SAFE CLEAN WATER PROGRAM
FY 24-25 Call for Projects Information Session
Overview

• Call for Projects
• Timeline
• SCW Program Goals and Fund Overview
• Regional Program
• Scoring Criteria
• Stormwater Investment Plan
• Transfer Agreement
• Adaptive Management
• Projects Module Overview
Call for Projects FY2024-2025

• Call for Projects for FY 24-25 Funding is open now and currently scheduled to close **July 31, 2023**
• Projects Module has been updated. Please review every form and tool tip carefully and ensure completeness prior to submitting your application(s)
  • Note: Projects Module will ask the applicant which session was attended (or whether the applicant viewed the recording)

*Sign up for updates on the Safe Clean Water Program*
Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP) Timelines (Regional Program)

- **2022**
  - July 31, 2022: Call for Projects FY 23-24
  - July 31, 2022: Develop SIPs FY 22-23
  - Board Approval of FY 22-23 SIP

- **2023**
  - July 31, 2023: Call for Projects FY 24-25
  - Develop SIPs FY 23-24
  - Board Approval of FY 23-24 SIP

- **2024**
  - July 31, 2024: Call for Projects FY 25-26
  - Develop SIPs FY 24-25
  - Board Approval of FY 25-26 SIP

- **Long Term**
  - Year 3: Call for Projects FY 25-26
  - Year 4: Develop SIPs FY 25-26
  - Year 5: Develop SIPs FY 25-26
  - Year 6: Develop SIPs FY 25-26

Adaptive Management
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.

Reference: Section 18.04 of the Safe, Clean Water Program Implementation Ordinance
SCW Program Goals

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 benefitting each Municipality in proportion to the funds generated within their jurisdiction, after accounting for allocation of the one hundred and ten percent (110%) return to DACs, to the extent feasible.
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.

Reference: Section 18.04 of the Safe, Clean Water Program Implementation Ordinance
Special Parcel Tax of 2.5 cents per square foot of impermeable area → $280M annually

Detailed SCWP Revenue Distribution

- **40% Municipal Program**
- **10% District**
- **50% Regional Program**
- **Program Administration**
- **Public Education Program**
- **Schools Education**
- **Local Workforce Job Training**
- **Stormwater Education Programs** (≥20% of the District Program)

**Programs**:
- Scientific Studies Program (≤5%)
- Technical Resources Program (≤10%)
- Infrastructure Program (≥85%)
Regional Program

Call for Projects
For SCWP purposes, the County is divided into 9 Watershed Areas.
Regional Program

50% Program revenue

Provides funding for Multi-Benefit Watershed-based Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATERSHED AREA</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED ANNUAL RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>$17.2 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Los Angeles River</td>
<td>$12.4 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower San Gabriel River</td>
<td>$16.7 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>$1.8 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo</td>
<td>$11.6 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>$5.8 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>$17.5 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Los Angeles River</td>
<td>$38.6 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper San Gabriel River</td>
<td>$18.7 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Program

**Not less than 85%: Infrastructure Program**
- To implement Multi-Benefit watershed-based Projects

**Up to 10% Technical Resources Program**
- To provide resources for the development of Feasibility Studies through support from Technical Assistance Teams
- To provide Watershed Coordinators to educate and build capacity in communities and facilitate community and stakeholder engagement

**Up to 5%: Scientific Studies Program**
- To provide funding for eligible scientific and other activities
Regional Program – Infrastructure Program

Project Applicants:
• Any entity with a completed Feasibility Study
  • Including Feasibility Studies funded by Technical Resource Program
• Requires Municipal sponsors (MOU)

Projects and Activities:
• Multi-benefit
• Watershed-based
• Design, construction, land acquisition, OM&M, programs, and other eligible activities
• Projects to be included in an approved water quality plan such as E/WMP, IRWM, and others
Regional Program – Scientific Studies Program

Infrastructure Program

Technical Resources Program

Scientific Studies Program

Feasibility Study

Project concept

Scientific Study

Scoring Committee

Watershed Area Steering Committees

STORMWATER INVESTMENT PLAN

Regional Oversight Committee

Board of Supervisors

Transfer Agreement

Regional Program – Scientific Studies Program

Watershed Coordinators

Watershed Coordinator

Technical Assistance Teams
Scientific Studies Program

- Provides funding for eligible scientific and other activities, such as but not limited to:
  - Scientific studies
  - Technical studies
  - Monitoring
  - Modeling
  - Other similar activities
- Must be related to stormwater and urban runoff capture and pollution reduction
Regional Program – Technical Resources Program

- Infrastructure Program
- Technical Resources Program
- Scientific Studies Program
- Project Module
- Watershed Area Steering Committees
- STORMWATER INVESTMENT PLAN
- Regional Oversight Committee
- Watershed Coordinator
- Technical Assistance Teams
- Board of Supervisors
- Transfer Agreement

Flowchart:
- Project concept from Technical Resources Program to Watershed Coordinator
- Feasibility Study from Scientific Studies Program to Project Module
- Watershed Coordinators
Regional Program – Technical Resources Program

01 Project idea!

02 Engage with Watershed Coordinator and communities

03 Submit Project Concept

04 Review and approval by governance committees and Board

05 Technical Assistance Teams develop feasibility study

06 Feasibility study used to apply for Infrastructure Program

- Feasibility Studies address, at a minimum, the 19 Feasibility Study requirements of an Infrastructure Program application and are expected to be completed within 1-2 years.
- The District committed to complete feasibility studies for a typical rate of $300,000 to be approved and budgeted in the SIP.
- TRP program does not guarantee approval for IP funding by the WASC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Facilitate Community Engagement in SCWP</td>
<td>...sustained community engagement...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify and Develop Project Concepts</td>
<td>...projects that fulfill program goals...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work with Technical Assistance Teams</td>
<td>...contribute to technical assistance...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitate Identification and Representation of Community Priorities</td>
<td>...addressing community priorities...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integrate Priorities Through Partnerships and Extensive Networks</td>
<td>...share lessons learned...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cost-Share Partners</td>
<td>...identify cost-sharing for projects...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leverage Funding</td>
<td>...identify funding...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Local Stakeholder Education</td>
<td>...conduct education for communities...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Watershed Coordinator Collaboration</td>
<td>...ensure consistency across SCWP...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duties and responsibilities centered around connecting potential Regional Program applicants with technical resources and building inclusion and meaningful engagement in pursuit of SCW Program Goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATERSHED AREA</th>
<th>Watershed Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>Heal the Bay, S. Groner Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Los Angeles River</td>
<td>S. Groner Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower San Gabriel River</td>
<td>OhanaVets, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>Melina Sempill Watts Consulting, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>TreePeople, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>Heal the Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Los Angeles River</td>
<td>Council for Watershed Health (2); Environmental Outreach Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper San Gabriel River</td>
<td>Day One Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Positions are dependent on revenue and population*
Infrastructure Program – Example Projects

Urban Orchard

Rory M. Shaw Wetlands Park

Merced Avenue Greenway

Los Angeles
Infrastructure Program – 19 Feasibility Study Requirements

1. Detailed description of the proposed Project

2. Description and estimate of the benefits provided
   • Some benefits calculated through WMMS in the Project Module

3. Estimated schedule

4. Review of effectiveness of similar types of Projects
Infrastructure Program – 19 Feasibility Study Requirements

5. Monitoring Plan

6. Lifecycle Cost Estimate and Schedule
   • Calculated in the Project Module. Must include ALL project costs.

7. Operation and Maintenance Plan

8. Engineering Analysis
   • Soil Sampling, Geotechnical Investigations, Hydrology Report, etc.
### Infrastructure Program – 19 Feasibility Study Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9      | Potential CEQA-related and permitting challenges  
  - Include associated time requirement and cost. |
| 10     | Letter of Support from the Municipality  
  - Must include concurrence with the plan for O&M |
| 11     | Outreach/Engagement Plan |
| 12     | Comply with any County-wide displacement goals |
## Infrastructure Program – 19 Feasibility Study Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vector Minimization Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend review by local vector control district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Description of how Nature-Based Solutions are utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Summary of any legal requirements of obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Confirmation of conceptual approval from LACFCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure Program – 19 Feasibility Study Requirements

17. Acknowledgement of Eligible Expenditures
   • Only those incurred on or after November 6, 2018

18. Leveraged Funds

19. Summary of how project will benefit Disadvantaged Communities (DAC)
Infrastructure Program – LACFCD

Conceptual Approval

- Request confirmation of conceptual review from LACFCD no less than two months prior (May 31st, 2023)
- Contact LACFCD representative for each Watershed Area:
  - Upper Los Angeles River (Paul Shadmani)
  - Lower Los Angeles River (Ernesto Rivera)
  - Rio Hondo, Santa Clara, Upper San Gabriel, Lower San Gabriel River (Julian Juarez)
  - North, South and Central Santa Monica Bay (Marcela Benavides)

Watershed Managers Map

Refer to Feasibility Study Guidelines and 2022 Interim Guidance
At SafeCleanWaterLA.org for more information
18.07.B.1.c. Only Projects meeting the following criteria shall be submitted to the Scoring Committee for evaluation:

- Projects for which a Feasibility Study (or equivalent) has been completed.
- Projects that are Multi-benefit Projects
- Projects that are included in a Regional Water Management Plan (refer to [Pathway to Inclusion Document](#) online)
- Projects designed for a minimum useful life of 30 years.
Pathway to Inclusion in a Regional Water Management Plan

WMP Process

• Contact lead Agency for the Watershed Management Programs

• Provide Project information

• New Projects can be included in the Adaptive Management section of the WMP annual report or the resubmittal of the WMP

• Adaptive Management of the Annual Report is due December 15 of every year. Resubmittal of the WMP is allowed at any time

• More information:
  • http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/watershed_management/
IRMWP Process

- Project Proponent must sign up through the GLAC IRWM OPTI webpage to become a new OPTI user
  - [http://www.lawaterplan.org](http://www.lawaterplan.org)
- Must complete all required project information fields in the OPTI database
- The OPTI subregion Administrators and IRWM Administrators will be alerted of a new project entry
- Subregion OPTI Administrators may request proponent to attend subregion meeting to present the project to its members and stakeholders and answer any questions presented.
  - If project is determined to support the IRWMP objectives and there are no issues or concerns with the project, the subregion voting members cast vote to accept project as part of the IRWM Plan.
  - Upon approval, the OPTI Administrator completes OPTI information to verifying acceptance of project as part of the IRWM Plan and it becomes eligible for consideration for inclusion in future funding proposals.
Scoring Criteria

Infrastructure Program
All Regional Infrastructure Program Projects must meet the Threshold Score of 60 points or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits</td>
<td>50 points max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-OR-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits</td>
<td>40 points max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Significant Water Supply Benefits</td>
<td>25 points max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Community Investments Benefits</td>
<td>10 points max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Nature-Based Solutions</td>
<td>15 points max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Leveraging Funds and Community Support</td>
<td>10 points max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>110 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Criteria – Water Quality Benefits

Section A.1
Applies to any Water Quality Projects

Section A.2
- Projects designed for 0.25-inch rain events or below.
- Must capture, infiltrate, or divert 100% dry weather flows.

* Note that Section A.1 the Water Quality Cost Effective calculation in the project module uses Construction Cost and not Capital Cost.

### A.1 Wet + Dry Weather Water Quality Benefits

- **50 points max**
  - **The Project provides water quality benefits**
    - **A.1.1: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Cost Effectiveness**
      - (Cost Effectiveness) = (24-hour BMP Capacity)\(^2\) / (Capital Cost in $Millions) *
        - \(<0.4 \text{ acre feet capacity / $Million} = 0 \text{ points}\)
        - \(0.4-0.6 \text{ acre feet capacity / $Million} = 7 \text{ points}\)
        - \(0.6-0.8 \text{ acre feet capacity / $Million} = 11 \text{ points}\)
        - \(0.8-1.0 \text{ acre feet capacity / $Million} = 14 \text{ points}\)
        - \(>1.0 \text{ acre feet capacity / $Million} = 20 \text{ points}\)
      - Management of the 24-hour event is considered the maximum capacity of a Project for a 24-hour period. For water quality focused Projects, this would typically be the 85th percentile design storm capacity. Units are in acre-feet (AF).

- **20 points max**

- **- OR -**

- **30 points max**
  - **A.1.2: For Wet Weather BMPs Only: Water Quality Benefit** - Quantify the pollutant reduction (i.e. concentration, load, exceedance day, etc.) for a class of pollutants using a similar analysis as the E/WMP which uses the Districts Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS). The analysis should be an average percent reduction comparing influent and effluent for the class of pollutant over a ten-year period showing the impact of the Project. Modeling should include the latest performance data to reflect the efficiency of the BMP type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Class of Pollutants</th>
<th>Second or More Classes of Pollutant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(&gt;50% = 15 \text{ points})</td>
<td>(&gt;50% = 5 \text{ points})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&gt;80% = 20 \text{ points})</td>
<td>(&gt;80% = 10 \text{ points})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.2 Dry Weather Only Water Quality Benefits

- **20 points**
  - **A.2.1: For dry weather BMPs only, Projects must be designed to capture, infiltrate, treat and release, or divert 100% (unless infeasible or prohibited for habitat, etc) of all tributary dry weather flows.**

- **20 points max**
  - **A.2.2: For Dry Weather BMPs Only. Tributary Size of the Dry Weather BMP**
    - \(<200 \text{ Acres} = 10 \text{ points}\)
    - \(>200 \text{ Acres} = 20 \text{ points}\)
Scoring Criteria – Water Quality Benefits (A1.2)

Long-term pollutant reduction can be calculated in the Project Module through the Watershed Management Modeling System (WMMS)

lacountywmms.com
Scoring Criteria – Water Supply Benefits

Typically for spreading facilities or diversions to sanitary sewer for recycled water.

Refer to [2022 Interim Guidance](#) for Water Supply Guidance.

### B. Significant Water Supply Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 max</td>
<td>The Project provides water re-use and/or water supply enhancement benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13 max | B1. Water Supply Cost Effectiveness. The Total Life-Cycle Cost\(^2\) per unit of acre foot of Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff volume captured for water supply is:  
  - \(>\$2500/\text{ac-ft} = 0\) points  
  - \(\$2000-2500/\text{ac-ft} = 3\) points  
  - \(\$1500-2000/\text{ac-ft} = 6\) points  
  - \(\$1000-1500/\text{ac-ft} = 10\) points  
  - \(<\$1000/\text{ac-ft} = 13\) points |
| 12 max | B2. Water Supply Benefit Magnitude. The yearly additional water supply volume resulting from the Project is:  
  - \(<25\ \text{ac-ft/year} = 0\) points  
  - \(25-100\ \text{ac-ft/year} = 2\) points  
  - \(100-200\ \text{ac-ft/year} = 5\) points  
  - \(200-300\ \text{ac-ft/year} = 9\) points  
  - \(>300\ \text{ac-ft/year} = 12\) points |

\(^2\) Total Life-Cycle Cost: The annualized value of all Capital, planning, design, land acquisition, construction, and total life O&M costs for the Project for the entire life span of the Project (e.g. 50-year design life span should account for 50-years of O&M). The annualized cost is used over the present value to provide a preference to Projects with longer life spans.
Scoring Criteria – Water Supply Benefits

Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot (Optional)
For FY2024-25 Call for Project Cycle Only

- Scoring tallies at one-point increments.
- This is for FY24-25 Call for Project cycle ONLY
- Scoring Committee will take the alternate scoring into consideration
### Scoring Criteria – Community Investment Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Scoring Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Community Investments Benefits</td>
<td>10 points max</td>
<td>The Project provides Community Investment Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C1. Project includes:**
- One of the Community Investment Benefits identified below = 2 points
- Three distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 5 points
- Six distinct Community Investment Benefits identified below = 10 points

**Community Investment Benefits include:**
- Improved flood management, flood conveyance, or flood risk mitigation
- Creation, enhancement, or restoration of parks, habitat, or wetlands
- Improved public access to waterways
- Enhanced or new recreational opportunities
- Greening of schools
- Reducing local heat island effect and increasing shade
- Increasing the number of trees increase and/or other vegetation at the site location that will increase carbon reduction/sequestration and improve air quality.

Explanation must include supporting analysis and information
Scoring Criteria – Nature-Based Solutions

If Nature-Based Solutions are not utilized, include an explanation, with supporting analysis and information of why it is not feasible to do so.

Refer to [2022 Interim Guidance](#) for Programming of Nature-Based Solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Nature-Based Solutions</th>
<th>The Project implements Nature-Based Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1. Project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implements natural processes or mimics natural processes to slow, detain, capture, and absorb/infiltrate water in a manner that protects, enhances and/or restores habitat, green space and/or usable open space = 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilizes natural materials such as soils and vegetation with a preference for native vegetation = 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removes Impermeable Area from Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 point per 20% paved area removed) = 5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other funding sources could include funds from the SCW Municipal Program, Grants, Partnerships, etc.

Refer to [2022 Interim Guidance](#) for Strengthening Community Engagement and Support
General Tips (from Scoring Committee)

• Help us help you!!!
• Show your work
• Quantify need and benefits
• Be clear & simple
• Include back-up info for all sections/in right place
### Scoring Criteria – Water Quality Benefits

#### Definition
- Project components that capture, infiltrate, divert, or treat and release stormwater or urban runoff for either wet- or dry-weather flows.

#### Tips
- Website only looks at 1 BMP at a time; separate analyses must be shown for each component of the project.
- **Explain all assumptions**
- Website has a button to submit your work and calcs – be sure to use this feature!

#### Example
**Strathern North Stormwater Capture Project**
Benefits include:
- Utilizes a hydrodynamic separator to separate and trap trash, debris, sediment, oil, grease, and fine particulates from stormwater runoff.
- Captures and infiltrates the entirety of the 85th-percentile storm from two tributary areas.
## Scoring Criteria – Water Supply Benefits

### Definition
- Project components that capture stormwater or urban water runoff for reuse onsite or to augment existing water supplies through infiltration or diversion.

### Tips
- Provide a **note from the Watermaster or purveyor** proving that the project will recharge water.
- Provide **proof of dry weather flow**: monitoring data over several months (preferred), nearby stream gauge, or studies showing flow for different types of land use.

### Example
**Rory M. Shaw Wetlands Park Project**

Benefits include:
- Detention pond holding ~1,880 acre-feet of collected runoff from the upstream tributary area.
- Cooperative agreement between LADWP and project applicant (LACFCD) showing the acceptance of the project.
### Definition
- Community investment benefits include the components of a project that improve the public health and well-being of the surrounding community, such as flood management, creation of green space, and more.

### Tips
- Be **specific** about (and **quantify** whenever possible!) the community **NEEDS** being addressed (e.g., flooding, heat) & how the project will **ADDRESS** those needs (e.g., # of trees or canopy coverage; # of visitors to park).
- Provide concise and easy-to-understand (pictures, graphics) **back-up in appropriate** section where possible (e.g., rendering of plantings, pictures of flooding, etc.).

### Example
**Urban Orchard Project**
Benefits include:
- Creation of new green space via the transformation of 30 acres of brownfields into a park.
- Creation of new recreational spaces via the construction of a new education garden and 196-tree orchard.
- Creation of new habitat for native fish via construction of a wetland.
## Scoring Criteria – Nature-Based Solutions

### Definition
- Nature-based solutions means a Project that utilizes natural processes that slow, detain, infiltrate or filter Stormwater or Urban Runoff

### Tips
- **Identify specific components** of project that implement or mimic natural processes and whether each is nature-based OR nature mimicking
- **Quantify** nature-based solution elements (e.g., square feet of bioswale; acres of wetland; etc.)
- Include quantification in NBS section, not just in attachments

### Example
**Merced Ave Greenway (Phase I-South Residential Corridor)**

Nature-based Solutions include:
- Bioretention and biofiltration
  - 6,830 ft² bioretention BMPs: nature-based
- 11,078 ft² of plantings (132 trees and 2900 shrubs): nature-based
- 10,420 ft² of permeable pavement: nature mimicking
- Hardscape removal: 0.7 acres
Scoring Criteria – Community Support

Definition

- Support from and/or partnerships with the local community as a result of engagement throughout project development.

Tips

- Remember: outreach TO communities is different from support FROM or partnerships WITH communities.
- When showing community support, provide evidence of partnerships with NGOs, or compelling evidence that project enjoys widespread community support (e.g., multiple letters of support from diverse constituencies within the community; public polling; documentation that the community helped inform the project).
- Be specific and quantify the community engagement that has occurred (e.g., how many meetings were held and how many participated in each meeting).
Scoring Criteria – Community Support

Example

Lakewood Equestrian Center
Support includes:
- 2 community meetings
- Community survey that generated over 1000 responses
- Focus groups with local community groups (Scout Troup Parents, Neighborhood Watch, Equestrian Center Boarders & Trainers, community seniors, and community youth)
- 4 letters of support
Stormwater Investment Plans

(SIPs)
Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs)

Current Year Budget:
- 5-year plan
- Assign funding for
  - Infrastructure Program
  - Technical Resource Program
  - Scientific Studies Program
- Budget for current year is transferred to Project Developers subject to the Transfer Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Program (not less than 85%)</td>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Studies (up to 5%)</td>
<td>Special Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Resources Program (up to 10%)</td>
<td>Feasibility Study 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility Study 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility Study 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watershed Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs)**

### Subsequent 4 Year Projections:
- Conditional funding for full Project cost
- Watershed Area Steering Committees will verify annually:
  - Project schedule, budget, scope and benefits are consistent with initial proposal
- Projects over budget, behind schedule, or reduced scope or benefits may be subject to discontinued funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Program (not less than 85%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Studies (up to 5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Resources Program (up to 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIP Criteria

A. **Not less than 85%** of the budget shall be allocated to Infrastructure Program activities, **not more than 10%** of the budget shall be allocated to Technical Resource Program activities, and **not more than 5%** of the budget shall be allocated to Scientific Studies Program activities;

B. Projects that assist in achieving compliance with a **MS4 Permit** shall be prioritized, to the extent feasible;

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

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

Reference: Section 18.07.2 of the Safe, Clean Water Program Implementation Ordinance
E. A spectrum of **Project types and sizes** shall be implemented throughout the region, to the extent feasible, to be evaluated annually over a rolling five (5) year period;

F. **Nature-Based Solutions** shall be prioritized, to the extent feasible;

G. Projects, Feasibility Studies, scientific and technical studies, and other activities selected for inclusion in a SIP should be recommended to receive funding for their **total estimated costs**, unless a lesser amount has been requested;

H. **Operation and maintenance** costs for any Project may be included in the Infrastructure Program portion of a SIP, whether or not the design and construction of that Project was included in a SIP; and

I. Only Projects that **meet or exceed the Threshold Score** shall be eligible for inclusion in the Infrastructure Program. Projects that receive a score below the Threshold Score may be referred to the Technical Resources Program at the discretion of the Watershed Area Steering Committee.

*Reference: Section 18.07.2 of the Safe, Clean Water Program Implementation Ordinance*
Recipient shall submit the scope of work described in Exhibit A within 45-days after approval of the SIP.

Funds are disbursed within 45-days of receipt of the fully executed transfer agreement by both parties.

Sample Transfer Agreement available on SCW website. Actual Transfer Agreement will be provided by the District for signature.

Exhibit A – Scope of Work
Exhibit B – General Terms and Conditions
Exhibit C – Special Conditions
Exhibit D – Addendum to Agreement
Exhibit E – Nature-Based Solutions (Best Management Practices)
Exhibit F – Operations and Maintenance Guidance Document
Adaptive Management

Guidelines and Guidance to provide information related to best practices and additional clarity on select issues
Partial Funding Guidelines

• The District developed guidelines to address the ability for WASCs to recommend **Programming Partial Funding**

  ➢ The purpose of this Funding Reduction Concurrence (FRC) form is to demonstrate an IPPA’s or SSA’s willingness and ability to complete a project or study with a lesser amount than the amount requested in its application without negatively impacting the score or scope of the project.

  ➢ Provide a compensation plan for any shortfall.

  ➢ Reliance on subsequent Regional Program funding is not a guarantee and is therefore discouraged.

Figure 1: Flowchart for Partial Funding recommendation for projects and studies in each current SIP cycle.
The District developed the 2022 Interim Guidance to help facilitate Call for Project and each component includes a brief vision for future guidance.

**2022 Interim Guidance**
- Strengthening Community Engagement and Support
- Water Supply Guidance
- Programming of Nature-Based Solutions
- Implementing Disadvantaged Community Policies

Other program aspects continue to be clarified or addressed through the Metrics and Monitoring Study and/or advancement of various regional studies.
Strengthening Community Engagement and Support

This guidance includes:

1. Engagement Prior to Application
2. Engagement Plan for Project Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Levels</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform - Provide the community with relevant information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult - Gather input from the Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Involve - Ensure community input, needs, and assets are integrated into processes, receive demonstrable consideration and appropriate responses, and inform planning |
| | Educate – Grow community understanding of the existing infrastructure systems, purposes, perceived outstanding needs, pertinent history and regulations, SCW Program opportunities (including Watershed Coordinators) to establish |
| | Learn – Grow own understanding of existing community, perceived needs, pertinent history, key concerns, and other potentially interested parties. |
| | Collaborate – Leverage and grow community capacity to play a leadership role in both planning and implementation |
| | Incorporate – Foster democratic participation and equity by including the community in decision-making, bridge divide between community and governance |
| | Partner – Establish certain project concepts based on community-driven and identified needs, solidify formal partnerships, and build in sustained paths forward to joint implementation and management with well-defined roles per agreement |
Water Supply Guidance

1. Establishes shared vocabulary
2. Clarifies characterization of Water Supply Benefits
3. Provides guidance to the Scoring Committee
4. Provides guidance to the nine Watershed Area Steering Committees
The guidance clarifies how best to prioritize Nature-Based Solutions by:

1. Establishing a shared vocabulary
2. Providing guidance to the nine WASCs
3. Clarifying how project developer can support program goal.
4. Highlight how the Feasibility Study requirements and the Projects Module support Project proponents and WASCs in the prioritization of Nature-Based Solutions.
Implementing Disadvantaged Community Policies

1. Clarification of how to interpret and demonstrate project's ability to deliver DAC Benefits
2. Procedures for consistently accounting for the 110% SIP provisions
3. Considerations to inform deliberation and discussion
### Community Workforce Agreement (CWA) Acknowledgement

- For Projects with Capital Cost greater than $25M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Sample Capital Cost</td>
<td>$25,000,000.00</td>
<td>10/2023</td>
<td>10/2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$25,000,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By toggling this I acknowledge that a Project funded with SCW Program Contributions through the Regional Program with an estimated capital cost of over $25M must require that all contractors performing work on this Project be bound by the provisions of: (1) the Countywide Project Labor Agreement (Community Workforce Agreement), or (2) a Project Labor Agreement mirroring the provisions of the Community Workforce Agreement. See Community Workforce Agreement Website for more information.
Alternate Water Supply Scoring Pilot

- Additional Feasibility Information > Other
- The Alternate Scoring is ONLY for FY 24-25 Call for Project
- This will not automatically override the module generated water supply score

Would you like to use the pilot scoring rubric for Water Supply scoring? The pilot Water Supply scoring provides additional granularity so that projects can [ ] Yes score at one-point increments.

Click HERE to download the guidance document for Water Supply Benefits Alternative (Optional) Scoring Pilot and HERE to download the proposed scoring worksheet.

Upload Alternative Water Supply Scoring Worksheet
RESOURCES:

- Feasibility Study Guidelines
- Spatial Data Library
- Regional Program TA Template
- Previously Recommended SIPs
Safe Clean Water Program
Questions?

www.SafeCleanWaterLA.org

SafeCleanWaterLA@pw.lacounty.gov

833-ASK-SCWP