

DATE: October 15, 2018

TO: RMC Governing Board

FROM: Mark Stanley, Executive Officer

SUBJECT: Item 11: Consideration to approve opening a call for projects for Proposition 1, Round 2 funding

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: That the RMC authorize a resolution to approve opening a call for projects for RMC's Proposition 1, Round 2 funding.

BACKGROUND: The RMC Board approved RMC's Proposition 1, Chapter 6 Grant Program Guidelines on September 28, 2015. 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.

Staff conducted four public workshops to review the draft of revised grant guidelines during the month of July 2015 in the cities of Newhall, West Covina, Fullerton and Downey. The four workshops were well attended, more than 100 participants attended the workshops collectively. The public comment period was open from July 10 to August 14, 2015. In addition, the workshop in Downey included the participation of Assembly member 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.

Generally, Proposition 1 looks to fund water quality and supply enhancement projects. At the July 25, 2016 RMC Board meeting, the Governing Board approved the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Proposition 1 (2015) Tier 1 and Tier 2 Grant Recommendations (Resolution 2016-13). At the September 26, 2016 RMC Board meeting, the Governing Board approved the RMC Proposition 1 Grant Program (2015) Tier 1 and Tier 2 Grant Recommendations and preliminary authorized grant distributions of up to \$20,261,564 of RMC's \$30,000,000 Chapter 6 allocation (Resolution 2016-23). There was a total of twenty (20) projects recommended for funding.

The following is the proposed grant timeline:

Current Date	Action
<i>RMC Prop 1 Grant Program (Chapter 6) - Round 1</i>	
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
May-September 2016	RMC Board Approval of Round 1, Tier 1 Grants
<i>RMC Prop 1 Grant Program (Chapter 6) - Round 2</i>	
October 16-December 16 2018	Call for Projects
December 2018-February 2019	Assemble Project Review Teams & Score Applications
March – May 2019	RMC Board Approval of Round 2, Tier 1 Grants (anticipated)

Upon approval to open a call for projects for RMC's Proposition 1, Round 2 grant program, RMC Staff will issue the official Call for Projects which will go from October 16, 2018- December 16, 2018. Any grant applications submitted will be reviewed and scored according to the Project Evaluation Criteria. See the attached Exhibit A- Project Evaluation Criteria. It is listed as Appendix C as part of the RMC Grant Guidelines. The Final Prop 1 Grant Program Guidelines can be found at: http://rmc.ca.gov/Final_RMC_Guidelines_Oct2015.pdf

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 Measure 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.

Funding: Funding for this project will be allocated from Chapter Six (6) of Proposition 1, under statute 79731 (f): San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, the sum of thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000).

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
1.0	Restore River Parkways			
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
	Subtotal	10	10	10
*2.0	Educational/Interpretive Signage			
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
	Subtotal	2	2	2

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
3.0 Habitat and Restoration Resource Values			
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 – 3.2 The project preserves threatened natural habitat and protects native flora and fauna biodiversity that may be lost to a planned development. – OR – 3.3 The project preserves project preserves and/or enhances existing natural habitat and protects native flora and fauna biodiversity.	5	5	5
3.4 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
3.5 The project supports substantial in-stream or native riparian habitat and/or supports substantial upland native vegetative cover.	1	2	1
3.6 The project supports unique and/or irreplaceable ecological systems, i.e., coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, monarch breeding, migratory watering area.	1	2	1
3.7 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
3.8 The project provides for contiguous open space and is adjacent to publicly owned open space or private land protected under a conservation easement or similar perpetual restriction. The project includes habitat that provides a buffer between protected or proposed protected areas and incompatible uses.	1	2	1
3.9 The project will be managed in such a manner as to provide maximum long term habitat protection and has an established long-term maintenance plan.	1	2	1
3.10 The project enhances wetland and subtidal habitats to restore ecosystem function and provide multi-beneficial flood protection and resilient shorelines.	1	2	1
3.11 The project is on the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project Regional Strategy project list.	1	2	1
3.12 The project design is resilient and adaptable to climate change. In addition, 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
3.13 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
Subtotal	15	25	15

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
4.0 Matching Funds			
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
4.3 Contribution of matching funds will count towards completion of the entire project being submitted for funding	3	3	3
Subtotal	15	15	15
5.0 Environmental Justice and Disadvantaged Communities			
5.1 Cal-Enviro Sreen standards - http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html 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. If your project area is not included in the Cal-Enviro maps, then include in the project narrative, the data and analysis utilized for evaluating the pollution burden and it is also the best available science. 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 http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html .	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 track 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 http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html .	5	5	5
5.7 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
5.8 The project provides physical linkages to open space (passive and recreational) from a disadvantaged and/or park-poor neighborhood.	2	1	1
5.9 The project conforms to the RMC Environmental Justice Policy per Section 2.4.	5	5	5
Subtotal	38	33	33

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
6.0 Multi-benefit and multi-jurisdictional			
6.1 This project is a multi-benefit 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
Subtotal	3	3	3
7.0 Stakeholders/Partners Resource Value			
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
Subtotal	8	8	8
8.0 Stewardship and Management Plan Value			
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
Subtotal	4	4	4

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
9.0 Water Sustainability/Water Storage/Water Infrastructure			
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
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
Subtotal	10	10	10
10.0 Urban Land Value			
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
Subtotal	10	5	5
11.0 Water Resource and Quality Value			
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

Project Evaluation Criteria	Program Relevance		
	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills
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
Subtotal	25	25	25
<u>TOTAL POINTS</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>130</u>

October 15, 2018 – Item 11

RESOLUTION 2018-22

RESOLUTION OF THE SAN GABRIEL AND LOWER LOS ANGELES
RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS CONSERVANCY (RMC) APPROVING A
CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR PROPOSITION 1, ROUND 2 FUNDING

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 State of California has authorized an expenditure of funds from Proposition 1, the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 to the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy for capital outlay and local assistance multi-benefit grants for ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects; 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 October 16, 2018-December 16, 2018; 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 the grant is consistent with the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006, which provides funds for the RMC grant program.
3. FINDS that the Proposition 1 RMC Grant Program is consistent with the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (“Proposition 1”), which provides funds for the RMC grant program.
4. FINDS that the actions contemplated by this resolution are exempt from the environmental impact report requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

- 5. ADOPTS the staff report dated October 15, 2018.
- 6. AUTHORIZES the RMC to open a call for projects for RMC's Proposition 1, Round 2 funding.

~ End of Resolution ~

Motion _____ Second: _____

Ayes: _____ Nays: _____ Abstentions: _____

Passed and Adopted by the Board of the
SAN GABRIEL AND LOWER LOS ANGELES RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS
CONSERVANCY on October 15, 2018.

Frank Colonna, Chair

ATTEST: _____
David Edsall
Deputy Attorney General