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Disadvantaged Community Benefit Interim Guidance
SCWP Disadvantaged Community Benefit Goal

Investing in disadvantaged communities by:

- Locating beneficial Projects within, or
- Such that the benefits of a Project are directly provided to,

Census Block Groups where the median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median household income (MHI)

https://arcg.is/rbKfm
Interpreting “Disadvantaged Community Benefit”

1. Projects where *any of the construction effort is within a census block group designated as a disadvantaged community* will be considered “within” a disadvantaged community, and therefore providing a Disadvantaged Community Benefit.

2. Projects where *none of the construction effort is within a census block group designated as a disadvantaged community* can be considered to provide a Disadvantaged Community Benefit *if it provides a “direct benefit” to a census block group designated as a disadvantaged community.*
Consideration of Direct Benefit

Whether a Project provides a “direct benefit” as used in SCWP policy will be a decision made by WASCs on a project-by-project basis, considering:

• the goals of the SCWP,
• the benefits provided to the community by each Project, and
• the area within which those benefits will be felt.
Consideration of Direct Benefit

Considering different geographic boundaries

Figure 1 - Inglewood Census Place (DWR Disadvantaged Community Mapping Tool): Pink is disadvantaged, and purple is severely disadvantaged.

Figure 2 - Inglewood Census Block Groups (DWR Disadvantaged Community Mapping Tool): Pink is disadvantaged, purple is severely disadvantaged, and yellow is missing data.
Census Places

US Census places within SCWP boundaries that have an MHI below 80% of the statewide MHI (2018 data), and therefore could be considered disadvantaged at the scale of the municipality:

- Bell
- Bellflower
- Bell Gardens
- Commerce
- Compton
- Cudahy
- El Monte
- Gardena
- Hawaiian Gardens
- Hawthorne
- Huntington Park
- Inglewood
- Lynwood
- Maywood
- Montebello
- Paramount
- Pomona
- Rosemead
- San Fernando
- South El Monte
- South Gate
- Walnut Park
Consideration of Direct Benefit

Considering different geographic boundaries

Steps to evaluate:

1. Is there a formal or informal community boundary more appropriate than Census Block Group boundaries to consider for the benefit area of a particular Project? If yes…

2. Using that boundary as a community, does the median household income statistic or the current CalEnviroScreen tool consider that community “disadvantaged?” If yes…

3. Does the WASC wish to recommend that the Project will provide benefits across the entire community boundary?

CalEnviroScreen: https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data
Community Support

• One of the most effective ways to document if a Project will provide benefit to a community is if the community itself says so and expresses support.

• Similarly, decisions by the WASC can rely upon the lack of documented public support, or the presence of documented resistance from members of a community.
Interim Nature-Based Solutions Programming Guidelines
Nature-Based Solutions Guidance

• Guidance document clarifies how best to prioritize Nature-Based Solutions

• Specifically aims to help the WASCs prioritize Nature-Based Solutions when evaluating Projects and programming SIPs

• Highlights how different individuals and entities can support the SCWP requirement that Regional Infrastructure Program funds “Shall be programmed, to the extent feasible, such that Nature-Based Solutions are prioritized” (Section16.05.D.1.g)
Nature-Based Solutions in the SCWP

• Section 16.03.V: Nature-Based Solutions means a Project that utilizes natural processes that slow, detain, infiltrate or filter Stormwater or Urban Runoff. These methods may include:
  • relying predominantly on soils and vegetation;
  • increasing the permeability of Impermeable Areas;
  • protecting undeveloped mountains and floodplains;
  • creating and restoring riparian habitat and wetlands;
  • creating rain gardens, bioswales, and parkway basins; and
  • enhancing soil through composting, mulching, and planting trees and vegetation, with
  • preference for native species.
Nature-Based Solutions Examples

Need/Desired Outcome: Reduced Pollutants in Local Waterways

Nature-Based Solution: Rain Garden w/ Bioswales and Biofiltration

SCWP Benefit: Water Quality Benefit
Nature-Based Solutions Examples

Need/Desired Outcome:
Improved Local Water Supply Resilience

Nature-Based Solution:
Retention Pond w/ Trail Access

SCWP Benefit:
Water Supply Benefit

Stantec
Nature-Based Solutions Examples

Need/Desired Outcome:
- Increased Park Space & Access to Recreation

Nature-Based Solution:
Community Park w/ Rain Garden

SCWP Benefit:
Community Investment Benefit

Stantec
## Links between Needs, SCWP Goals, and NBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Need or Desired Outcome</th>
<th>Potential Natural Processes &amp; Nature-Mimicking Strategies</th>
<th>SCWP Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved environmental water quality</strong></td>
<td>Bioretention; biofiltration; removed impermeable area; increase of permeability; soil enhancement; green streets</td>
<td>Water Quality Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased local water supply</strong></td>
<td>Surface and subsurface infiltration to groundwater; treat and release clean stormwater flows for a justified beneficial use; stormwater capture to offset irrigation with potable water; soil enhancement to offset irrigation with potable water; new native and climate-appropriate planting to offset irrigation with potable water; remove impermeable area; increase permeability</td>
<td>Water Supply Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved flood management</strong></td>
<td>Bioretention; native and climate appropriate planting; removal of impermeable area; increase of permeability; microtopography changes; protection or restoration of riparian or wetland systems</td>
<td>Community Investment Benefit (CIB): Flood Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved flood conveyance</strong></td>
<td>Stream daylighting; bioretention; microtopography changes; removed impermeable surfaces; increase of permeability; localized infiltration to groundwater</td>
<td>CIB: Flood Conveyance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete table on pages 6-7
WASC Assessment of Projects

Questions to Ask Regarding Individual Projects

Are there natural processes or nature-mimicking strategies that this Project will use to address watershed needs and deliver SCWP benefits?

If not, should this project be revisited for future SIP consideration instead?
WASC Assessment of SIPS

Questions to Ask Regarding SIPS

Has the WASC prioritized Nature-Based Solutions within this and prior Stormwater Investment Plans?

How are the Nature-Based Solutions funded to-date collectively providing the anticipated benefits to the Watershed Area, and where are the biggest needs or opportunities?
WASC Tools and Strategies

To evaluate Disadvantaged Community Benefits or Nature-Based Solutions in their Watershed Area, WASCs can:

• Ask their Watershed Coordinator(s) to evaluate and report how people, city and county agencies, and other stakeholders would describe the preferred Disadvantaged Community Benefits and prioritize Nature-Based Solutions

• Invite presentations to better understand potential Disadvantaged Community Benefits sought and how Nature-Based Solutions would bring benefits in the Watershed Area
Partial Funding Guidelines
Partial Funding

- Goal to give WASCs additional flexibility when developing their SIPs

- The partial funding award should not result in ANY reduction to the scope or benefits of (or the score assigned to) the project or study as identified in the application (and as submitted in the Feasibility Study, if applicable)
WASC interested in partial funding award and solicits interest/capability from IPPA or SSA

- YES
  - IPPA or SSA identifies interest in partial funding award
    - YES
      - As applicable and able, WASC and IPPA or SSA preliminarily discuss partial funding amount
        - CONCURRENCE
          - IPPA or SSA submits the Funding Reduction Concurrence (FRC) Form. IPPA or SSA sufficiently identifies all potential impacts to scope and benefits.
          - WASC reviews FRC form and confirms no negative impacts to the score achieved by the initial application, if applicable
            - No re-scoring warranted
              - WASC proceeds with programming recommended SIP, reserving the right to program zero dollars, the FRC amount, the original requested amount, or any amount between the FRC and the original requested amount.
            - Re-scoring anticipated or desired
              - WASC considers programming all or none of the IPPA's or SSA's original scope and amount.
        - NO
          - NO CONCURRENCE
            - WASC considers programming all or none of the IPPA's or SSA's original scope and amount.
Questions and Discussion

Full guidance documents available: [https://safecleanwaterla.org/regional-program-2/](https://safecleanwaterla.org/regional-program-2/)

SCWP Digital Spatial Data Library [https://arcg.is/rbKfm](https://arcg.is/rbKfm)