amendment to the motion approved at the prior meeting for the regional bacterial scientific study.

Ms. Cattell stated that she had a phone call with Ms. Johnson and Mr. Gibbs pertaining to OurWaterLA, and that she attended an OurWaterLA meeting with Ms. Johnson.

b) SIP Programming Discussion

Previously, the District had suggested an 80 percent funding allocation for the SIP. However, the current COVID pandemic has introduced a lot of uncertainty. Also, it's important to note there was not a Watershed Coordinator during this process. This said, these funds will prove beneficial in the current economy, so these are circumstances that each Committee will need to take into account when designating a percent funding SIP allocation. If the Committee ultimately elects to move forward with a higher allocation near the initial 80 percent recommendation, a written justification will be required to accompany the requested percent allocation as it moves forward for approval consideration.

Ms. Cattell stated she would like the group to reconsider approving the SIP at this time, and instead move forward with a new agenda for the SIP to reduce the amount of funding we are allocating to a more conservative level while also reevaluating the scientific study.

Mr. Hernandez added that he would be willing to reevaluate the bacteria scientific study or even remove it from the SIP. While it was approved overwhelmingly by this Committee, the scientific study does not appear to be generating a lot of positive interest in the other watersheds. This said, Mr. Hernandez does not want to reopen the entire SIP. At this time, the SIP has allocated 84

Safe, Clean Water Program

Santa Clara River

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



percent to Year 1, with 80 percent the recommended allocation, and to date, 83 percent of the SCW funds have been collected. If we remove the scientific study, this should get the percent allocation under what has been collected to date. Mr. Hamamoto agrees with Mr. Hernandez, and added that Mr. Rich Watson had previously stated that at least five of the nine watersheds needed to approve the scientific study for it to move forward, or be put on hold. Mr. Hernandez added that nothing would prevent Mr. Watson from applying again next year.

c) [Voting Item] – Amendment to the March 5th, 2020 approved motion on Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution (see attached)

After Item 5.b on the agenda, the group moved to item 5.e and elected to skip this voting item.

d) Public Comment Period

Ms. Ayer stated her appreciation for Mr. Hamamoto's efforts on the scientific study and that the Acton community sees a lot of value in this study, and requests that when it moves forward, it is done in coordination with our community. Ms. Cattell added that there are other ways to get stormwater monitoring efforts funded, and that is under the stormwater monitoring coalition in its five-year plan, and not necessarily rely on the WASC.

Mr. Hamamoto stated that even though Item 5.c is moot for this year, for future years I would like to request that in addition to community input and coordination, that studies have community support.

e) [Voting Item] – Confirm Final Stormwater Investment Plan (*only needed if there are changes to the SIP approved from March 5th, 2020 meeting*)

Mr. Caluag uploaded the previous SIP tool with the March 5th SIP approval results showing the two infrastructure projects (IP) (Hasley Canyon Park and Newhall Park), the regional bacteria scientific study, and the watershed coordinator yielding a 84 percent allocation in Year 1 (FY 20-21), a 89 percent allocation in Year 2 (FY 21-22), a 92 percent allocation in Year 3 (FY 22-23), a 54 percent allocation in Year 4 (FY 23-24), and a 54 percent allocation in Year 5 (FY 24-25). There is now a newer version of the SIP tool which includes any carryover and the results now yield a 84 percent allocation in Year 1 (FY 20-21), a 77 percent allocation in Year 2 (FY 21-22), a 73 percent allocation in Year 3 (FY 22-23), a 40 percent allocation in Year 4 (FY 23-24), and a 30 percent allocation in Year 5 (FY 24-25).

Ms. Cattell asked what the new percent allocations would be with removing the scientific study. Mr. Caluag updated the SIP tool and the results with the scientific study removed yield a 82 percent allocation in Year 1 (FY 20-21), a 74 percent allocation in Year 2 (FY 21-22), a 69 percent allocation in Year 3 (FY 22-23), a 38 percent allocation in Year 4 (FY 23-24), and a 29 percent allocation in Year 5 (FY 24-25).

Ms. Cattell believes the group can reduce funding for both IPs and add funding next year as available.

After this discussion, Mr. Hernandez proposed the following:

Safe, Clean Water Program

Santa Clara River

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Motion - Mr. Hernandez proposed to reconfirm the SIP as previously approved, with the exclusion of the regional bacteria scientific study, funding the two infrastructure projects, Hasley Canyon and Newhall Park, and a watershed coordinator. Ms. Cattell seconded this motion.

Mr. Gibbs proceeded with the voting rollcall for this motion and the results were as follows:

- Mr. Juarez – Yes
- Mr. Marks – Yes
- Mr. Steve Cole – Yes
- Ms. Ruffell – Yes
- Ms. Prado – Yes
- Mr. Braly – Yes
- Ms. Johnson – Yes
- Ms. Cattell – Yes
- Mr. Gibbs – Yes
- Ms. Dianne Erskine-Hellrigel – Yes
- Mr. Hamamoto (3 votes) – Yes
- Mr. Hernandez – Yes
- Ms. Merenda – Yes
- Mr. Newman – Yes
- Mr. Peterson – Yes

Motion results:

17 – Yes

0 – No

The SIP, as motioned above, is approved.

6. Break

Committee decided not to take a break.

7. Adjournment

Mr. Gibbs thanked the District for the WebEx platform and the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

Next Meeting:

June 2020 (tentatively)

SANTA CLARA RIVER WASC MEETING - MAY 14, 2020

		Quorum Present				Voting Items		
Member Type	Organization	Member	Voting?	Alternate	Voting?	Minutes	Approve Revisions to SS motion	Confirm Final SIP
Agency	District	Julian Juarez	x	Carolina Hernandez		y		y
Agency	Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency	Dirk Marks	x	Mike Alvord		y		y
Agency	Santa Clarita Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency	Steve Cole	x	Rick Viergutz		y		y
Agency	LA County Sanitation Districts	Kristen Ruffell	x	Martha Tremblay		y		y
Agency	Santa Clarita Recreation & Community Services	Janine Prado	x	Tyler Pledger		y		y
Community Stakeholder	Poole & Shaffery	Hunt Braly	x			y		y
Community Stakeholder	Agua Dulce Town Council	Mary Johnson	x			y		y
Community Stakeholder	Santa Clarita Sierra Club	Sandra Cattell	x	Diane Trautman		y		y
Community Stakeholder	GP Strategies	Jason Gibbs	x	Frederick Andre Hollings		y		y
Community Stakeholder	St. Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Foundation	Dianne Erskine-Hellrigel	x	Heidi Webber		y		y
Municipal Members	LA County Public Works	Bruce Hamamoto	x	Allen Ma		y		y
Municipal Members	LA County Public Works	Bruce Hamamoto	x	Allen Ma		y		y
Municipal Members	LA County Public Works	Bruce Hamamoto	x	Allen Ma		y		y
Municipal Members	Santa Clarita	Darren Hernandez	x	Darin Seegmiller		y		y
Municipal Members	Santa Clarita	Heather Merenda	x	Oliver Cramer		y		y
Municipal Members	Santa Clarita	Robert Newman	x	Mike Hennawy		y		y
Municipal Members	Santa Clarita	Tom Cole		David Peterson	x	y		y
	Total Non-Vacant Seats	17			Yay (Y)	17	0	17
	Total Voting Members Present	17			Nay (N)	0	0	0
	Agency	5			Abstain (A)	0	0	0
	Community Stakeholder	5			Total	17	0	17
	Municipal Members	7				Approved	Not Approved	Approved

Attendees

Santa Clara River WASC Meeting - May 14, 2020

BHAMAMO	Jacqueline Ayer
Mary Johnson	BHAMAMO
JGUTIERR	Eunie Kang
Safe Clean Water LA	Heather Merenda
Sandra	Oliver
Julian Juarez	Heather
RNEWMAN	Mike Antos (Stantec)
CJ Caluag - LACFCD	Allen Ma
Diane Trautman	DSEEGMILLER
Keith Abercrombie	sloanep
HCB	sloanep
kchang	sloanep
Jason Gibbs	dmarks
Dianne Hellrigel	Darren Hernandez
David Peterson	steve cole
	kruffell



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.



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.