

# Comments from the Management Conference on the Finance Plan of SMBNEP's CCMP

## Comments from Coastal Conservancy:

Hi Guangyu,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SMBRC Finance Plan. I have the following comments and would be happy to chat on the phone if you have questions or just want to discuss. Overall I think this is a very helpful document to have because it can help us make the case for funding needs for the Santa Monica Bay program.

### General Comments:

- It would be more helpful to have names of projects in the CCMP Next Step/Project Activity Name column. SCC has many projects on-going in the SMB watershed and it is hard to tell if they have all been captured in this plan, and hard to know where they should be added in. Once the project names are clarified I can go back in and add all of the projects I know of in the watershed that would fit within these actions (including the P12 projects). Either that or I can send you a list and you can insert them where you like.
- The Finance Plan would be more useful from a fundraising perspective if it had a total estimated cost. In order to do that, I would remove projects with vague descriptions and no cost estimates. For instance, Action #10 is "remove additional fish barriers", the two project descriptions are very broad, the partners listed are "many", and there are no cost estimates. There are a few other examples like this throughout the document.

### Specific Comments:

- Need a better cost estimate for Rindge Dam. Current estimate over the next five years is only \$105,000. It is my understanding that they need significant funding for engineering, barrier removal upstream of the Dam, and funding for dam removal itself.
- Add the AES Power Plant redevelopment and wetland restoration in Redondo Beach. Cost estimate is around \$50M. Lead entity is City of Redondo Beach. Partners are SCC, CNRA.
- Add Engineering and Design of Ballona Wetlands Restoration Project. Cost estimate is \$2M. DFW is lead. SCC is partner.
- SCC Prop 12 is not funding the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility (Action 21).
- SCC is not the lead entity on supporting creation of increased public transit to and from beaches (Action 25).
- What do the asterisks refer to in the CCMP Next Steps column?

Thanks for pulling all of this together.

Best,  
Megan

## Comments from LA County Sanitation Districts:

Hi Guanyu,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I was a bit confused going through this because there are so many actions and as you know some SMBRC is just tracking because they are led by others. Do you need to track finance plan for work done by others? Not sure how this fits in Finance Plan and if your expectation is that you'll get funding values for every action, every year? That is pretty significant task specially since some actions are very broad efforts. Also, maybe I am just new but it would be helpful if you can review for me a few items. First, I understand we have the CCMP that includes 44 actions. The past months, you have shared the workplan for FY 20, and in there was a reference to estimated FY 20 budget (that I don't remember if I saw the attachment) and now there is a finance plan that you are asking for input. What is else is coming for FY 20? I guess maybe I can look at website to try to figure this out but this is where some Board member orientation information would be helpful. Also, at what point do we get to see how the money from the NEP was actually spent in the fiscal year?

I have the following comments regarding a couple of actions we are involved in.

Action 21 -Support recycled wastewater efforts by JWPCP of LACSD.

I assume you are looking for what funds are needed by SMBNEP to support this action? But I noticed that one of the columns has "or partner funding" so does this mean money we are spending? I think on your end you are just tracking this effort and you would need no funds for this activity, is that correct? If you are looking at Partner Funding, every year we (LACSD) budget on our end funds, around 1 million dollars for support work. MWD has budgeted \$17 million dollars for construction of demonstration plant, which has been spent already and there is a lot of other work going on. The operating budget for the 0.5 mgd demo facility once it is operating is about \$3 to 5 million/year (this is still being evaluated). My suggestion is that you don't include our costs because it gets complicated, things change and not sure it is helpful to you. Please let me know what you think.

Action 36 -Support OA sensor array maintenance, calibration and data downloads in accordance with SOP.

I think for this action, our staff has sent you some information and the \$12,000 listed is what SMBNEP is expected to contribute. On our end, for in kind services for this effort, our Marine Biology Laboratory staff spent about \$10,000 in one year, so yearly this about what we would expect to spend. Staff in our Reuse and Compliance Section, who support some of the activities of the Marina Biology Lab, and also track other SMBRC efforts account for another \$10,000 in in kind support. Not sure if you need to include this but I thought I would share the information.

Thanks,  
Martha Tremblay

## Comments from City of Santa Monica:

| Staff   | Action | Description   | Next Step | Description  | Current Funding   | Needs for Implementation  |               |
|---------|--------|---|-----------|--|---|---|---------------|
| Shannon | 1      | Acquire open space for preservation of habitat and ecological services  | 3         | Support partners in identification and prioritization of key acquisition or conservation easement properties | N/A   | TBD   | City supports |
| Shannon | 2      | Restore kelp forests in the Bay to improve the extent and condition of the habita   |           |  |   |   | City supports |
| Shannon | 6      | Restore coastal strand and foredune habitat to beaches and sandy shores to improve coastal resilience   | 1         | Continue long-term monitoring of the Santa Monica Beach Restoration Pilot Project                            | \$55K, funded by USEPA, Annenberg Metabolic Studio, Patagonia | \$20K for monitoring, CAL EPA grants, California Natural Resources Agency |               |
| Shannon | 7      | Restore and maintain the entire LAX Dunes system to support native plants, wildlife, and rare species   |           |  |   |   | City supports |
| Shannon | 13     | Restore Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve to enhance wetland habitats and benefits to people  |           |  |   |   | City supports |
| Shannon | 15     | Implement projects that improve understanding and/or enhance endangered and threatened species populations (e.g. habitat improvements for Western Snowy Plover, genetics)                   | 3         | Support projects within western snowy plover critical habitat  | Same as action 6  | \$15K, maintenance of dune restoration pilot, CALEPA, CNRA                |               |
| Curtis  | 16     | Support the implementation of activities and projects such as those in Enhanced Watershed Management Plans (EWMPs) and  | 1         | Continue to support implementation of projects identified in EWMPs and WMPs                                  |   | \$25,000,000 - Prop 1 Stormwater, County Measure W, Local funds Measure V |               |
| Curtis  | 17     | Infiltrate, capture, and reuse stormwater and dryweather runoff through green infrastructure, LID, and other multibenefit projects and improve understanding of ecosystem services provided | 2         | Complete additional LID projects throughout the watershed  |   | \$16,400,000 - Prop 1 Stormwater, County Measure W, Local funds Measure V |               |
|         |        |   | 3         | Promote adoption of local ordinances to require  | N/A - already adopted   |   |               |

| Staff    | Action | Description   | Next Step     | Description   | Current Funding  | Needs for Implementation  |  |
|----------|--------|---|---------------|---|--|---|--|
|          |        |   |               | projects in public right-of-way to mitigate stormwater  |  |   |  |
| Alex     | 21     | Support policies that promote reuse, recycling, and advanced wastewater treatment to reduce reliance on imported water sources  | Add activity: | implement Sustainable Water Infrastructure Project, which would construct the Advanced Water Treatment Facility to reduce reliance on imported water. | \$96M; Clean Water State Revolving Fund loan, City local funds |   |  |
| Chris C. | 22     | Support policies and implement projects that divert landfill waste and encourage composting to improve water quality and lower greenhouse gas emissions   | 3             | Support expansion, outreach and implementation for residential and commercial organics collection and recycling                                       |  | \$1,000,000, TBD  |  |
| Liz      | 24     | Coastal Resilience in LCP   | 1             | Adopted LCP, includes coastal resilience efforts  | funding by private developers                                  |   |  |
| Liz      | 24     | Coastal Resilience in LCP   | 2             | sea level rise studies have already been conducted  | funding by private developers                                  |   |  |
| Chris D. | 25     | Support best management practices, increased public access, and improved public facilities for beaches and other public trail systems to support both enhanced natural resources values and benefits to | Add Activity: | Improve multimodal access (pedestrian and bicyclist)to and along beaches  | \$11.2M, local funds   | N/A   |  |
| Shannon  | 30     | Conduct community engagement, education, and inform policies related to water conservation and reuse to reduce water demand and reliance on imported sources  | 1 to 4        |   | \$1.7M, local funds  | \$17M, local funds  |  |
| Alex     | 31     | Achieve water quality benefits by businesses through community engagement and implementation of best management practices   | 2             | Distribute restaurant engagement tool   |  | TBD, local funds or any county/state funds for program implementation |  |

| Staff   | Action | Description  | Next Step | Description   | Current Funding   | Needs for Implementation   |               |
|---------|--------|--|-----------|---|---|--|---------------|
| Shannon | 32     | Reduce marine debris by supporting bans on single-use items, conducting outreach, and participating in trash reduction programs          | 2         | Support municipality bans of polystyrene, non-recyclable plastics, and single use items             | \$12K/year (outreach, education), Green Cities California, Urban Sustainability Director's Network, local funds | \$12K/year, grants from GCC and USDN   |               |
| Shannon | 33     | Monitor microplastics (including microfibers) and other marine debris in the Bay and coastal environments to inform                      |           |   |   |  | City supports |
| Shannon | 36     | Monitor chemical, physical, and biological characteristics in the Bay to inform climate change impacts such as ocean acidification       |           |   |   |  | City supports |
| Alex    | 40     | Research and inform best management and pollution reduction practices to address non-point source pollution and facilitate               |           |   | \$60K; local funds  | \$60K/year local funds   |               |
| Shannon | 42     | Inform strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase carbon sequestration in support of existing state actions and policies | 2         | Identify projects or programs that will prioritize carbon sequestration and resilience              |   | \$800M, Cal Air Resources Board, CAL EPA, AQMD grants, Cap and Trade Dollars, Transformative Climate Community |               |
| Curtis  | 43     | Implement the County-wide Safe Clean Water Program to support stormwater   | 2         | Participate in advisory board and support implementation of projects from the new funding mechanism | N/A - Santa Monica already participates   |  |               |

## **Comments from City of Redondo Beach:**

Mostly our comments should be around the wetland restoration opportunity at the 50-acre AES Redondo site. The Coastal Commission has determined that 6 acres are active, jurisdictional wetland, and State Coastal Conservancy recently awarded us a \$500,000 planning grant for the site. And Just yesterday, the California Natural Resources Agency awarded Redondo Beach \$4.8 million to purchase a portion of this site, the largest award from this section of Proposition 68 - see attached.

Next week we are having a field visit by the Executive Director of the Wildlife Conservation Board, John O'Donnell, the ED of the SCC, Sam Shuchat and a representative of the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Finance Plan of the Santa Monica Bay CCMP should specifically mention this incredible opportunity to restore an active wetland located on a power plant site that is due to retire on Dec. 31, 2020. There is no better opportunity in the Santa Monica Bay to restore an active wetland.

I hope this is enough for you to comment. Please feel free to call anytime today, although I'm probably unavailable from 12 -2. I've cc'd Christian and Guangyu, so hopefully between the three of you the SBCOG can submit comments by the October 4th deadline.

Thanks for following-up on this!

Bill Brand  
Mayor  
City of Redondo Beach

*\*\* See also CNRA Announcement Attachment \*\**

## For Immediate Release

### Media Contact:

Lisa Lien-Mager, 916-653-9402

[lisa.lien-mager@resources.ca.gov](mailto:lisa.lien-mager@resources.ca.gov)

October 02, 2019

# Natural Resources Agency Announces Awards to Protect Cultural, Community and Natural Resources

**SACRAMENTO** – The California Natural Resources Agency today announced \$37 million in funding for 21 projects under its Cultural, Community and Natural Resources grant program funded by Proposition 68.

In 2018, California voters passed the California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Act of 2018 (Proposition 68), which directed \$37 million to the Natural Resources Agency for competitive grants that protect and enhance natural, cultural, historic, park and community resources.

“These awards are a unique opportunity to help protect and celebrate important cultural resources while also building climate resiliency and expanding access to recreation,” California Natural Resources Secretary Wade Crowfoot said. “We’re excited to support projects that enable communities to showcase traditional practices and promote sustainability.”

A few projects are highlighted below with the full list of projects following.

The City of Twentynine Palms was awarded \$2 million to construct a dual-purpose building that will serve as a visitor center for Joshua Tree National Park and a cultural center and museum for the Twentynine Palms Chemehuevi and San Manuel (Serrano) Bands of Mission Indians. The center will showcase elements of the park’s Campbell collection of prehistoric, historic and tribal artifacts, which date back 10,000 years to the earliest human habitation of the area known as the Pinto Basin Culture. The visitor center will also facilitate the goal of becoming a gateway to the Joshua Tree National Park.

The County of San Luis Obispo was awarded \$1.9 million to rehabilitate and restore the historic Cass Warehouse, known as the Cayucos Veteran’s Hall, to serve as an important community center. The Warehouse will increase opportunities for community education and engagement programs, provide recreational amenities and public access to cultural resources, and serve as an economic center for the community. The Cass Warehouse is the oldest building in the original townsite and eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources.

The Yurok Tribe was awarded \$2.7 million to acquire 2,584 acres in Humboldt County, allowing it to continue to reclaim ownership of its ancestral territory and manage the landscape using traditional knowledge and contemporary restoration practices. This property will be managed in conjunction with adjacent properties overseen by the tribe, with coordination of sustainable forest management, habitat restoration, sediment reduction, fire and fuels reduction, and carbon sequestration efforts. This acquisition will directly help tribal members by providing job opportunities, access to traditional foods, and a space for traditional practices.

## FULL LIST OF AWARDS -

### Alameda County:

- **City of Oakland, \$2,201,100**, *Mosswood Park Career Center and Innovation Lab at Mosswood Community Center*

### Del Norte County

- **Save the Redwoods League, \$875,000**, *Grove of Titans Redwoods Protection Project*

### Fresno County:

- **City of Kerman, \$2,003,695**, *City of Kerman Eastside Community Park*

### Humboldt County

- **Yurok Tribe, \$2,700,000**, *Ke'pel Creek Acquisition Project*

### Los Angeles County:

- **AltaSea, \$2,132,559**, *AltaSea Visitor Center*
- **Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy, \$131,190**, *White Point Nature Preserve and Center Community Stewardship Project*
- **Providence Little Company of Mary Foundation, \$674,988**, *Lawndale Wellness and Activity Center*
- **City of Redondo Beach, \$4,829,000** *Acquisition of 15 Acres at AES Power Plant Site for Park Development*

### Monterey County:

- **Esselen Tribe of Monterey County, \$4,520,000**, *Esselen Tribal Lands Conservation Project*

### Napa County:

- **Sonoma Land Trust, \$750,000**, *Acquisition of McCormick Ranch: Protecting the Natural Resources of Napa & Sonoma Counties*

### Nevada County:

- **The Sierra Fund, \$344,193**, *The Nisenan Preserve, Phase II: Enhance Culture, Community, and Natural Resources*

### Orange County:

- **Discovery Cube Orange County, \$3,468,953**, *Visitor Enrichment Experience Project*

### Sacramento County:

- **Powerhouse Science Center, \$2,300,000**, *Vital Visitor Enhancements at New Powerhouse Science Center*
- **Southgate Recreation and Park District, \$2,325,160**, *Fruitridge Community Center and Park Restoration Project*

### San Bernardino County:

- **Twentynine Palms, \$2,000,000**, *Project Phoenix Cultural Center and Joshua Tree Visitor Center*

### San Luis Obispo:

- **County of San Luis Obispo, \$1,937,000**, *Cayucos Veteran's Hall Restoration*

### San Mateo County:

- **Amah Mutsun Land Trust, \$399,676**, *Collaborative Restoration of an Indigenous Cultural Landscape at Quiroste Valley Cultural Preserve, Año Nuevo State Park*

Sierra County:

- **Sierra County Land Trust, \$353,400, Sierra Buttes/Lakes Basin Acquisition Program – Smailes Property.**

Sonoma County:

- **Sonoma County Regional Parks, \$389,850, Tolay Gathering Area – “Heenup Tuliila.”**

Stanislaus County:

- **Stanislaus County, \$756,030, Bonita Park Pool Project**

Tulare County:

- **City of Farmersville, \$1,908,206, Farmersville Community Park Phase III – The Sequoia Gateway Area**

###

## Comments from Supervisor Sheila Kuehl's Office:

### Comments on CCMP Plan

#### Action #13: Restore Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve

- Add to collaborating partners: LACFCD; LAC (SD4 very involved – the Ocean Cleanup has decided to pilot their trash cleanup solutions at Ballona)

#### Action #16: Support activities to achieve TMDLS

- Add to collaborating partners: LACFCD – Safe, Clean Water and County's Water Plan (upcoming)

#### Action #17: Implement and study runoff capture projects **Priority**

- LAC Department of Public Works doing a lot of work on this within their stormwater division; they are partnering with TreePeople on expanding home-based capture systems and LID guidelines/support for homeowners

#### Action # 21: Support policies to reduce reliance on imported water **Priority**

- LAC: LACFCD working on County's Water Plan that will focus on this; Our County Sustainability Plan also highlights this as a target goal

#### Action #22: Implement composting and landfill diversion projects

- LAC Public Works: Roadmap to Zero Waste Future; K-12 education program

#### Action #28: support disadvantaged communities **Priority**

- Move to lead: LAC Public Works and Parks (Measures A & W have designated percentages for DACs, also the LA River Master Plan)
- TreePeople

#### Action #30: engage community in water conservation and reuse

- Add TreePeople (Generation Earth Program), LAUSD

#### Action #32: Reduce Marine Debris **PRIORITY!!!!**

- Move to Lead: LA County Chief Sustainability Office and Public Works
- Under Next steps: to support policies by BOS to reduce and/or eliminate single-use plastics
- We will engage them in our stakeholder process

#### Action #34: improve understanding of emerging contaminants

- Add to partners: regional water boards, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Water Foundation (as it relates to drinking water)

#### Action #40: Inform non-point source pollution

- Add to partners: LAC Public Works Stormwater Division, Our Water LA coalition

**Comments from Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy:**

Hi, Guangyu—for starter, re the financing chart, Item 14, remove State Parks as lead entity (they're not active partners on the Liberty wildlife bridge project), and replace with Caltrans and MRCA.

## Comments from Ballona Wetlands Land Trust:

Hi Guangyu,

The Land Trusts comments to the draft Finance Plan are as follows:

1) Ballona Wetlands Restoration Project (Action 13): The only listed CCMP next step related to the larger restoration project entails supporting the lead agencies with technical information. The estimated budget needs over five years for this task is \$5,000, which seems to suggest a substantially diminished role for the NEP. An explanation of this role reduction would be helpful in understanding the financial needs.

Additionally, SMBRC has a long and well-documented role of helping to identify funding for the actual restoration project itself, which is anticipated to cost between roughly 132 and 184 million dollars. The finance plan would seem to be a useful tool to track progress on the status of any potential project funds. An explanation of why there is no discussion of the anticipated needs and funding sources for this project would be helpful.

2) Ballona Wetlands Community Restoration (Action 13): The finance plan indicates that the projected budget for this project over the next five years has risen from \$28,000 in 2015 to \$130,000 in the plan, \$105,000 has already been secured. A discussion of this substantial cost increase would help decision-makers and the public better understand the fiscal impact of the project. The Land Trust has reason to believe that costs for this project will continue to rise as a result of vegetation efforts not being implemented in a more timely manner, giving invasive weeds a stronger foothold in much of the project area.

3) Reducing greenhouse gas emissions (Action 42): Climate change poses the single greatest threat to the planet in history. There has been discussion of using funds set aside for reducing greenhouse gas emissions on projects that may have no benefit or negligible benefit on GHG emissions. Limited funds set aside for addressing GHG emissions must be optimized for that purpose, and SMBRC should establish clear guidelines regarding how to determine the impact of a project on GHG emissions, and clear guidelines that the NEP will not seek funds set aside for GHG emissions reduction unless it can be shown that the funds will have a proportionally substantial impact on GHG emissions.

4) Comparative needs analysis: To facilitate the financial plan's use as a strategic planning document, it would be helpful to have some sense of the priorities of the NEP. Which underfunded actions or next steps are the most critical? Similarly, which potential funding sources would require the least effort to obtain?

5) Explanation of NEP financial model: Much of the NEP financial model seems to be heavily focused on "leveraging" funds. It would be helpful to have an explanation in the finance plan of which funds are legitimately described as leveraged funds, and which aren't. It is generally understood that leveraged funds are those funds that are "unlocked" by the base investment and which otherwise would not be available. However, it appears that the NEP sometimes counts any funds from any source being spent on projects in the annual work plans as leveraged funds, even when expenditure of those funds toward restoration activities was not dependent on the applicable base investment. This seems to have been

the case with the Ballona Wetlands Community Iceplant Removal Project, in which what was actually a cost overrun was treated as leveraged funds.

6) Acquisition (Action 1) : Acquisition is perhaps the most important element of conservation as land and other natural resources must be spared from development in order to be restored or enhanced. It would be extremely helpful to have a list of potential acquisition parcels with details such as whether there is a willing seller, the relative conservation value of the parcel, the permitting status of the parcel, and similar information. For instance, numerous parcels in the vicinity of the Ballona Wetlands have made news regarding their development status, including Toew's Beach, the land at the confluence Ballona and Centinela Creeks, and the land between the 90 freeway and the Villa Marina housing development. The Land Trust would be happy to assist in the development of such a list.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Walter

Walter Lamb  
Ballona Wetlands Land Trust  
310-384-1042