

Lower San Gabriel River  
Watershed Area Steering Committee  
“LSGR WASC”



**October 2022**  
**Prioritization Criteria**  
**Survey Results**

At the request of the LSGR WASC, a survey was developed and distributed to the LSGR WASC. Only one response per appointed Steering Committee seat was requested (i.e., Steering Committee Primary or Alternate Member - not both).

The results of the survey are intended to inform the development of prioritization criteria for use by the LSGR WASC when developing the Stormwater Investment Plan to meet the priorities of the LSGR watershed area. Any LSGR-specific criteria developed would be used to evaluate projects deemed eligible by the Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP) scoring criteria.

A total of 16 responses was received.

**SUMMARY OF OPTIONAL COMMENTS TO THE QUESTION:  
Should Minimum Catchment Area for Projects be Considered?**

| Answered “YES”  | Answered “NO”  | Answered “SOMETIMES”  |
|---|--|---|
| <p>The catchment should be considered in relation to the cost and amount of water caught.</p> | <p>At what minimum do we draw the line. Each project should be judged based on its merits.</p>   | <p>I think this should catchment area would be a more significant consideration for larger projects. I would not want to see a small community-based project that has great DAC and recreational benefits eliminated due to a small catchment area.</p> |
| <p>Projects should be regional in nature.</p>   | <p>This may preclude some smaller projects.</p>  | <p>Catchment areas and land uses/zoning designations should be considered. Projects for cities vying for funding where size constraints may be a problem should also be considered.</p>   |
|   | <p>A minimum may eliminate and/or discourage NGOs and community groups from applying.</p>  | <p>To make sure we're not spending effort on very small projects.</p>   |
|   | <p>While we would like to see more catchment area for projects as it indicates the impact of water treated and recycled, I would hate to see projects overlooked because it didn't meet the minimum catchment area requirement. Catchment area should be a big consideration in evaluating projects. However, setting up a minimum requirement isn't the way to go as it might unintendedly filter out some projects that have a potential in other aspects.</p> | <p>Catchment area can be a measure of a project's effectiveness and should be one of the scoring criteria. For smaller, community-based projects, this should be rated more flexibly so those projects are not at a disadvantage.</p>                   |
|   | <p>No, Program should support good projects, even projects with small catchment areas that use nature-based solutions that can be scaled up for aggregate impact</p>   | <p>In most cases it would make sense to include catchment area. However, the modeling shows that smaller, more localized projects may be necessary in conjunction with larger projects to most effectively address watershed priorities.</p>            |

SUMMARY OF OPTIONAL COMMENTS TO THE QUESTION:  
**Should Minimum Catchment Area for Projects be Considered?**

| Answered "YES" | Answered "NO"   | Answered "SOMETIMES"  |
|----------------|---|---|
|                | <p>I think catchment area is very important in order to make the most out of the money spent. However, as time goes on and the most effective projects are constructed, it is likely that the catchment areas of the proposed projects will be less. I don't feel there is a need for a cap but I would anticipate and suggest that everyone is looking at catchment areas in their assessment of projects.</p> | <p>While a minimum drainage area for a project would generally be a good idea, I think that there should be some qualifications. Some projects that focus on NBS or community benefit may have relatively small drainage areas, but provide significant community benefit. Perhaps there is a way for the project applicant to demonstrate both significant community benefit compared to the small drainage area, and also why the project cannot be funded from the 40% local funds in justification for use of the regional funds.</p> |
|                |   | <p>If we are to consider a range of project sizes, it may not be feasible for smaller projects to meet a minimum catchment area.</p>  |
|                |   | <p>Generally I would say yes. However, we should be able to award small projects funding as well.</p>   |

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

### **Given the needs of the LSGR watershed area, how should the WASC define a SMALL-, MEDIUM, and LARGE-sized project?**

|    | <b>Small-Sized Project</b>   | <b>Medium-Sized Project</b>   | <b>Large-Sized Project</b>  |
|----|--|---|---|
| 1  | less than 2 acre-feet  | more than 2 but less than 10 acre-feet  | more than 10 acre-feet  |
| 2  | Under \$1 million for construction   | between \$1-\$10 million  | Over \$10 million   |
| 3  | Less than \$1M   | \$1M-\$5M   | More than \$5M  |
| 4  | \$499,000 or less TOTAL, including design and construction.  | \$500,000-\$5,000,000   | Over \$5,000,000  |
| 5  | An implementation budget of under \$500K.  | Implementation budget of between \$500K-\$3,000,000   | Implementation budget of over \$3,000,000   |
| 6  | Less than 4 000 Sq feet  | Less than 8,000 Sq feet   | Larger than 12,000 ft   |
| 7  | Total cost (design and construction) <\$5 million dollars  | Total cost (design and construction) <\$10 million dollars  | Total cost (design and construction) >\$10 million dollars                                    |
| 8  |  |   |   |
| 9  | not certain...possibly affecting single parcel   | not certain   | not certain...possibly projects with catchments from multi-jurisdictional sources             |
| 10 | The best way I can think of is by construction dollar amount. Perhaps \$1M and less.   | Perhaps up to \$5M.   | Anything above \$5M. Open to what others think. I realize this might be a bit low threshold.  |
| 11 |  |   |   |
| 12 | <50 acres  | <500 acres  | >500 acres  |
| 13 | Small sized projects may be those that require less than 500K in funding.  | Medium-sized projects may be those that require funding in the range of 500K to 2M.   | Large-sized projects are those that require funding greater than 2M.                          |
| 14 | Suggest maximum cost of \$1M. Note that this doesn't necessarily correlate with project impact, but small and very small projects may have so little funding available or requested as to make matching and other requirements unreasonably onerous especially for a small organization. | Hard to define difference between medium and large-sized project when thinking about impact. This may push for projects with bigger and bigger catchment areas, concentrating funding to a few projects, which may look good on paper but bite off more than they can chew, versus a more decentralized approach. | Thinking to limit large projects to an annual budget is reasonable, which for LSGR is \$16.7M |
| 15 | Drainage area less than 1,000 acres  | Drainage area greater than 1,000 acres.   | Drainage area greater than 2,250 acres.   |
| 16 | Approx. <\$2.5M  | >/\$2.5M but less than \$7.5M   | >/\$7.5M  |

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

# Funding Match?

|    | If a project prioritizes NATURE-BASED solutions, is the need for a funding match a priority? | If a project benefits DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES, is the need for a funding match a priority?                             | Please provide a suggested minimum percent funding match, if any (includes in-kind contributions) for a SMALL-SIZED project (i.e., 0%, 5%, 10%, etc.) | Please provide a suggested minimum percent funding match, if any (includes in-kind contributions) for a MEDIUM-SIZED project (i.e., 0%, 5%, 10%, etc.) | Please provide a suggested minimum percent funding match, if any (includes in-kind contributions) for a LARGE-SIZED project (i.e., 0%, 5%, 10%, etc.)                                      |
|----|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 10%   | 25%  | 50%  |
| 2  | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 5%  | 10%  | 25%  |
| 3  | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 25%   | 25%  | 25%  |
| 4  | Remains a Priority   | Remains a Priority   | 10%   | 15%  | 20%  |
| 5  | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 10%   | 15%  | 20%  |
| 6  | Remains a Priority   | More of a Priority   | 25%   | 25%  | 30%  |
| 7  | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 10%   | 20%  | 20%  |
| 8  | Remains a Priority   | More of a Priority   | 20%   | 15%  | 10%  |
| 9  | Remains a Priority   | Remains a Priority   | 0%  | 0%   | 0%   |
| 10 | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 5%  | 10%  | 20%  |
| 11 | Remains a Priority   | Remains a Priority   | 5%  | 10%  | 15%  |
| 12 | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | I don't have a hard number in mind  | I don't have a hard number in mind   | I don't have a hard number in mind   |
| 13 | Less of a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 0%  | 0%   | 0%   |
| 14 | Remains a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 0%  | 10%  | 15%  |
| 15 | Remains a Priority   | Remains a Priority   | 5%  | 5%   | 5%   |
| 16 | Less of a Priority   | Less of a Priority   | 10%   | 15%  | 20%  |
|    | <b><u>TOTALS</u></b><br><i>Remains a Priority = 14</i><br><i>Less of a Priority = 2</i>      | <b><u>TOTALS</u></b><br><i>Remains a Priority = 4</i><br><i>Less of a Priority = 10</i><br><i>More of a Priority = 2</i> | <b><u>TOTALS</u></b><br><i>0% = 3</i><br><i>5% = 4</i><br><i>10% = 5</i><br><i>20% = 1</i><br><i>25% = 2</i><br><i>No Answer = 1</i>                  | <b><u>TOTALS</u></b><br><i>0% = 2</i><br><i>5% = 1</i><br><i>10% = 4</i><br><i>15% = 4</i><br><i>20% = 1</i><br><i>25% = 3</i><br><i>No Answer = 1</i> | <b><u>TOTALS</u></b><br><i>0% = 2</i><br><i>5% = 1</i><br><i>10% = 1</i><br><i>15% = 2</i><br><i>20% = 5</i><br><i>25% = 2</i><br><i>30% = 1</i><br><i>50% = 1</i><br><i>No Answer = 1</i> |



## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

### Reserving Funds?

|   | Does the WASC need to prioritize and/or reserve funds for <u>small-sized projects</u> ? | If yes, please provide your thoughts on how best to prioritize small-sized projects.   | Does the WASC need to prioritize and/or reserve funds for <u>Operation &amp; Maintenance</u> funding requests? | If yes, please provide your thoughts on how best to prioritize O&M funding requests.  |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | No  |  | Yes  | after Round 5, at least 25% should be prioritized for O&M funding requests and should increase each year thereafter   |
| 2 | Yes   | Set aside \$1 million in regional funds annually for small-sized projects.   | No   |   |
| 3 | Yes   | Include some amount each year set aside for small-sized projects.  | No   |   |
| 4 | Yes   | Small project could be used to try a new technology on a smaller scale that might prove useful on a larger scale. Also small projects could feature NBS or demonstrate use of private property alternatives, or community that could reduce heat island effects or job creation. | Yes  | This would really be on a case by case basis.   |
| 5 | Yes   | \$2 million of the annual allocation should be reserved for small projects.  | No   |   |
| 6 | No  |  | No   |   |
| 7 | Yes   | Projects could be prioritized based on location (proximity to other projects, catchment area land uses, etc), public outreach and education benefits, and project scheduling (how quickly can the communities begin to see benefits).  | No   |   |
| 8 | No  |  | Yes  | The best way to prioritize O&M funding requests is to have a percentage to set aside for them.  |
| 9 | No  |  | Yes  | Projects constructed will become ineffective if O&M money is not allocated for their upkeep. Large regional projects may be located in a jurisdiction but serve the watershed. Without O&M money the local agency will need to negotiate complicated MOUs with neighboring cities based on the percentage of catchment if regional O&M money is not provided for project maintenance, or worse, the locality may not have the funds to continue to operate the BMP and the project may be taken out of service. |

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

### Reserving Funds?

|    | Does the WASC need to prioritize and/or reserve funds for <u>small-sized projects</u> ? |   | Does the WASC need to prioritize and/or reserve funds for <u>Operation &amp; Maintenance O&amp;M</u> funding requests? |  |
|----|---|---|--|--|
|    |   | If <u>yes</u> , please provide your thoughts on how best to prioritize small-sized projects.  |  | If <u>yes</u> , please provide your thoughts on how best to prioritize O&M funding requests.   |
| 10 | Yes   | Consider projects by lead by NGO's, or a collaboration/partnership between NGO's and a government entity.   | Yes  | I have seen grants that provide up to one year of O&M, which is a huge assist towards implementation. I don't think O&M should be for longer periods than that since agencies have access to Measure W O&M dollars.  |
| 11 | Yes   | Set aside at least 10% of annual allocation for small-sized projects. Prioritize based on highest-rated small-sized projects.   | Yes  | Set aside at least 10% of annual allocation for O&M funding requests.  |
| 12 | No  |   | Yes  | Case specific  |
| 13 | Yes   | Small-sized projects are less likely to be mega-scale regional projects across multiple cities. It will take significant and strategic outreach to the community and help identify the potential projects. We would like to see a pool of small sized project applications as a result of active community outreach. We need to understand the nature of these projects might cause it to take longer to get prepared for submission. In the meanwhile, we need to reserve funds in our WASC to be sure that we have enough funding for these projects when they do come through. | Yes  | There are several scenarios here. For simplicity, I will list two scenarios. 1) if the organization/agency has the capacity to provide O&M once a project is funded and completed, we should encourage O&M be funded by the organization/agency. 2) if the organization/agency has no capacity to fund O&M, then O&M funding request should be considered holistically with the project when it is being evaluated. The project scope should include all the O&M funding in the subsequent years for the WASC to see an overall long term picture. We need to understand the impact to our WASC when we decide to fund projects with O&M funding requests. |
| 14 | No  | If small projects are less than \$1M, then there should be enough to fund multiple small projects. WASC members should consider available funding and criteria before funds are awarded.  | Yes  | Suggesting 5-10% of awards to IP projects in any SIP.  |
| 15 | No  |   | Yes  | Based on need first.   |
| 16 | No  |   | No   |  |

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

### Funding Caps for CONSTRUCTION?

|    | Should the LSGR WASC consider a SCWP funding award cap for CONSTRUCTION? | If yes, please provide your thoughts on how a funding cap should be considered.  | If you answered "No" and would like to share your thoughts, please do so here.   |
|----|--|--|--|
| 1  | No   |  |  |
| 2  | No   |  | I wouldn't want a cap on funding a large regional project with a huge catchment area that would get us to our goal more quickly and efficiently.     |
| 3  | Yes  | This could be a dollar amount over the course of a number of years (e.g. \$10M-\$15M over 3 years) or based on a funding match (e.g. up to 75% of construction cost)   |  |
| 4  | Yes  | Maximum of \$15M total, with no more than \$5M in any one year.  |  |
| 5  | Yes  | I believe O&M should and could be used as match funding, hence my answer to the prior question regarding a request for O&M. That said, without a cap on construction funding, the WASC's ability fund future projects will be hamstrung. The \$16.7M will be exhausted and spent well into the future with a few large/heavily built projects. |  |
| 6  | No   |  |  |
| 7  | Yes  | Funding caps could be implemented based on the type of project being proposed (infiltration, re-use, nature-based, etc).   |  |
| 8  | No   |  | I think it should be considered on a case by case basis.   |
| 9  | No   |  | The answer really should be it depends on the benefit to the watershed and how the project will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the WIMP. |
| 10 | No   |  | Each project should be considered on its own merits and how well it meets the goals of SCWP.   |

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

### Funding Caps for CONSTRUCTION?

|    | Should the LSGR WASC consider a SCWP funding award cap for CONSTRUCTION? | If yes, please provide your thoughts on how a funding cap should be considered.  | If you answered "No" and would like to share your thoughts, please do so here.   |
|----|--|--|--|
| 11 | No   |  |  |
| 12 | No   |  | I think we should indicate that we may not fund projects that are asking for too much of the budget, but not set a hard cap  |
| 13 | No   |  | If we evaluate each project on its own merits and understand how the size and scope of each project impacts our WASC and our ability to fund other projects, I don't see a need to impose minimums or caps for projects. I'd like to have some flexibility in how we evaluate projects at this point in time, until more patterns generate and start suggesting otherwise. |
| 14 | Yes  | Suggest constraining to one year estimated revenue or \$16.7M  |  |
| 15 | Yes  | It should all be tied to the cost benefit of the project. More funding for a better water quality and community project. |  |
| 16 | No   |  | I don't think a funding cap is needed; but excessive project costs should definitely be looked at and considered as part of the negotiating process when the project is potential for funding award in which case the applicant can be asked to increase its cost share as a means of bringing down costs to the WASC  |



## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

### Funding Caps for O&M?

|    | Should the LSGR WASC consider a SCWP funding award cap for O&M? | If yes, please provide your thoughts on how a funding cap should be considered.   | If you answered "No" and would like to share your thoughts, please do so here.  |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1  | No  |   |   |
| 2  | Yes   | If we're not careful, O&M could eat up our entire funding with nothing left for new projects.   |   |
| 3  | No  |   |   |
| 4  | Yes   | \$250,000 per year per project, with consideration of a local match of 25% from the jurisdictions that drain into the project.  |   |
| 5  | Yes   | LSGR's allocation for O&M should be minimal (initial first couple of years). O&M should be considered a match or leveraged funding.   |   |
| 6  | Yes   | The wasc can't take on the responsibility for operating and maintaining something on behalf of that community, they should have a large percentage of that funded without this. |   |
| 7  | Yes   | Funds should assist in O&M of projects. Projects should also be visited by the WASCs to ensure O&M of facilities are adequate and appropriate.                                  |   |
| 8  | No  |   | I think it should be considered on a case by case basis.  |
| 9  | No  |   |   |
| 10 | Yes   | Without understanding how much some of these projects cost to maintain, I would suggest \$500k and 1 year max.  |   |
| 11 | No  |   |   |
| 12 | No  |   | I think we should indicate that we may not fund projects that are asking for too much of the budget, but not set a hard cap |

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

### Funding Caps for O&M?

|    | Should the LSGR WASC consider a SCWP funding award cap for O&M? | If yes, please provide your thoughts on how a funding cap should be considered.  | If you answered "No" and would like to share your thoughts, please do so here.   |
|----|---|--|--|
| 13 | No  |  | If we evaluate each project on its own merits and understand how the size and scope of each project impacts our WASC and our ability to fund other projects, I don't see a need to impose minimums or caps for projects. I'd like to have some flexibility in how we evaluate projects at this point in time, until more patterns generate and start suggesting otherwise. |
| 14 | Yes   | Max \$1M over 5 years. This is in line with O&M awards LSGR has already made   |  |
| 15 | No  | Not necessarily, however, City should be looking to cost share as much as possible.  |  |
| 16 | No  | I am not a fan of funding O&M at this point considering the limited funds available to construct projects each year; perhaps O&M funding can be considered after some sort of time horizon 10, 15 years out once a number of the necessary construction projects have been built. It seems that O&M costs should become part of each agency's requirement to fund through local funds/other. |  |

