

**DATE:** September 28, 2015

**TO:** RMC Governing Board

**FROM:** Mark Stanley, Executive Officer

**SUBJECT:** Item 9: Consideration of resolution approving the RMC Proposition 1 Grant Guidelines

---

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** That the RMC adopt a resolution approving the RMC Proposition 1 Grant Guidelines.

**BACKGROUND:** The last grant program framework was adopted by the RMC Board on September 24, 2007 (RMC Grant Program 2007). Recently, with the passage of the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1) in November 2014, the RMC was required to update and approve guidelines consistent with the Proposition 1 bond language. RMC staff made the determination that prior bond fund guidelines, the most recent update in 2007, fit well as a model for framing water bond grant requirements. The most significant deviation from the 2007 RMC Grant Program update is ensuring water components are robust and the requirements will meet the needs of AB 1471, the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, the California Water Action Plan and are inline with AB 685, California's Human Right to Water.

Generally Proposition 1 looks to fund water quality and supply enhancement projects. Staff conducted four public workshops to review the draft of revised grant guidelines, including the Project Evaluation Criteria (See Exhibit A: Project Evaluation Criteria), during the month of July in the cities of Newhall, West Covina, Fullerton and Downey. The workshop locations were chosen strategically and centrally situated to ensure full participation from local community groups and city staff (See Exhibit D: Press Release for the Public Workshops).

The four workshops were very well attended, more than 100 participants attended the workshops collectively. The public comment period was open from July 10 to August 14, 2015. Of special note, the workshop in the City of West Covina was kicked off with opening comments by the host cities Mayor the Honorable Fredrick Sykes. In attendance were RMC Board Members Denis Bertone and Margaret Clark. In addition, the workshop in Downey included the participation of Assemblymember Anthony Rendon (AD 63) who gave participants a brief welcome and history of AB 1471 from the perspective of the main author of the water bond.

Staff received a wide variation of comments regarding the grant guidelines with specific interest in the following (Please see Exhibit B: Public Comments):

- Minimum/Maximum funding available
- Points for water sustainability
- Consideration for cities that are implementing Watershed Management Plans (WMPs) and Enhanced WMPs (EWMPs)
- The level of emphasis on community outreach
- How will cities that lack staff capacity compete for the funding
- How will RMC and SMMC compete for the \$100 million funding

- How points would be allocated according to each program area: Mountains/Foothills, Rivers/Tributaries and Urban Program
- Timeframe of project completion, originally indicating 3 years in the RMC Grant Guidelines versus the standard 5 year requirement
- Matching fund requirements
- Youth employment criteria and/or using the California Conservation Corps

RMC Staff also set up an email address to allow potential grantees to submit comments by the close of the public comment period. RMC staff received comments from LA County Public Works, the Cities of Huntington Park, San Gabriel, Whittier, and Bell Gardens. The main theme from each of these cities was requesting that higher weight be given to projects including Water Sustainability/Water Infrastructure and Water Resource and Quality and that consideration be given to cities that are trying to implement newly approved Watershed Management Plans (WMPs). Various questions were specifically addressed in the Project Evaluation Criteria, see Exhibit A: Project Evaluation Criteria. Comments were also submitted by non-profit organizations including the Nature Conservancy, The Trust for Public Land, the LA Neighborhood Land Trust, From Lot to Spot, and Northeast Trees. The comments submitted from individuals were very similar and had a very specific request that that all grants using funding from Proposition 1 be for projects that benefit disadvantaged communities. The comments submitted from individuals and these organizations varied and are reflected in the attached spreadsheet, Exhibit B: Proposition 1 Comments Matrix.

Based on the comments received, RMC Staff revised the Grant Guidelines and made the following changes:

1. Section involving Stakeholders/Partners Resource Value and using the California Conservation Corps for project implementation (Section 7.4) language was revised to include Youth Employment Program in coordination with the State/County or qualified non-governmental organization (NGO) regarding youth employment.
2. Section 6 Multi-Benefit and Multi-Jurisdictional Projects: Provided definitions for these terms
3. Omitted duplicate sections involving letters of support from stakeholders and moved to Section 7:Stakeholders/Partners Resource Value
4. Changed point criteria in Section 4: Matching Funds, but overall totals remain the same
5. Included points for cities that are implementing Watershed Management Plans (WMPs) and Enhanced WMPs (EWMPs) in the Water Resource and Quality Value (Section 11.0)
6. Project completion time frame has been corrected from three years to five years
7. Overall Scores for each program area were revised and have different total scores  
**Urban: 145    Rivers/Tributaries: 150    Mountains/Foothills: 135**

Prior to having the grant workshops, RMC had also begun to engage cities within our territory to raise awareness of the upcoming Prop. 1 workshops and call for projects; communicate directly with cities directly impacted by Proposition 1 funding and identify direct and immediate needs of the respective municipalities. This work took place in the Spring of 2015 and was done primarily in the form of a city survey conducted by Jose Gardea of Urbanism Advisors.

Through its consultant, the RMC received responses from 38 cities via a city survey that would be used as a guide to assist city staff in identifying potential projects. A total of 65 projects were submitted during this phase for a total request amount of \$276 million. A variety of projects were submitted including water retention, water capture, and clean-up.

During this phase, multiple themes emerged that highlighted both opportunities and challenges for cities as they contemplated water bond funding, including:

- Lack of staff capacity
- Readiness concerns
- Understanding Prop. 1 priorities
- Planning and design phases

All city staff was alerted to upcoming public workshops that would be held during the Summer and strongly encouraged to attend and participate. See attached **Exhibit C: City Survey and Workshop Report**

See the attached Exhibit A- Project Evaluation Criteria which is the criteria that will be used for scoring all projects submitted for the upcoming grant program. It is listed as Appendix C as part of the RMC Grant Guidelines.

The following is the proposed grant timeline:

Current Date	Action
January 26, 2015	Review of current Grant Program Guidelines
February 2, 2015	Draft Guidelines
June 2015	Submit Draft Guidelines to Natural Resources- Initial Review
July 23, 27, 28 & 30, 2015	Public Workshops Begin (4 Total), review of Grant Program Guidelines and Public Comments
July 10-August 14,2015	Public Comment Period
August 14-22, 2015	Revisions to Guidelines
August 24, 2014	Submit guidelines to Natural Resources-Final Review
September 28, 2015	RMC Board approval of Prop. 1 Grant Guidelines
September 28-December 16, 2015	Call for Projects
October-December 2015	Assemble Project Review Teams & Score Applications
December 16, 2015	Due Date of RMC Grant proposals
March 2016	RMC Board Approval of Grants- Tentative

Upon approval of the Proposition 1 Grant Guidelines, RMC Staff will issue the official Call for Projects which will go from September 28, 2015- December 16, 2015. Any grant applications submitted will be reviewed and scored according to the Project Evaluation Criteria.

A critical element of the funding plan for RMC projects is to leverage within the highest degree possible with other funding sources such as LA County Proposition A, River Parkway Program, Wildlife Conservation Board, Urban Streams, Urban State Parks, Fish & Wildlife Program, Active Transportation Program (Metro), Urban Greening, IRWM, and other grant programs available.

The following are exhibits attached to this report: Exhibit A- Project Evaluation Criteria  
Exhibit B- Proposition 1 Comments Matrix; Exhibit C: City Survey and Workshop Report; Exhibit D- Prop. 1 Workshop Press Release; and Exhibit E: Frequently Asked Questions

**Funding:** To date the RMC has approved \$94 Million in Watershed Improvement Projects and Programs using past bond funds including Propositions 13, 40, 50 and 84. This has resulted in the completion of approximately 195 projects, 160 of which are completed, and the balance of 35 projects that are “certified”; meaning they are active, approved projects in which funds have been encumbered. The project applicants include cities, non-governmental organizations, and joint powers authority partners, most notably the Watershed Conservation Authority.

The most recent Capital Outlay report lists funds appropriated, encumbered, and remaining funds from these past bonds. Currently, the remaining balance is \$4,949,773. This includes a remaining balance of \$641,221 from Proposition 50 and \$3,974,530 from Proposition 84.

The grant program that will be implemented by the Conservancy will be using the \$30 million in direct allocation to the Conservancy from Proposition 1. It is anticipated that the funds will be spent within a five to seven year time frame.

**LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND RMC ADOPTED POLICIES/AUTHORITIES:** Public Resources Code Section 32604 provides in part that the conservancy shall do all of the following:

- (a) Establish policies and priorities for the conservancy regarding the San Gabriel River and the Lower Los Angeles River, and their watersheds, and conduct any necessary planning activities, in accordance with the purposes set forth in Section 32602.
- (c) Approve conservancy funded projects that advance the policies and priorities set forth in Section 32602.

Proposition 1, Chapter 6, Sections 79731(f) and 79735(a) which allocates the following funding to the RMC: Section 79731(f) of the funds authorized by Section 79730, the sum of three hundred twenty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars (\$327,500,000) shall be allocated for multi-benefit water quality, water supply, and watershed protection and restoration projects for the watersheds of the state in accordance with the following schedule:..(f) San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000). And Section 79735(a) of the funds authorized by Section 79730, one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) shall be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for projects to protect and enhance an urban creek, as defined in subdivision (e) of Section 7048, and its tributaries, pursuant to Division 22.8 (commencing with Section 32600) of, and Division 23 (commencing with Section 33000) of, the Public Resources Code and Section 79508.

**APPENDIX C: PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA\***

Staff will deem a grant application complete when it has passed the initial selection process. Staff will recommend the grant application to the Grant Selection Committee for evaluation and scoring by utilizing the evaluation criteria set forth below. An application must achieve an average score of 85 percent or higher in order to qualify for recommendation of grant funds to the RMC Board.

\*Criterion that are marked with an asterisk are not eligible for funding, however these elements will contribute to an applicant's overall score. Applicants must demonstrate that supplemental funding is available for non-eligible costs.

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
<b>1.0 Restore River Parkways</b>			
1.1. The Project is identified in an existing or proposed trail plan (e.g. Master Bikeway Path Plan) or connects communities to major existing or planned trails or open space.	5	5	5
1.2. Restore River Parkway, Section 79732 (a) (3) California River Parkways Act of 2004	1	1	1
1.3. * Project is on land that is an underutilized public or private holding. Underutilized properties include blighted vacant lots or inaccessible public lands	1	1	1
1.4. The project is within ¼ mile or 10 minutes walking distance of a residential area and/or public transportation and includes multilingual wayfinding signage.	1	1	1
1.5. The project includes improvements to a pedestrian, equestrian and/or bicycle connection to an existing trail, trail system, community facility, recreation area or school.	1	1	1
1.6. The project would accommodate a new trail into an inaccessible area.	1	1	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>*2.0 Educational/Interpretive Signage</b>			
2.1 *Educational/Interpretive and/or informational elements are included.	1	1	1
2.2 *Signage or educational/interpretive message includes the natural history, cultural history, and watershed stewardship. (not include in criteria)	1	1	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.0 Habitat and Restoration Resource Values</b>			
3.1 The project results in new habitat and increases at least one of the following: terrestrial, avian, or aquatic habitats or creates new linkages or corridors. – OR –	5	5	5
3.2 The project preserves threatened natural habitat and protects native floral and faunal biodiversity that may be lost to a planned development. – OR –			
3.3 The project preserves threatened natural habitat and protects native floral and faunal biodiversity that may be lost to a planned development. – OR –			

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance <span style="float: right;">Item 9</span>		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
3.4. The project preserves and/or enhances existing natural habitat and protects native floral and faunal biodiversity.	1	2	1
3.5. The project includes an evaluation of the suitability, strategy, and success measures for the site's habitat preservation, creation, and/or enhancement.	1	2	1
3.6. The project supports substantial in-stream or native riparian habitat and/or supports substantial upland native vegetative cover	1	2	1
3.7. The project includes habitat that supports or may support either a special status species, or a candidate for special status species per federal, state, local, or California Native Plant Society designations.	1	2	1
3.8. The project supports unique and/or irreplaceable ecological systems, i.e., coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, monarch breeding, migratory watering area	1	2	1
3.9. The project is located within a county-designated ecologically sensitive watershed area, i.e., Significant Ecological Area, Conceptual Area Protection Plan (CAPP), or other agency reviewed plan area.	1	2	1
3.10. The project protects watershed processes enhances or supports downstream habitat.	1	2	1
3.11. The project includes habitat that provides a buffer between protected or proposed protected areas and incompatible uses (e.g. Wildland-Urban Interface).	1	2	1
3.12. The project is adjacent to publicly owned open space or private land protected under a conservation easement or similar perpetual restriction.	1	2	1
3.13. The project will be managed in such a manner as to provide maximum long term habitat protection (please explain)	1	2	1
3.14. The project enhances wetland and subtidal habitats to restore ecosystem function and provide multi-beneficial flood protection and resilient shorelines	1	2	1
3.15. The project is on the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project Regional Strategy project list	1	2	1
3.16. The project contains a quantifiable plan for evaluating the long term success of any habitat restoration efforts.	1	2	1
3.17. The scope of habitat restoration does not negatively impact the health of already existing natural habitat on site or adjacent to the site.	1	2	1
3.18. The project is compliant with the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB32) and subsequent policy and program implementation in order to meet the State's Climate Change Adaptation and Greenhouse Gas Reductions	1	2	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.0 Matching Funds</b>			
4.1 Project sponsor will contribute 100% or more matching funds (does not include in-kind services; can be other grants/gifts or private and local funding)	7	7	7
4.2 Project sponsor will contribute 50% or more matching funds (does not include in-kind services; can be other grants/gifts or private and local funding)	5	5	5

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
4.3 Contribution of matching funds will count towards completion of the entire project being submitted for funding	3	3	3
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5.0 Environmental Justice and Disadvantaged Communities</b>			
5.1 Cal-Enviro Sreen standards Up to 15 bonus points will be awarded to proposed projects that primarily benefit communities with high pollution burdens and/or high population characteristic scores, based on CalEnviroScreen maps. <a href="http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html">http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html</a> 5 points = CalEnviroScreen score of 61% - 70% (on any of the 3 maps) 10 points = CalEnviroScreen score of 71%- 80% (on any of the 3 maps) 15 points = CalEnviroScreen score of 81% or higher (on any of the 3 maps)			
	15	15	15
5.2 The project creates a sense of community through educational outreach, community activities, and programs.	2	1	1
5.3 The project concept and designs are a result of direct community input held through community meetings within the vicinity of where project is located, and occurred no earlier than January 2013.	3	3	3
5.4 The project will serve an area that has a significant percentage of residents living with chronic diseases (examples: diabetes, obesity, asthma) please visit <a href="http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html">http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html</a> .	2	1	1
5.5 The project contains signage elements that promote physical activity and "healthy living" practices such as mileage makers, walking trails and other physical activities.	2	1	1
5.6 Creates new park space in a disadvantaged or park poor community defined as a census tract with a population that has more than 30% youth and less than 80% of the state's annual median income and/or having less than 2 acres/0.8 hectares of open space per 1,000 residents. As defined by subdivision (a) of Section 79505.5, please visit <a href="http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html">http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html</a> .	5	5	5
5.6 The project design and/or location provides relief from the negative impacts of urban density such as incompatible land uses and unregulated industrial impacts.	2	1	1
5.7 The project provides physical linkages to open space (passive and recreational) from a disadvantaged and/or park-poor neighborhood.	2	1	1
5.8 The project conforms to the RMC Environmental Justice Policy per Section 2.4.	5	5	5
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6.0 Multi-beneficial and multi-jurisdictional</b>			
6.1 This project is a multi-beneficial and multi-jurisdictional ecosystem and watershed protection project in accordance with statewide priorities. Multi-benefit = Achieves more than one water related element. Ex: water recycling AND trail use, water infrastructure AND sustainability, etc., Multi-jurisdictional= Partnership with more than one city, or includes more than one watershed, or is a partnership between one or more counties.	3	3	3

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance <span style="float: right;">Item 9</span>		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>7.0 Stakeholders/Partners Resource Value</b>			
7.1 The project is clearly defined and includes an objective, mission and purpose.	1	1	1
7.2 The project is significant to one or more local citizen groups or non-governmental organizations as evidenced by a letter of support from the organization's governing body.	1	1	1
7.3 The project promotes and implements the California Water Action Plan objectives which include reliable water supplies, the restoration of important species and habitat and a more resilient and sustainably managed water infrastructure.	1	1	1
7.4 Projects will use the California Conservation Corps for project implementation (whole or partial) or look to hire youth through certified Youth Employment Program in coordination with the State/County or qualified non-governmental organization (NGO).	5	5	5
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>8.0 Stewardship and Management Plan Value</b>			
8.1 The project includes an adopted guidelines, strategic plan, etc. for active stakeholder/partner participation that includes the 20-25 year period of the project after completion (includes identification of stakeholder/partner groups).	1	1	1
8.2 The project includes a landscape maintenance manual containing details regarding logistics of weed management, trail maintenance, trash management, unauthorized uses, and a habitat establishment monitoring program.	1	1	1
8.3 The project identifies funding for a specified list of activities that an organization (i.e. professional contractor, local non-profit, or community volunteer group) with relevant expertise, that will provide appropriate future stewardship and adaptive management to ensure the sustainability of the project.	1	1	1
8.4 Applicant has organizational capacity and has 10+ years of maintaining and operating projects of similar size and scope	1	1	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>9.0 Water Sustainability/Water Storage/Water Infrastructure</b>			
9.1 The project includes 3 or more of the following elements to address climate change: 1) Sustainable site planning and land use compatibility 2) Safeguarding water and water efficiency, 3) Energy efficiency and renewable energy, 4) Conservation of materials and resources, and 5) Indoor environmental quality.	5	5	5
9.2 The project incorporates more than 50% recycled content product hardscape elements (benches, signage, light fixtures, gates, fences, etc).	1	1	1
9.3 The project contains a more than a 75% native plant palette.	1	1	1
9.4 Maintain and improve flood protection through natural and non-structural systems and ecosystem restoration.	1	1	1

Project Evaluation Criteria		Program Relevance <span style="float: right;">Item 9</span>		
		Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
9.5	Establish riverfront greenways to cleanse water, hold floodwaters and extend open space.	1	1	1
9.6	Optimize water resources by improving the quality of surface and ground water and enhance ground water recharge, to reduce dependence on imported water.	1	1	1
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>10.0 Urban Land Value</b>				
10.1	The project contributes to the removal of a nuisance property/use from the community.	2	1	1
10.2	The project provides relief from high urban density defined as 150% or more of county median population density.	2	1	1
10.3	The project contributes to an existing or proposed park, natural area, corridor, or greenway in an urbanized area.	2	1	1
10.4	The project involves joint-use of a site (e.g. a school yard, is a public park during off-school hours).	2	1	1
10.5	The project is sited in an area with more than 120% of the median county percent under age 18.	2	1	1
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>11.0 Water Resource and Quality Value</b>				
11.1	The project provides a new opportunity for substantial water conservation and/or water quality improvements	5	5	5
11.2	The project contains or improves groundwater supply and/or recharge capabilities.	5	5	5
11.3	Project includes treatment of storm water runoff.	4	4	4
11.4	The project includes a groundwater improvement element that exceeds the recommended elements of the Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001.	1	1	1
11.5	The project utilizes recycled water.	1	1	1
11.6	The project utilizes cisterns or similar devices to collect and recycle rainwater on site. Project includes water conservation measures.	1	1	1
11.7	The project includes a water quality element consistent with the description of a "small or neighborhood project" as described in the Greater Los Angeles Region IRWM Plan.	3	3	3
11.8	The project includes a water quality element consistent with the description of a "medium or sub watershed project" as described in the Greater Los Angeles Region IRWM Plan.	2	2	2
11.9	The project includes a water quality element consistent with the description of a "large or multi sub watershed project" as described in the Greater Los Angeles Region IRWM Plan.	1	1	1
11.10	The project is part of a Watershed Management Plan or Enhanced Watershed Management Plan within Greater LA County	2	2	2
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>145</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>135</b>



## Exhibit B: RMC Prop. 1 Guidelines: Comments Matrix

Submitted by	Comment	Date	Individual	Email
LA County Public Works	Higher weight to Water Sustainability/Water Infrastructure and Water Resource and Quality Value	8/13/2015	Angela George	<a href="mailto:ageorge@dpw.lacounty.gov">ageorge@dpw.lacounty.gov</a>
	Change project completion from 3 yrs to 5 yrs.		Charles Darensbourg	<a href="mailto:cdarensbourg@dpw.lacounty.gov">cdarensbourg@dpw.lacounty.gov</a>
City of Huntington Park	Higher weight to Water Sustainability/Water Infrastructure and Water Resource and Quality Value	8/14/2015	Michael Ackerman	<a href="mailto:mackerman@hpcg.gov">mackerman@hpcg.gov</a>
	Change project completion from 3 yrs to 5 yrs.			
City of San Gabriel	Higher weight to Water Sustainability/Water Storage/Water Infrastructure & Water Resource and Quality Value Matching funds should be set at 50% (Section 4.1) and 25% (Section 4.2)			
	Project Description limit is 100 words or less, but may need more, confusing language in guidelines Provide sample resolution for approval by governing body	8/1/2015	Daren T. Grilley	<a href="mailto:dgrilley@sgch.org">dgrilley@sgch.org</a>
	Change project completion from 3 yrs. To 5 yrs.			
City of Whittier	Higher weight to Water Sustainability/Water Storage/Water Infrastructure & Water Resource and Quality Value	8/14/2015	David Pelser	<a href="mailto:dpelser@cityofwhittier.org">dpelser@cityofwhittier.org</a>
	Change project completion from 3 yrs. to 5 yrs.			

<b>City of Bell Gardens</b>	RMC should offer assistance with preparing the applications by funding a grant writer. Change project completion from 3 yrs to 5 yrs, to implement the newly approved Watershed Management Plans (WMPs).	8/17/2015	Chau Vu	<a href="mailto:cvu@bellgardens.org">cvu@bellgardens.org</a>
<b>The Nature Conservancy</b>	<p>Section 2.9 Promote innovations with the greatest impact</p> <p>3.9 review of initial criteria may delay the process and result in additional costs, consider revising</p> <p>Appendix C: So. California Wetlands Recovery Project "project list" leads to "Comprehensive Project Board" which requires review by Wetland Managers Group. Seems like an unnecessary and lengthy step. Consider revising.</p> <p>Section 4.1-4.2 How can projects receive the full 15 points?</p>	7/2/2015	Jill Sourial	<a href="mailto:jill.sourial@tnc.org">jill.sourial@tnc.org</a>
<b>LA Neighborhood Land Trust</b>	<p>Urban agriculture projects should be eligible for funding Section 79732 (a) "Assist in water-related agricultural sustainability projects"</p> <p>Use the LANLT as a resource when implementing the RMC's EJ policy</p> <p>RMC should provide technical assistance to applicants, especially small NGOs and quantifying "quantifiable outcomes" for climate change adaptations and GHG reductions.</p> <p>Clarify the definition of "multi-jurisdictional projects. If the definition refers to the size or area of the projects, we urge RMC to reconsider its emphasis so that small scale projects can be on a level playing field with larger projects.</p>	8/14/2015	Alina Bokde	<a href="mailto:etunk@lanlt.org">etunk@lanlt.org</a>

<p><b>CA Association of Local Conservation Corps</b></p>	<p>Appendix A, pg 19: Definition of Local Conservation Corps means a community conservation corps that is certified by the CA Conservation Corps.</p>	<p>8/17/2015</p>	<p>Crystal Muhlenkamp</p>	<p><a href="mailto:crystal@caleec.com">crystal@caleec.com</a></p>
<p><b>From Lot to Spot</b></p>	<p>State Agencies must facilitate fund access to community based nonprofit organizations- who are regularly deterred from applying for reimbursement-based grants as they cannot afford to operate on a reimbursement basis.</p> <p>Community outreach and engagement should not rely solely on letters of support. Authentic and extensive community engagement should have a score of 10 and should be available as an eligible cost under the grant.</p> <p>In order to compete for Prop 1 funds, reduce application points for matching funds to 1-5 points.</p>	<p>8/10/2015</p>	<p>Viviana Franco</p>	<p><a href="mailto:viviana@fromlottospot.org">viviana@fromlottospot.org</a></p>
<p><b>The Trust for Public Land</b></p>	<p>Section 2.2. Addition of additional bullet: "create, expand, or improve public open space" as long as efforts provide water related benefits.</p> <p>Section 2.8 Nature based play infrastructure vs. traditional playground equipment. Guidelines must be specific about what types of infrastructure might be eligible through the urban greening priority in this program.</p> <p>Consider nature based play infrastructure as eligible playground equipment.</p>	<p>7/22/2015</p>	<p>Tori Kjer</p>	<p><a href="mailto:tori.kjer@tpl.org">tori.kjer@tpl.org</a></p>

Suggestion to require outline of a monitoring and assessment plan in the Grant Application:Project Description  
 What types of projects must be consulted with CCCs, are acquisitions?

<b>Northeast Trees</b>	Youth Employment, Exhibit E:Other agencies should be guided and given the option to utilize youth crews from agencies such as NE Trees where youth crews have proper training. Should not be exclusive to CCCs or local conservation corps. Project costs for restoration and ecological services will behigher under the current guidelines, considering using the Corps labor rates and for additioanl management.	8/14/2015	Mark Kenyon
------------------------	---	-----------	-------------

<b>Individuals</b>			
Omar Pichardo	Prop. 1 funds should be located in disadvantaged communities.		<a href="mailto:omar.pichardo91@gmail.com">omar.pichardo91@gmail.com</a>
Eddie Martinez	Prop. 1 grants must be for projects in or that benefit disadvantaged communities		eddiemartinez55@gmail.com
Laura Gutierrez	100% of the Urban River and Creek Improvement Funds are in or benefit DACs	8/14/2015	<a href="mailto:lauragr@gmail.com">lauragr@gmail.com</a>
Victoria Cruz	100% of the Urban River and Creek Improvement Funds are in or benefit DACs	8/14/2015	<a href="mailto:vlcruz@casadefieras.org">vlcruz@casadefieras.org</a>
Victor Gonzalez	100% of the Urban River and Creek Improvement Funds are in or benefit DACs	8/14/2015	<a href="mailto:huitzi@operamail.com">huitzi@operamail.com</a>
Anita Diaz	Prop. 1 funding should be apportioned to low income areas near the LA River and the Rio Hondo in the SG Valley to encourage healthier lifestyles and promote physical activity.	8/15/2015	<a href="mailto:anitadzas14@gmail.com">anitadzas14@gmail.com</a>

Phil Reyes	Conservancy Proposition 1 Guidelines for grants funded by the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, should require that all grants must be for projects in or that benefit disadvantaged communities.	8/26/2015	<a href="mailto:reyesPhil@hotmail.com">reyesPhil@hotmail.com</a>
Ernesto Hidalgo	Conservancy Proposition 1 Guidelines for grants funded by the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, should require that all grants must be for projects in or that benefit disadvantaged communities.	8/14/2015	<a href="mailto:eghidalgo@hotmail.com">eghidalgo@hotmail.com</a>



## Exhibit C- Prop. 1 Outreach Plan

Spring and Summer 2015

### City Survey:

During the Spring, the RMC undertook a city survey of its catchment to accomplish the following objectives:

- Raise awareness of the upcoming Prop. 1 workshops and call for projects
- Communicate directly with cities directly impacted by potential Prop. 1 funding
- Identify direct and immediate needs of the respective municipalities

Through its consultant, the RMC, during the initial phase of the project, engaged 38 cities via a document containing project eligibility criteria that would be used as a guide to assist city staff identify potential projects. Communication between the RMC consultant and city staff included emails and phone calls.

A total of 65 projects were submitted during this phase for a total request amount of \$276 million. A variety of projects were submitted including water retention, water capture, and clean-up.

All city staff was alerted to upcoming public workshops that would be held during the Summer and strongly encouraged to attend and participate.

In addition, most federal and state elected representatives were contacted in reference to the city survey project. Many of the offices of the elected officials directly contacted their partner cities during this phase.

During this phase, multiple themes emerged that highlighted both opportunities and challenges for cities as the Prop. 1 funding becomes available. The themes include:

- Lack of staff capacity
- Readiness concerns
- Understanding Prop. 1 priorities
- Planning and design phases

### Public Workshops:

Subsequent to the city survey and as a result of the feedback obtained during the survey, the RMC hosted four public workshops during the month of July. The workshop locations were Santa Clarita, West Covina, Fullerton, and Downey. RMC staff believes that the workshop locations were strategically and centrally situated to ensure full participation from local community groups and city staff.

The RMC emailed a notification flyer to its contact database which includes non-profits, public agencies, community stakeholders, and elected officials. In addition, the RMC's consultant sent out an email notification to all city managers and city staff that had earlier participated in the city survey. On average, about 20 people confirmed for each of the workshops. In the end, over 100 registrants participated in the public workshops.

The agenda for the workshops included a brief introductory statement from Mark Stanley about the RMC, an outline of the city survey results, and a powerpoint presentation from RMC staff relative to the proposed draft Prop. 1 guidelines. A question and answer session was also held during the workshops.

The key topics that arose during the workshops included:

- Time frame of project completion from 3 years to 5 years
- Minimum/Maximum funding availability
- More points for water sustainability
- Heavier emphasis on community outreach
- How will cities that lack staff capacity compete for the funding
- How will RMC and SMMC compete for the \$100 million funding



# San Gabriel & Lower Los Angeles RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY

California Natural Resources Agency

## Governing Board of Directors:

Frank Colonna, Chair  
Environmental Public Member  
Dan Arrighi, Vice Chair  
Central Basin Water Association

Matthew Rodriguez, Secretary  
California Environmental Protection Agency

Denis Bertone  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

Vacant  
San Gabriel Valley Water Association

John Laird, Secretary  
California Natural Resources Agency

Michael Cohen  
Department of Finance

Troy Edgar  
Orange County Division of the League of California Cities

Margaret Clark  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

Hilda Solis  
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

Roberto Uranga  
City of Long Beach  
Vacant  
Orange County Division of the League of California Cities

Luis Marquez  
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

## Ex Officio Members

Lisa Mangat, Acting Director  
Department of Parks and Recreation

John Donnelly  
Wildlife Conservation Board

Colonel Kimberly M. Colloton  
US Army Corps of Engineers

Shane Silsby  
Orange County Public Works Department

Stephen Johnson  
San Gabriel River Water Master

Randy Moore  
Angeles National Forest  
US Forest Service

Gail Farber  
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

## Executive Officer

Mark Stanley



## For Immediate Release:

Friday August 7, 2015  
Contact: Mark Stanley 626-815-1019 x100  
Jose Gardea 323-559-1762

### PRESS RELEASE: RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY COMPLETES PUBLIC WORKSHOPS WHERE OVER 100 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATED

The Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (RMC), as part of the Proposition 1 competitive grant roll-out, has just completed a series of public meetings throughout their service region. The purpose of the workshops was to review the proposed grant guidelines for the grant program and to gather feedback from the public regarding the guidelines.

Assemblymember Anthony Rendon (63<sup>rd</sup> AD) attended one of the workshops in Downey, "These workshops are the result of numerous meetings across the state and are the result of the intentional process of rewriting the water bond prior to its completion and passage last November." Community involvement and competitive grants are two of the key themes that are currently part of the Proposition 1 water bond programs, including those that will be distributed by the RMC.

Over 100 members of the public participated in the workshops, which were held in Newhall, West Covina, Fullerton, and Downey between July 23<sup>rd</sup> and July 30, 2015. At the workshops, participants learned about the RMC, its previous funding programs, and reviewed the RMC's Prop. 1 draft guidelines. Participants also engaged RMC staff in a question and answer session. Mark Stanley, Executive Officer of the RMC, informed participants that the deadline to submit questions and comments relative to the draft guidelines is August 14, 2015.

The RMC will incorporate into the guidelines public comments that were gathered at these public meetings and subsequent suggestions submitted via their website. The RMC anticipates having final guidelines by late September 2015.

The RMC is expected to release a Call-for-Projects application in the fall. Further information regarding the timeline and the proposed grant program is available on [www.rmc.ca.gov](http://www.rmc.ca.gov)

The voters of California approved the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 ("Proposition 1" or "Water Bond") in November 2014 codified as Division 26.7 of the Water Code which authorized \$7.545 billion dollars in general obligation bonds for State water projects, including surface and groundwater storage, ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration, and

drinking water protection. The purpose of Proposition 1 is to provide funding for projects that implement the three objectives of the California Water Action Plan which are more reliable water supplies, restoration of important species and habitat and a more resilient and sustainably managed water infrastructure (Proposition 1, Chapter 2, Section 79701 (e)). Chapter 6 of Proposition 1 allocates \$30 million to the RMC for competitive grants for multi-benefit ecosystem, watershed protection and restoration projects in accordance with statewide priorities (79731(f)).

###

The San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (RMC) is one of 10 statewide conservancies. Their territory spans portions of the Antelope Valley, the San Gabriel Mountains, a majority of Los Angeles County and Northern Orange County. Additional information about the Conservancy can be found on the website: [www.rmc.ca.gov](http://www.rmc.ca.gov)



California Natural Resources Agency

**Governing Board of Directors:**

Frank Colonna, Chair  
Environmental Public Member  
Dan Arrighi, Vice Chair  
Central Basin Water Association

Matthew Rodriguez, Secretary  
California Environmental Protection Agency

Denis Bertone  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

Vacant  
San Gabriel Valley Water Association

John Laird, Secretary  
California Natural Resources Agency

Michael Cohen  
Department of Finance

Troy Edgar  
Orange County Division of the League of California Cities

Margaret Clark  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

Hilda Solis  
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

Roberto Uranga  
City of Long Beach

Vacant  
Orange County Division of the League of California Cities

Luis Marquez  
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

[Ex Officio Members](#)

Lisa Mangat, Acting Director  
Department of Parks and Recreation

John Donnelly  
Wildlife Conservation Board

Colonel Kimberly M. Colloton  
US Army Corps of Engineers

Shane Silsby  
Orange County Public Works Department

Stephen Johnson  
San Gabriel River Water Master

Randy Moore  
Angeles National Forest  
US Forest Service

Gail Farber  
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

[Executive Officer](#)

Mark Stanley

# San Gabriel & Lower Los Angeles RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY



## Proposition 1 Water Bond Workshops FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

August 2015

1. **Question:** What is the time frame that a project must be completed by? 3 years or 5 years

**Answer:** The Legislature appropriates funds from bond acts on an annual basis; a legislative appropriation for projects is generally valid for a five-year period

2. **Question:** What is the minimum and maximum amount of funding?

**Answer:** \$250,000 - \$2 million

3. **Question:** Will projects be competing against each other across the entire grant round, or will they be competing within each category?

**Answer:** They will be competing within each program category which consist of Urban Program, Mountains/Foothills, and Rivers & Tributaries

4. **Question:** Is there a matching requirement in order to apply?

**Answer:** No, but projects that have matching funds will be viewed as more favorable

5. **Question:** With the 10% set aside for planning projects, does CEQA have to be completed?

**Answer:** Depends on the project, but no, CEQA doesn't have to be completed. However, it should be part of the project task list that can be completed as part of the grant, if necessary.

6. **Question:** Will planning projects be scored the same as implementation projects? Based on the evaluation criteria, planning projects do not seem to be able to score very high.

**Answer:** Yes, they will be scored the same. However, the RMC will be setting aside 10% of the total amount of funds to go towards planning projects.

7. **Question:** Many cities do not have planning funds available to compete and submit projects that are shovel ready. How is this being addressed?

**Answer:** The RMC has provided funds in the past for planning projects. We'll do our best to connect cities with resources for planning-related assistance.

8. **Question:** Will the guidelines be the same for the \$100 million that is supposed to be shared with the SMMC?

**Answer:** The guidelines will probably change for the \$100 million funding pot, however, not too significantly. They will be consistent with the legislative language within the water bond.

9. **Question:** How will the \$30 million be spent? Will it be spent entirely within this grant round?  
**Answer:** The \$30 million will not be spent within this grant round. However, that will be based on the number of bonds that are sold and made available to the RMC.
10. **Question:** Will community based organizations received extra points for community outreach?  
**Answer:** See section under Environmental Justice, which awards up to 5 points for projects that show that community input was sought for a proposed project.
11. **Question:** How will the \$100 million be divided between SMMC and RMC? When will that be resolved?  
**Answer:** We are being informed that those decisions may be determined in the Fall 2015
12. **Question:** Can the Conservation Corp Contract be considered a match? What is the process for contracting with the Conservation Corps?  
**Answer:** The Conservation Corps contract cannot be considered a match, however, additional points (up to 5 points) will be provided to applicants that use the Corps for project implementation. The Corps must be consulted (See Appendix E: CCC and Certified Community Conservation Corps Consultation Document) prior to submitting grant application.
13. **Question:** What constitutes the most competitive project proposal?  
**Answer:** One example can be a project that can include one or more water-related components, has multiple objectives consistent with the RMCs mission, provides matching funds and is ready for implementation.
14. **Question:** What is the RMC Territory? Can it be clearly defined?  
**Answer:** Yes, generally it includes 68 cities, including 20 unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and Orange County adjacent to the San Gabriel River and its tributaries, the lower Los Angeles River and its tributaries, the San Gabriel Mountains, the Foothill Mountains, the Puente Hills, and the San Jose Hills area including, but not limited to, East Los Angeles. Refer to Public Resources Code 32603 for additional details.
15. **Question:** What are the scores needed to receive funds?  
**Answer:** The scoring will be based on each program area and will vary. However the scores for each section are as follows: Urban=140; Rivers/Tributaries= 145; Mountains/Hills=130.
16. **Question:** We understand that points for Prop 1 grant proposals will be awarded for either contributing 50% matching funds or 100% matching funds. Are these percentages based on the amount of funding requested in the requested or overall project cost?  
**Answer:** Matching percentages are based on the amount requested to the RMC. If matching funds exceed 100% and can complete the project, then a project will be viewed as highly competitive and may ultimately receive more points.
17. **Question:** Are guidelines shared by all conservancies?  
**Answer:** No, every Conservancy has its own set of guidelines and grant programs.

18. **Question:** How much consideration will be given to watershed plans in points?  
**Answer:** There are no specific points for watershed plans, however, projects that can refer to these plans will be ranked more favorably.
19. **Question:** Will application be available on-line?  
**Answer:** Not in this grant round.
20. **Question:** Are retrofit expenditures allowed?  
**Answer:** Yes.
21. **Question:** Are costs involving CEQA eligible costs?  
**Answer:** Yes, particularly for planning grants.
22. **Question:** What size projects will get CEQA exemptions?  
**Answer:** That is up to the applicant to determine as part of a project feasibility. The RMC does not determine whether a project will be exempt from CEQA.
23. **Question:** Can Proposition 84 funds be used to match Prop. 1?  
**Answer:** Yes
24. **Question:** Can municipal funds be used to match Prop. 1?  
**Answer:** Yes. Matching funds are encouraged from any other non-state funds, including federal, private funds, and in-kind funds.

###

The San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (RMC) is one of 10 statewide conservancies. Their territory spans portions of the Antelope Valley, the San Gabriel Mountains, a majority of Los Angeles County and Northern Orange County. Additional information about the Conservancy can be found on the website: [www.rmc.ca.gov](http://www.rmc.ca.gov)





RMC Staff conducted four formal workshops to review the revised grant guidelines including the Project Evaluation Criteria during the month of July in the cities of Newhall, West Covina, Fullerton and Downey. The workshop locations were strategically and centrally situated to ensure full participation from local community groups and city staff.

The four workshops were very well attended with over 100 total attendees. The public comment period ran from July 10-August 14, 2015. RMC Board members Denis Bertone and Margaret Clark attended the workshop held in West Covina. In addition, the workshop in Downey included the participation of Assemblymember Anthony Rendon (AD 53) who gave participants a brief welcome as the main author of the water bond. RMC Staff included Marybeth Vergara and Luz Quinnell with the assistance of Jose Gardea of Urbanism Advisors.

Photos above were taken at the workshop held in the City of Downey on July 30, 2015



September 28, 2015 – Item 10

RESOLUTION 2015-19

RESOLUTION OF THE SAN GABRIEL AND LOWER LOS ANGELES  
RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY (RMC) ADOPTING THE  
CONSERVANCY PROPOSITION 1 GRANT GUIDELINES

WHEREAS, The legislature has found and declared that the San Gabriel River and its tributaries, the Lower Los Angeles River and its tributaries, and the San Gabriel Mountains, Puente Hills, and San Jose Hills constitute a unique and important open space, environmental, anthropological, cultural, scientific, educational, recreational, scenic, and wildlife resource that should be held in trust to be preserved and enhanced for the enjoyment of, and appreciation by, present and future generations; and

WHEREAS, The people of the State of California have enacted the California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 40), the Water, Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 50), and the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 84); and the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1), which provides funds for the RMC grant program; and

WHEREAS, The RMC may award grants to local public agencies, state agencies, federal agencies, and nonprofit organizations for the purposes of Division 22.8 the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, The RMC held four public grant workshops to update and approve its guidelines consistent with the Proposition 1 water bond language and made changes to its existing grant program based on comments received from potential applicants; and

WHEREAS, Upon approval by the Board, the RMC will issue the official Call for Projects which will go from September 28, 2015-December 16, 2015; and

WHEREAS, This action is exempt from the environmental impact report requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and NOW

*Therefore be it resolved that* the RMC hereby:

1. FINDS that this action is consistent with the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy Act and is necessary to carry out the purposes and objectives of Division 22.8 of the Public Resources Code.
2. FINDS that this action is consistent with the California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 40), the Water, Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Proposition 50); the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 84), and the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1), which provides funds for the RMC grant program.
3. FINDS that the actions contemplated by this resolution are exempt from the environmental impact report requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Passed and Adopted by the Board of the  
SAN GABRIEL AND LOWER LOS ANGELES RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS  
CONSERVANCY on September 28, 2015.

- 4. AUTHORIZES the RMC Board to approve and adopt the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1) Grant Guidelines.
- 5. ADOPTS the staff report dated September 28, 2015.

*~ End of Resolution ~*

Motion \_\_\_\_\_ Second: \_\_\_\_\_

Ayes: \_\_\_\_\_ Nays: \_\_\_\_\_ Abstentions: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank Colonna, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Fujimoto  
Deputy Attorney General